

ARPANSA Strategic Risk Register

Following is a register of six key strategic risks facing the Agency in 2016–17. Numbers 1 to 4 relate to the four strategic objectives and 5 and 6 relate to enabling activities of finance and workplace health and safety.

No.	Strategic risk	Category	Impact	Residual risk level	Controls	Treatment	Owner
1	Failure to provide accurate, effective and timely advice to the Minister's office and the Department	Reputation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to deliver strategic objectives Loss of Government confidence Reputational damage 	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dedicated parliamentary and government relations capability Maintain a network of trained advisors Relationship with Minister's office Process for managing parliamentary and departmental work flow 	Reduce	Head of Office of the CEO
2	Ineffective response to nuclear and radiological incidents and emergencies	Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harm to public safety or the environment Inadequate support to Government and other emergency response entities Reputational damage Uncoordinated efforts to apply national plans 	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trained emergency response personnel Engage in emergency response planning and exercises, both nationally and internationally Maintain 24/7 operation of the duty officer function Routine testing of incident management plan and arrangements 	Reduce	Head of Radiation Health Services
3	Error in Australian Clinical Dosimetry Service audit	Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorrect dose given to patients undergoing radiation therapy Loss of stakeholder confidence in the audit program Loss of program funding Reputational damage Harm to patient 	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audit program certified to ISO 17025 standard Direct audit comparison with international peers Independent external review 	Reduce	Head of Medical Radiation Services
4	Inadequate or delayed regulatory decision	Reputation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced regulatory effectiveness and efficiency Regulatory arrangements fail to prevent an incident Harm to public safety or the environment Reputational damage Regulatory burden 	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trained regulatory personnel Risk-informed regulatory delivery model Internal business processes in line with quality management system Ongoing engagement with Commonwealth licence holders Application of the Regulator Performance Framework Review by International Regulatory Review Service 	Reduce	Head of Regulatory Services
5	Inability to deal with fiscal restraint	Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unplanned deficit in budget Reduced service delivery Loss of stakeholder confidence Escalating costs to stakeholders Reputational damage 	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated planning and budgeting process Financial and non-financial performance monitoring and reporting Cost recovery arrangements Identify cost savings 	Reduce	Head of Corporate Office & Chief Financial Officer
6	Inadequate workplace health and safety arrangements	Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Death or serious harm to an ARPANSA worker (including staff and contractors) Prosecution of ARPANSA Executive Non-compliance with WHS requirements Reputational damage 	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive commitment to WHS demonstrated Risk-informed WHS management system and arrangements Monitor compliance with WHS requirements Dedicated WHS advisor Training and ongoing awareness 	Reduce	Head of Corporate Office & Chief Financial Officer