

Ref	The risk: what can happen and how can it happen	Qualitative Risk Analysis					Risk Score		Risk Priority	Risk Status	Rankings		Treatment Actions			Risk Reduction Measures & Treatment Type	Manager	Treatment Progress	Comments
		Threat or Opportunity	Existing Controls in place & Their Effectiveness	How likely is the event?	Consequence Rating	What are the consequences of the event?	Likelihood Rating x Consequence Rating				Threat Rank	Opp Rank	NZTA	TBS	Others				
1.1 SOIL ISSUES																			
1.1.1	AC may require further soil quality data (section 92/91) as presented information is insufficient	Threat	Good communication with AC team (ongoing) - section 92 is quite common and is often used to stall application processing	Quite Common	Medium	Delays to application process, further testing required, potential route for consultation process to be required.	4 x 40 = 160		Very High Threat		#N/A								
1.1.2	Further contamination of soil (pre containment)	Threat	No controls in place presently	Quite Common	Medium	May add to levels of heavy metals in soils further contaminating site. This may lead to restriction of activities in certain areas whilst remediation/consent is sought	4 x 40 = 160		Very High Threat		#N/A								
1.1.3	Adverse reaction from neighbours/iwi/AC Parks/HPT when parties are advised of contaminated site risk	Threat	None presently	Quite Common	Medium	Management of issue and parties may be costly and potential PR issue	4 x 40 = 160		Very High Threat		#N/A								
1.1.4	Potential need for remediation and/or long term discharge consent	Threat	None presently	Likely	Medium	If consent is granted or site is remediated then ongoing management.	5 x 40 = 200		Very High Threat										
1.1.5	Extent of contamination at Stokes Point not yet fully characterised and therefore extent / impact of exposure of public and neighbours and workers to contaminated soil sites unclear	Threat	None presently	Unlikely	Medium	Full characterisation required and measures put in place if health exposure issues	3 x 40 #N/A		High Threat		#N/A	#N/A							
1.1.6	Soils samples taken to date only examine northern area. Southern has not been reviewed to date. Testing will be required for southern end.	Threat	None presently although process to initiate further investigation is underway (DG)	Likely	Minor	May find southern end is a contaminated site that may require additional consent/management	5 x 10 = 50		Moderate Threat										
1.2 ROAD RESURFACING																			
1.2.1	Resurfacing of extensions is not covered by current application. This may require separate consent	Threat	None presently. Waiting on direction from NZTA (preliminary instructions given to unbundle	Likely	Medium	Works will be outside scope of current consent (if consent is required), preliminary assessment to be finalised.	5 x 40 = 200		Very High Threat		#N/A								
1.2.2	Resurfacing of 4 centre lanes may require consent and this is not covered by existing consents (AMA for example) AMA HAVE STATED THEY HAVE NO DISCHARGE THEREFORE NO CONSENT IS REQUIRED.	Threat	None required				### #N/A #N/A		#N/A										
1.3 CONSULTATION AND NOTIFICATION																			
1.3.1	Lack of agreement or delays re consultation within PMT	Threat	Discussions between SM, DG, CH	Likely	Major	Time delays	5 x 70 = 350		Extreme Threat										
1.3.2	AC require notification under special circumstances yet consultation is not undertaken either through instruction from NZTA or through recommendation from PMT	Threat	NZTA asking AC managers about likelihood of special circumstances so consultation can be done if required.	Unlikely	Minor	If special circumstances are invoked, processing time will be longer.	3 x 10 = 30		Moderate Threat		#N/A								
1.3.3	NZTA choose proactive consultation with neighbours prior to lodgement highlighting improvements regarding noise and containment	Opportunity	NZTA currently (Nov10) revisiting decision on whether or not to consult.	Unlikely	Medium	Reduced chance of special circumstances (notification) and improved neighbour relations if consultation is favourable	2 x -40 = -80		High Opportunity										
1.3.4	Consultation undertaken prior to lodgement and fails to reach agreement (objections) with numerous stakeholders (neighbours, parks, HPT)	Threat	Draft Consultation Plan	Quite Common	Minor	Delayed timeframe for lodging or processing, and possible need to address issues raised	4 x 10 = 40		Moderate Threat										
1.3.5	Consultation undertaken prior to lodgement and focus becomes negative aspects such as contaminated soil	Threat	Draft Consultation Plan - if consultation to occur, update to include positives regarding contamination i.e. shift to containment over land and possible future remediation	Quite Common	Minor	Time delays and negative public image / response and requirement for action to address concern	4 x 10 = 40		Moderate Threat										
1.3.6	Consultation undertaken issues raised by local iwi and others such as HG Forum cannot be addressed	Threat	N/A	Quite Common	Minor	Delayed timeframe for lodging or processing if NZTA choose to engage and risk to relationship with iwi / Forums	4 x 10 = 40		Moderate Threat										
1.3.7	Post lodgement / granting consultation with neighbours	Opportunity			Medium	Reduced chance of time delays in pre-lodging phase	### -40 #N/A		#N/A										
1.3.8	Post lodgement / granting consultation with neighbours but neighbours become aware of application and/or contamination issues as a result of NZTA consultation with iwi/AC Parks etc	Threat		Likely	Medium	Time delays, adverse PR	5 x 40 = 200		Very High Threat		#N/A								
1.4 NOISE																			
1.4.1	Present maintenance operations may exceed allowable noise levels requiring consent to be notified.	Threat	Undergoing trials to reduce overall noise emissions. Appears to be successful to date (due to new attachments etc).	Rare	Medium	Consent status becomes Discretionary Activity and therefore risk of Notification, timeframes/effort to obtain consent increase including Noise Management Plan etc	1 x 40 = 40		Moderate Threat		#N/A								
1.4.2	Noise specialist report (Marshall Day) monitoring of acoustic levels still not finalised and therefore conclusion regarding noise status cannot be made in time for lodging deadline.	Threat	Marshall Day delivering final report under urgency	Rare	Medium	Timeline delays	1 x 40 = 40		Moderate Threat		#N/A								
1.4.3	Management of controls (different plant/equipment to reduce noise levels) after consent obtained, fails due to poor site management, work methods etc	Threat	Draft EMP submitted with application includes measures to keep noise under thresholds	Unusual	Negligible	Minor non compliance resulting in dialogue with local authorities, possible complaints from neighbours	2 x 1 = 2		Negligible Threat										
1.4.4	Noisy works over coastal areas away from main area of works - unusual non routine maintenance of expansion joints for example (NCV behind Princes Street).	Threat	Hazard analysis prior to work, letters of notification to residents.	Unusual	Minor	Possible requirement for separate consent for discretionary works (requires notification of application of consent - unbundled for this reason).	2 x 10 = 20		Low Threat		#N/A								
1.5 ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS																			
1.5.1	AEE lack of technical robustness means application is rejected (Section B8) - see Submission below																		
1.5.2	AEE submission to council is technically sounds but style and format means it is confusing / lacks clarity	Threat	Reliance on visual summaries & tables, and review by NZTA. Final sign off prior to submission	Unusual	Minor	Potential requests for further information leading to delays.	2 x 10 = 20		Low Threat		#N/A								
1.5.3	AEE submission to council does not satisfy council technical requirements, due to lack of expert review prior to lodgement (section 92 - request for further information)	Threat	Highly skilled staff preparing submission, ongoing reviews by experts. Final sign off prior to submission	Quite Common	Medium	Potential requests for further information leading to delays.	4 x 40 = 160		Very High Threat										
1.5.4	Decision/approval on containment recommendations (following review of containment matrix) not provided by 12/11/10, meaning full description of proposal and AEE can not be completed.	Threat	Containment matrix has been distributed. Waiting on feedback.	Unlikely	Major	Final submission can not be completed. Application stalls. Significant delays	3 x 70 = 210		Very High Threat										

Ref	The risk: what can happen and how can it happen	Qualitative Risk Analysis					Risk Score	Risk Priority	Risk Status	Rankings		Treatment Actions			Risk Reduction Measures & Treatment Type	Manager	Treatment Progress	Comments
		Threat or Opportunity	Existing Controls in place & Their Effectiveness	How likely is the event?	Consequence Rating	What are the consequences of the event?	Likelihood Rating x Consequence Rating			Threat Rank	Opp Rank	NZTA	TBS	Others				
1.5.5	AC have agreed to non quantification of PM10, and hazardous air pollutants based on 100% containment over land by 2013. Further quantification of discharges may be required dependent on proposed land containment	Threat	Current commitment to 100% containment over land. Robust work methodologies.	Unusual	Medium	Further quantification may show adverse effects for residents and change status of application to discretionary (potential notification).	2 x 40 = 80	High Threat										
1.5.6	AC may not accept suggested condition of consent to determine BPO for discharged wash/waste water after containment	Threat	Key message to deliver to AC during socialising of consent process.	Likely	Minor	Time delays, further work for consent application	5 x 10 = 50	Moderate Threat										
1.6	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN																	
1.6.1	EMP submission to council is confusing & lacks clarity, from poor style (presentation)	Threat	Reliance on visual summaries & tables, and review by NZTA	Unusual	Minor	Potential requests for further information leading to delays.	2 x 10 = 20	Low Threat		#N/A								
1.6.2	EMP submission to council does not satisfy council technical requirements, due to lack of expert review prior to lodgement (section 92 - request for further information)	Threat	Highly skilled staff preparing submission, ongoing reviews by experts. Final sign off prior to submission	Quite Common	Medium	Potential requests for further information leading to delays.	4 x 40 = 160	Very High Threat										
1.6.3	AC may not agree with future flexibility (e.g. product changes) provided by EMP approach, resulting from change of approach from council.	Threat	Consultation with AC	Unusual	Minor	Rework of application, delays.	2 x 10 = 20	Low Threat										
1.6.4	Progress on EMP means it is not finalised in time for current lodging timeframe	Threat	Monitor progress vs resources vs programme	Unusual	Minor	Delays to submission	2 x 10 = 20	Low Threat										
1.7	CONTAINMENT																	
1.7.1	Refer separate risk register for main risks (containment risk matrix issued in draft 4/11/10)																	
1.7.2	NZTA can not/will not commit to containment as originally presented to AC (ARC), resulting from review of containment risk matrix e.g financial, structural etc (refer table above)	Threat	No control currently	Unlikely	Major	Application stalls. Short term consent will only be achievable.	3 x 70 = 210	Very High Threat										
1.7.3	No full comprehensive study has been undertaken for all aspects containment feasibility (TBS have undertaken conceptual review of the feasibility based on their work practices, this does not include detailed structural assessment only brief discussions with SSE, and may not be relevant to future maintenance contractors). There is a risk that commitments can not be achieved.	Threat	TBS report/study, (draft) containment matrix.	Quite Common	Major	Commitment to AC can not be met. Consent duration and flexibility reduced. Non compliance with consent conditions.	4 x 70 = 280	Very High Threat										
1.7.4	Demonstration of encapsulation performance is not completed prior to submission.	Threat	Skilled staff preparing submission, ongoing reviews by experts. Final sign off prior to submission	Rare	Medium	Potential requests for further information from AC leading to delays.	1 x 40 = 40	Moderate Threat										
1.7.5	AC may require greater detail for justification of percentage encapsulation that can be provided without significant trials, expense, long term studies etc.	Threat	Prepare substantial submission. Consultation with council, demonstration of previous/existing projects	Unlikely	Medium	Further studies required, trials may need to be initiated.	3 x 40 = 120	High Threat										
1.7.6	AC require consent to bind containment to specific methodologies	Threat	Application based on generic information. Consultation with council. Pre-lodgement review	Unusual	Medium	Limits flexibility for processes of future contractors.	2 x 40 = 80	High Threat		#N/A								
1.8	SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION TO AUCKLAND COUNCIL																	
1.8.1	Rejection of application by AC (Section 88) due to no pre-lodgement consultation/review	Threat	Consultation with AC, application will not be lodged until AC confirm acceptance (pass section 88 test)	Rare	Medium	Further work required for completion of application, review, sign off. Time delays	1 x 40 = 40	Moderate Threat		#N/A								
1.8.2	AC section 92 (request for further information) , resulting from insufficient information being submitted.	Threat	Pre-lodgement review, ongoing consultation with AC	Likely	Medium	Further work required for completion of application, review, sign off. Time delays	5 x 40 = 200	Very High Threat		#N/A								
1.8.3	AC section 91 (request for related consents e.g. contaminated sites, road resurfacing), resulting from unidentified consent trigger not being covered within application, or disagreement regarding connectivity between maintenance operations.	Threat	Pre-lodgement review, ongoing consultation with AC	Unusual	Medium	Further work required on other aspects (i.e. Drafting new applications for different works), review, sign off. Time delays	2 x 40 = 80	High Threat		#N/A								
1.8.4	AC will not accept NZTA proposal of levels of service (e.g. 85% containment). AC demand higher LOS.	Threat	Consultation with council, demonstration of previous/existing projects. AEE, BPO	Rare	Medium	Duration of consent will be less than applied for.	1 x 40 = 40	Moderate Threat										
1.8.5	Application could end up in environmental court if two parties (AC and NZTA) do not reach agreements re. BPO and levels of service.	Threat	Consultation with council, demonstration of previous/existing projects. AEE, BPO	Rare	Major	Delays to award of consent. Media (national) coverage for NZTA, and stakeholder relationships.	1 x 70 = 70	High Threat										
1.9	TIMELINE																	
1.9.1	Delayed lodging of application due to resolution of containment.	Threat					### #N/A #N/A	#N/A		#N/A	#N/A							
1.9.2	Delayed lodging of application due to feedback from AC pre-lodgement consultation	Threat					### #N/A #N/A	#N/A										
1.9.3	AC processing time runs longer than expected - due to Section 91 or Section 92 requests.	Threat					### #N/A #N/A	#N/A										
1.9.4	Application is publically or limited notified by AC (eg Special Circumstances)	Threat	Activity status management	Unlikely	Medium	Time delays, costs and appeal risk	3 x 40 = 120	High Threat										
1.9.5	If application notified and goes to appeal	Threat		Unusual	Medium	Time delays, costs, PR risk												
1.9.6	Consultation	Threat					### #N/A #N/A	#N/A										
1.9.7	Tender process (next maintenance contract) is delayed due to failure to resolve consent application.	Threat	Monitoring & implementing progress vs. programme. Indications have been that tender will be released early 2011.	Quite Common	Major	Delayed tender for maintenance contract, increased costs	4 x 70 = 280	Very High Threat		#N/A								
1.9.8	Consent not granted prior to expiry of existing consents (assuming all unknowns around containment etc are resolved in a timely fashion).	Threat	Monitoring & implementing progress vs. programme. Contingency to obtain continuance application and/or short term consent if necessary.	Rare	Major	Two stage application, continuance followed by full application. Lack of surety for NZTA for tender process.	1 x 70 = 70	High Threat										
1.10	CHANGE OF SCOPE / REQUIREMENTS FROM NZTA																	
1.10.1	Scope of project and/or goalposts change (NZTA internal policies for example)	Threat	Dedicated Project Manager, regular team meetings. Contingency to obtain continuance application and/or short term consent if necessary	Quite Common	Medium	Delays, further costs, inability to tender next contract	4 x 40 = 160	Very High Threat		#N/A								
1.10.2	NZTA ask for different direction on containment in light of review of containment matrix	Threat	??	Unlikely	Medium	Delays, further costs, inability to tender next contract	3 x 40 = 120	High Threat		#N/A								
1.11	STAFFING RESOURCES (CHANGE OF AVAILABILITY etc)																	
1.11.1	Key staff change - NZTA	Threat	Records of meetings, actions etc	Quite Common	Minor	Decision making process may stall/slow. Education of new staff on project	4 x 10 = 40	Moderate Threat		#N/A								

Ref	The risk: what can happen and how can it happen	Qualitative Risk Analysis					Risk Score	Risk Priority	Risk Status	Rankings		Treatment Actions			Risk Reduction Measures & Treatment Type	Manager	Treatment Progress	Comments
		Threat or Opportunity	Existing Controls in place & Their Effectiveness	How likely is the event?	Consequence Rating	What are the consequences of the event?	Likelihood Rating x Consequence Rating			Threat Rank	Opp Rank	NZTA	TBS	Others				
1.11.2	Key staff change - TBS	Threat	Records of meetings, actions etc	Unusual	Minor	Delays to project	2 x 10 = 20	Low Threat										
1.11.3	Key staff change - AC	Threat	Records of consultation, clarity of information provided.	Quite Common	Medium	Delays, change of approach from AC	4 x 40 = 160	Very High Threat										
1.11.4	Insufficient resources available	Threat	Monitor resources vs. prog vs. progress. Forecasting of work to go.	Unusual	Minor	Delays to project	2 x 10 = 20	Low Threat										
1.12 FINANCIAL																		
1.12.1 Insufficient funding from NZTA to implement containment							### #N/A #N/A	#N/A		#N/A	#N/A							
1.12.2	Additional costs from further work required from AC	Threat	Robust submission, Pre-lodgement review, ongoing consultation with AC	Likely	Minor	Delays for granting of consent	5 x 10 = 50	Moderate Threat		#N/A								
1.12.3	Project costs blow out, from either lack of management or continual changing of scope.	Threat	Monitor resources vs. prog vs. progress. Forecasting of work to go.	Unlikely	Minor	Additional costs to NZTA	3 x 10 = 30	Moderate Threat										
1.13 OTHERS																		
1.13.1	Future contractors change methods and systems for maintenance meaning original containment commitments are no longer achievable/met.	Threat	Robust tender process, generic info in application and therefore flexibility of consent conditions. Contingency to obtain continuance application and/or short term consent if necessary	Unusual	Negligible	Non compliance with consent, contractor may default on contract KPI/KRA's, contract may need to be re-tendered.	2 x 1 = 2	Negligible Threat		#N/A								
1.13.2	Option for alternative for lodging (e.g. gentleman's agreement to commit to levels of containment prior to submission, then go to tender, then complete full application with greater surety).	Opportunity	Consultation with council, demonstration of previous/existing projects. AEE, BPO	Unlikely	Medium	Not tied into consent prior to tender, costs can be established during tender process.	2 x -40 = -80	High Opportunity			#N/A							
1.13.3	AC do not grant long term (20years +) consent due to uncertainty of unidentified risks (e.g. containment) not being determined prior to current target date lodgement	Threat	Application only lodged after pre-lodgement approval, sufficient detail/information in application	Likely	Medium	Short term consent, or application put on hold.	5 x 40 = 200	Very High Threat		#N/A								

1 CutOffScore = 100
0

	Negligible 1	Minor 10
1	Negligible Threat	Low Threat
2	Negligible Threat	Low Threat
3	Negligible Threat	Moderate Threat
4	Low Threat	Moderate Threat
5	Low Threat	Moderate Threat

	Substantial -100	Major -70
1	High Opportunity	High Opportunity
2	Very High Opportunity	High Opportunity
3	Very High Opportunity	Very High Opportunity
4	Extreme Opportunity	Very High Opportunity
5	Extreme Opportunity	Extreme Opportunity

Threat Validation List

	Likelihood Rating
Likely	5
Quite Common	4
Unlikely	3
Unusual	2
Rare	1

Opportunity Validation List

	Likelihood Rating
Almost Certain	5
Expected	4
Likely	3
Unlikely	2
Very Unlikely	1

Consequence List

	Consequence rating	
	Threat	Opportunity
Collapse	150	-100
Substantial	100	-100
Major	70	-70
Medium	40	-40
Minor	10	-10

Negligible

1

-1

Risk Status List

L	Live
E	Emerging
P	Parked
C	Closed
Yes	Exposure possible @ current commitment status
No	Exposure not possible @ current commitment status

Exposure Categories

SD	Service Delivery ie Network Efficiency/Network Availat
H&S	Health & Safety
ES	Environmental Sustainability
CS	Community Sustainability
CPL	Compliance
\$	Financial

TOPickList

Likely
Quite Common
Unlikely
Unusual
Rare

Almost Certain
Expected
Very Unlikely

Medium 40	Major 70	Substantial 100
Moderate Threat	High Threat	High Threat
High Threat	High Threat	Very High Threat
High Threat	Very High Threat	Very High Threat
Very High Threat	Very High Threat	Extreme Threat
Very High Threat	Extreme Threat	Extreme Threat

Medium -40	Minor -10	Negligible -1
Moderate Opportunity	Low Opportunity	Negligible Opportunity
High Opportunity	Low Opportunity	Negligible Opportunity
High Opportunity	Moderate Opportunity	Negligible Opportunity
Very High Opportunity	Moderate Opportunity	Low Opportunity
Very High Opportunity	Moderate Opportunity	Low Opportunity

ility

Collapse

150

High Threat
Very High Threat
Extreme Threat
Extreme Threat
Extreme Threat

CONSEQUENCE or EXPOSURE

		Definitions						
Descriptor	Health & Safety	Image	Environment	Stakeholder Interest	\$ M	Loss Service Delivery	Rating	
Threat	Collapse (addition for AHB study)	Multiple Fatalities	International Media Coverage reputations ruined	Permanent widespread ecological damage	Commission of Inquiry, severe community impact	> \$500m	4 lanes: >1 year	150 (Dec 2006 workshop)
	Substantial	Multiple Fatalities	International Media Coverage	Permanent widespread ecological damage	Commission of Inquiry	+ \$10m	2 lanes: >10 days 4 lanes: >5 days 8 lanes: >2 days	100
	Major	Several Fatalities	Sustained National Media Coverage	Heavy Ecological Damage, Costly Restoration	Ministerial Inquiry	+ \$5m - \$10m	2 lanes: 1-10 days 4 lanes: 8hr-5 days 8 lanes: 2hr-2 days	70
	Medium	Serious Injuries	Regional Media Coverage or Short Term National Coverage	Major but recoverable ecological damage	Ministerial Questions or 3rd party investigations	+ \$2m - \$5m	2 lanes, 2-24 hours 4 lanes: 1-8 hours	40
	Minor	Minor Injuries	Local Media Coverage	Limited but medium term effects	Official Information request	+ \$500k - \$2m	2 lanes, 1 - 2 hours	10
	Negligible	Slight Injuries	Brief Local Media Coverage	Short term effects	Minor Complaint	< \$500k	1 lane, off peak 2 lanes at night	1
Opportunity	Negligible	Prevention of slight injuries	Brief Local Media Coverage	Short term enhancement	Letter of support	< \$500k		-1
	Minor	Prevention of minor injuries	Local Media Coverage	Limited but medium term enhancement	Submission in support of RMA and LTMA	+ \$500k - \$2m		-10
	Medium	Prevention of serious injuries	Regional Media Coverage or Short Term National Coverage	Medium to long term ecological enhancement	Champion in community	+ \$2m - \$5m		-40
	Major	Saving of several fatalities	Sustained National Media Coverage	Long term and important ecological enhancement	Small financial contribution	+ \$5m - \$10m		-70
	Substantial	Saving of multiple injuries	International Media Coverage	Permanent widespread ecological enhancement	Large financial contribution	+ \$10m		-100

PROBABILITY or UNCERTAINTY

THREAT

Descriptor	Probability	Frequency	Description	Rating
Likely	>50%	Greater than once per year	The threat is expected to occur in most circumstances	5
Quite Common	20%-50%	Once per 1-5 years	The threat will commonly occur in most circumstances	4
Unlikely	10%-20%	Once per 5-10 years	The threat may occur occasionally	3
Unusual	1%-10%	Once per 10-50 years	The threat could infrequently occur	2
Rare	<1%	Less than once per 50 years	The threat may occur only in exceptional circumstances	1

OPPORTUNITY

Descriptor	Probability	Description	Rating
Almost Certain	>90%	The opportunity is almost certain to be realised	5
Expected	75%-90%	The opportunity is expected to be realised in most circumstances	4
Likely	50%-75%	The opportunity will probably be realised	3
Unlikely	25%-50%	The opportunity is unlikely to be realised	2
Very Unlikely	<25%	The opportunity is very unlikely to be realised	1

		Threat					
		Negligible 1	Minor 10	Medium 40	Major 70	Substantial 100	Collapse 150
Consequence →	Probability ↓						
Likely	5	Low Threat	Moderate Threat	Very High Threat	Extreme Threat	Extreme Threat	Extreme Threat
Quite Common	4	Low Threat	Moderate Threat	Very High Threat	Very High Threat	Extreme Threat	Extreme Threat
Unlikely	3	Negligible Threat	Moderate Threat	High Threat	Very High Threat	Very High Threat	Extreme Threat
Unusual	2	Negligible Threat	Low Threat	High Threat	High Threat	Very High Threat	Very High Threat
Rare	1	Negligible Threat	Low Threat	Moderate Threat	High Threat	High Threat	High Threat

Compare Versions:	Ranking	Score - Beca	AHB - Dec 2006 (Opus)	Score - 2006 Manual
	Extreme	350+	350+	350+
	Very High	160-300	140-300	200-300
	High	70-140	70-120	70-160
	Moderate	30-50	30-50	30-50
	Low	4-20	4-20	4-20

		Opportunity				
		Negligible -1	Minor -10	Medium -40	Major -70	Substantial -100
Consequence →	Probability ↓					
Almost Certain	5	Low Opportunity	Moderate Opportunity	Very High Opportunity	Extreme Opportunity	Extreme Opportunity
Expected	4	Low Opportunity	Moderate Opportunity	Very High Opportunity	Very High Opportunity	Extreme Opportunity
Likely	3	Negligible Opprotunity	Moderate Opportunity	High Opportunity	Very High Opportunity	Very High Opportunity
Unlikely	2	Negligible Opprotunity	Low Opportunity	High Opportunity	High Opportunity	Very High Opportunity
Very Unlikely	1	Negligible Opprotunity	Low Opportunity	Moderate Opportunity	High Opportunity	High Opportunity

Note: Amended to reflect more representative risk assessment

Sum of Beca1	
Group1	Total
0	0
101	0
102	5
103	1
104	2
105	2
106	0
107	1
108	2
109	2
110	0
111	0
201	3
202	1
203	1
204	0
205	2
206	1
301	2
302	0
303	0
304	0
305	1
306	0
307	0
308	0
309	0
401	0
402	3
403	0
404	2
501	0
502	0
503	0
504	0
505	0
506	0
507	0
508	0
509	0
510	1
(blank)	
Grand Total	32