How to use this template

Fill in the required boxes in Table 1.3. The completed *Risk Register* should be brief and concise to easily convey the essential information. The description of the risk should be specific, include the potential impact and identify the appropriate actions. The overall risk is determined by multiplying the likelihood score (table 1.1) with the severity score (table 1.2).

What are potential consequences of risk?

* Negative impact on the lives of beneficiaries
* Damaging media coverage
* Loss of credibility with stakeholders
* Financial performance failure; i.e. over or under spend
* Staff and/or volunteer turnover

**Based on the final ratings, give attention to those with highest scores and prioritize mitigating actions.**

Mitigation actions/risk strategies should include such things as:

* **Risk avoidance:** Not performing an activity that could carry risk (What should you stop?)
* **Risk reduction:**Steps to reduce impact or likelihood of risk from occurring (What should you do now/later?)
* **Risk transfer:**Reduce the impact of risk by sharing it with other external parties (Who should we work with?)
* **Risk acceptance:** Accepting the loss when it occurs; acceptable for small risks where cost of mitigating against the risk outweighs the potential losses (What can we tolerate?)
* **Recovery actions** - Planned actions taken once a risk has occurred to allow you to move on. (What should you do after?)

**Table 1.1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Considerations for rating likelihood** |   |   |   |
| Event is expected to occur in most circumstances | >90% | Almost Certain | **5** |
| Event could occur in most circumstances | 50-90% | Likely | **4** |
| Event likely to occur  | 30-50% | Possible | **3** |
| Event may occur  | 10-30% | Unlikely | **2** |
| Event may only occur in exceptional circumstances | <10% | Rare | **1** |
| **Table 1.2** |   |   |   |
| **Considerations for rating impact**  |   |   |   |
| * Death or permanent disability
* Survival of National Society or its programs at risk
* Public inquiry/closure
* Reputation severely affected
* Sustained negative media coverage
* Affects more than 25% of financial reserves or budget
* Near complete loss of stakeholder support or confidence
* High Board involvement
 | (Reflecting missed targets)>40% | Catastrophic | **5** |
| * Serious personal injury
* Significant loss of reputation or stakeholder confidence
* Damage to reputation
* Strong negative media coverage
* Formal internal inquiry
* Major compliance censure
* Affects 5-25% of financial reserves or budget
* Resolved by executive management
 | (Reflecting missed targets)20-40% | Major | **4** |
| * Personal injury
* Stakeholder complaints/concerns raised
* Media coverage on incident
* Embarrassment to National Society
* Major compliance penalties
* Affects 1-5% of financial reserves or budget
* Matter raised by senior government officials
* Resolved by leadership team
 | (Reflecting missed targets)10-20% | Moderate | **3** |
| * Minor injury
* Complaints addressed internally by managers
* Unlikely to lead to negative publicity
* Minor compliance penalties
* Affects 0.1-1% of financial reserves or budget
* Resolved by routine management action
 | (Reflecting missed targets)5-10% | Minor | **2** |
| * Minor injury
* Complaints addressed by staff
* No negative publicity
* Minor compliance admonition
* Affects 0.01% of financial reserves or budget
* Resolved by routine procedures
 | (Reflecting missed targets)<5% | Insignificant | **1** |
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**Table 1.3**

**Risk Register example**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ID | Risk | Description of potential impact on team/National Society | Likelihood (1:low-5-high) | Impact(1:low-5-high) | Overall risk =(Likelihood x Impact) | Control procedures currently in place | Date of review | Risk strategy/Mitigating actions(avoidance, reduction, transfer, acceptance, recovery) | Individual(s) responsible | Monitoring frequency/Timeline for action(s) | Projected cost |
| 1 | Behavioural Risk is existing. It could be on call receivers side or caller side. | Reputational damage | 2 | 3 | 6 |  |  | Training,monitoring and testing could be done to mitigate behavioural risk from call receiver side and proper explanation could be done to reduce behavioural risk from caller side. |  |  |  |
| 2 | Timely response may not happen | Reputational damage | 3 | 2 | 6 |  |  | Detailed Sops to be followed strictly explaining the time limit to response and continuous follow up. |  |  |  |
| 3 | There could be Inappropriate answers/questions |  | 3 | 3 | 9 |  |  | More training and FAQs are frequently updated, to mitigate inappropriate answers. To mitigate inappropriate questions explain purpose and scope of the hotline. |  |  |  |
| 4 | There will be some questions which answers are not yet approved. Concerns are in discussion for years. Those sort of questions are impossible to answer |  | 3 | 2 | 6 |  |  | Prepare diplomatic answers, and explain why we can't answer those particular questions directly.  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Number of calls more or less(High or low) |  | 4 | 3 | 12 |  |  | Call time management with limiting a call to specific minutes, contingency plan to expand capacity |  |  |  |
| 6 | Confidentiality of the calls and complains is the risk that exists.  |  | 2 | 4 | 8 |  |  | Clear understanding and is part of contract risk is already addressed through contract, strongly follow the clause in contract. |  |  |  |
| 7 | Failure to take actions against Red Flagged complaints |  | 3 | 4 | 12 |  |  | Clear SOPs to handle such and dedicated person to follow up on those. |  |  |  |
| 8 | Managing expectation of people on quality of service we provide and the expectations from the programmes.  |  | 4 | 2 | 8 |  |  | Regular review of services, training and FAQs Not making promises that could not be delivered. Call recording and review of recorded calls, invite key people in the periodic review meeting. In operational level once in a week review meeting. At managerial level in three months. In programme side Accurate information provided about the programme, Effective referral system will be established to mitigate the risk. |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9 | Network and technical problem |  | 4 | 3 | 12 |  |  | Have a backup and contingency plan, business continuity plan, key contacts to fix those problems. |  |  |  |
| 10 | Funding and ownership |  | 4 | 4 | 16 |  |  | Monitor performance and have continuity options, investigate future options, reporting to relevant partners to continue it.  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Functionality of call centre in event of another earthquake or other major emergency  |  | 2 | 5 | 10 |  |  | Contingency plan and business continuity.  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Relationship with service provider |  |  |  |  |  |  | Regular contacts and clear setting of expectations, clearly defined contact points. |  |  |  |
| 13 | Updating call centre with information |  | 2 | 3 | 6 |  |  | By providing regular information bimonthly and in needs basis. |  |  |  |