**ACT Rescue and Foster (ARF) Inc**

RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN
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# RISK MANAGEMENT POLICY STATEMENT

ARF is committed to the management of risk to:

* help ensure the safety our foster carers, volunteers and foster dogs
* maintain the trust of our members and the public
* provide quality of service
* maintain our assets and intellectual property
* protect our image and reputation; and
* meet our statutory obligations.

Risk management is a key part of improving our business and services to be a leading community service organisation. Our aim is to achieve best practice in controlling all the risks to which our organisation is exposed.

To achieve this aim, our risk management plan will be proactively maintained and continually improved. This involves risk identification and risk evaluation linked to practical and cost-effective risk control measures commensurate with our organisational needs.

Risk management is a continuous process demanding awareness and proactive action from all ARF volunteers to reduce the possibility and impact of accidents and losses, whether caused by ARF or externally. Suitable risk management activities will be incorporated into our business planning, operations and the management of our volunteers.

Risk Management is a core responsibility for all volunteers.
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# ABOUT US

ARF (ABN 54 495 663 951) is an incorporated association of people in the Canberra (Australia) and surrounding region who rescue dogs from euthanasia and foster them temporarily in our own homes for as long as it takes to find them loving, permanent homes. ARF has been active since 2001.

ARF aims to: Save and improve the lives of dogs primarily in the Canberra region, as well as in surrounding regions, including metropolitan and regional Sydney by:

* Rescuing and rehoming as many unwanted dogs as possible;
* Educating the community about responsible dog companionship;
* Working with local pounds to help achieve, develop and implement "minimum destruction" policies and procedures; and
* Establishing and developing networks of communication for people involved in rescue and rehoming dogs.

**Statistics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Detail** |
| Public Office Holder | William Marshall |
| Address | PO Box 1308, Woden, 2606 |
| Email | Arf-committee@fosterdogs.org |
| Number of Members | Approx. 300 as at July 2021 |
| General Assets (Computers, furniture, etc) | Mobile internet dongle; printer; laptop; two high quality cameras; dog runs; dog crates S, M & L; marquee and stalls equipment; general dog care, enrichment and training equipment |
| Reputation | A leader in Canberra and surrounding areas for rescuing and rehoming dogs |
| Stakeholders | Government (e.g. ACT Domestic Animal Services); Foster carers; Adopters; Volunteers; General public; ARF members; Vet partners |
| Skills & knowledge | Strong personal relationships with key stakeholders; Animal behaviour skills |

**Emergency Contacts**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Title** | **Name** | **Contact** |
| Other | Committee Member | Wendy Parsons | 02 6231 6342/  0478 636 856 |

# INTRODUCTION

Risk[[1]](#footnote-1) is inherent in the functions and activities of ARF and its volunteers. As the consequences of an adverse event may include an inability to meet stakeholder requirements, financial loss, organisational embarrassment, operational disruption, legal problems, and so forth, it is important that management policies, procedures and practices are in place to minimise ARF’s exposure to risk.

This document sets out a plan to include Risk Management in the business and operations of ARF, and to provide guidelines for its implementation. Risk Managementinvolves adopting and applying a systematic process to identify, analyse, assess, control and monitor risk so that it is reduced and maintained within an acceptable level. The goals behind introducing Risk Management into ARF are threefold:

* To provide an assurance that ARF has identified its highest-risk exposures and has taken steps to properly manage these;
* To ensure that ARF business planning processes include a focus on areas where risk management is needed; and
* To establish a process across ARF that will integrate the various risk control measures that the organisation already has.

This Plan sets out the manner in which ARF’s Risk Management Policy is achieved. ARF’s risk management approach and process follows that outlined by the Australian Standard for Risk Management, AS/NZS 4360:2004. ARF achieves these requirements by developing suitable analysis and documentation of risks in implementation of activities, namely to:

* Identify risks in the immediate area and of wider organisation impact;
* Assess the probability of the risk eventuating;
* Assess the likely impact on the organisation if the risk occurs;
* Determine an overall risk rating on the basis of probability and impact;
* Record any existing controls or strategies which aim to reduce the risk;
* Determine if the risk exposure is acceptable or not; and
* Determine further action plans and contingency plans to manage the risk where appropriate.

Documentation of risks form the Risk Register (below), which is open to review and updating. Risk information will be filtered to focus on only those risk exposures that are significant and relevant to providing assurance. The end result of risk management is to provide ARF with a regular profile report of the status of risks and risk controls across the organization, and an assessment/assurance report of its major risks.

**All members of ARF are responsible for managing risk within their span of control, for promoting the application of risk management and assisting with the identification of global or broad-based risks that could impact on ARF as a whole.**

The Risk Plan is reviewed annually by the Governance Subcommittee, reviewed and endorsed by the Committee and made available to all members. Risk will be addressed as needed in core documents and in training or other information sharing. Other reviews and updates will occur as necessary.

The annual review of the Risk Plan includes:

* A review of the Risk Register and summary ranking of risks by overall rating level to identify all “high” and “medium” level risks across the organisation as a whole to ensure that all are accounted for in the organisation’s broader planning and reviewing processes of its services and operations.
* A statement, provided through the Governance Subcommittee (and its report) to the Annual General Meeting of ARF’s risk performance over the previous twelve months.

ARF sees three criteria for setting its risk management priorities, as follows. Further risk identification, risk assessments and risk treatment need to be carried out bearing these in mind.

* Risks affecting the **safety, security and health** of ARF’s volunteers and dogs.
* Risks affecting ARF’s **reputation or ability** to perform.
* Risks affecting ARF’s **management** of and **accountability** for performance.

# RISK REGISTER

## Foster care

| **Risk No.** | **Activity/Asset/ Stakeholder** | **Risk Event (What will happen?)** | **Consequences and rating (Result?)** | **How will risk occur?** | **Likelihood** | **Risk rating** | **Current Controls (mitigation)** | **After controls** | **Revised risk rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Foster care activities – Driving foster dog to vet, walking foster dog, meet and greets of foster dog with carer’s own dog, meet and greets with prospective adopters, meet and greets with prospective adopters and their dogs | Foster carer’s own dog guards against foster dog  Foster dog guards against foster carer’s own dog/animals or family/friends  Foster carer provides unapproved temp care  Infected and contagious animal (e.g. Canine parvovirus) enters a foster carer’s home, infecting foster dog and/or own animals  Unprofessional behaviour displayed by foster carer towards pound staff, adopters or members of the public | Injury (major and minor) or death of foster carer  Injury (major and minor) or death of foster carer’s household members or own animals  Injury (major and minor) or death of foster dog  Injury of potential adopters, their children or their animals (e.g. potential adopter breaks finger handling foster dog that bolts, child mauled)  Miscellaneous accident (major and minor)  Litigation  Bad press  Reputational damage  Reduction in numbers of foster carers  Adoption imminent and not able to be completed so dog remains in care longer, with associated costs  **4 - Major** | Inexperience (e.g. new foster carer is not properly supervised by mentor)  Accident (e.g. dog fights, dog attacks, mishandling of foster dog)  Negligence (e.g. undertaking activities not endorsed in the foster carer manual)  Illness of foster carer (e.g. any illness that prevents foster carer from performing required duties)  Foster carer not provided with appropriate induction or training | **4 – Likely** | **Unacceptable** | ARF Behaviour Assessment and Approvals Panel help ensure aggressive dogs do not enter ARF  Foster carers undertake regular training  RSC records foster carer attendance at training sessions  Approvals Panel does not approve foster care by carer who has not undertaken required training each year  Foster carer is provided with a copy of the Foster Carers’ Manual and is talked through it by their mentor  Foster carer induction session provided to all new carers by ARF Home Visit Officer  Support structures in place to support foster carers e.g. engaged mentors, closed Facebook page, informal networks  Mentors attend meet and greets with new/gold level foster carers. Mentors that do not attend meet and greets with new/gold level foster carers are not allowed to mentor  RSC keeps foster carers informed of developments e.g. when disease, to the best of our knowledge is prevalent in our community and behaviours are modified as necessary  Foster carers and mentors have access to the necessary equipment to mitigate infection  Foster carers and mentors have access to the necessary equipment to mitigate injury to dog or person  Access to the necessary advice and equipment to mitigate disease and infection | **3 – Moderate**  **3 – Possible** | **Acceptable**  **Insurance covers injury to volunteer workers** |
| 2 | Foster dog – dog with behavioural issues (anxiety) or a puppy comes back into ARF’s care after being adopted; problem in foster carer’s home means foster dog cannot stay | ARF puts anxious dog in kennels because foster carer unable/unwilling to foster him/her  ARF puts puppy into kennels because foster carer unable/unwilling to foster him/her | Dog’s behavioural issues worsen and it becomes unable to be rehomed and is therefore euthanized  Foster carer psychologically and emotionally distressed  Puppy misses out on important socialisation or develops behavioural issues  Bad press  Reputational damage  Reduction in numbers of foster carers  **4 – Major** | No policies and procedures in place to manage issue | **4 – Likely** | **Unacceptable** | RSC to develop a Standard Operating Procedure Manual  RSC includes in SOP Manual options that can be used when required to ensure anxious dogs are not put in kennels including for example building relationships with local pet sitter businesses, documentation for emergency temp care recruitment, strong relationships with other local rescues | **3 – Moderate**  **3 – Possible** | **Acceptable** |
| 3 | Foster dog to be euthanised | A behaviourist or a vet assess that an ARF foster dog is not able to be rehomed or not able to be saved medically | Foster carer psychologically and emotionally distressed  Reputational damage  Reduction in numbers of foster carers  Bad press  **4 – Major** | Dog develops serious behavioural or medical issues while in ARF’s care  Dog returns to ARF with behavioural or serious medical issues  Dog comes into ARF with behavioural or serious medical issues | **3 – Possible** | **Unacceptable** | RSC to develop a Standard Operating Procedure Manual  RSC to document this procedure in RSC Standard Operating Procedure Manual:   * Carer and Mentor are contacted by Committee in writing **and** in person/via phone PRIOR to euthanasia of foster dog – email sent by President or Secretary on behalf of whole Committee * Foster carer and mentor can opt-out of participating in this process at any stage * Foster carer and mentor are:   + made aware of the issues/reasoning and timeframe for the dog to be destroyed;   + given the opportunity to see and spend time with the dog, if it is possible to safely do so;   + given access to support from the Committee, or a person nominated by the Committee;   + given the opportunity to be involved with the process and are given options that allow the process to be carried out if they do not wish to be a part of it. * Only after the above steps have been completed, is the dog destroyed. | **4 – Major**  **2 – Unlikely** | **Acceptable** |
| 4 | Foster dog – escapes yard | Foster dog hit by car  Foster dog seized by rangers  Foster dog goes missing/stolen  Foster dog attacks/attacked by another dog when out  Foster dog contracts illness while out  Foster dog injured while out | Injury (major and minor) or death of foster dog  Infected and contagious animal (e.g. Canine parvovirus) enters a foster carer’s home, infecting foster dog and/or own animals  Adoption imminent and not able to be completed so dog remains in care longer  Miscellaneous accident (major and minor)  Litigation  Reputational damage  **3 – Moderate** | Inexperience (e.g. new foster carer)  Accident (e.g. gate left open by tradesperson)  Negligence (e.g. yard check not undertaken or issues missed during assessment) | **3 – Possible** | **Acceptable** | Mentors and/or home visit officers conduct yard checks of all potential foster carers before they take on a foster dog  Foster carers regularly check their own yards, particularly if dogs are left alone in the yard during the day (e.g. time for digging escape tunnels), and report any issues to mentors  RSC helps to arrange volunteer assistance with fence repairs for foster carers when it becomes aware of any issues | **3 – Moderate**  **2 – Unlikely** | **Acceptable** |

## 

## Behaviour assessment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk No.** | **Activity/Asset/ Stakeholder** | **Risk Event (What will happen?)** | **Consequences and rating (Result?)** | **How will risk occur?** | **Likelihood** | **Risk rating** | **Current Controls (mitigation)** | **After controls** | **Revised risk rating** |
| 5 | Behaviour Assessments | Assessor killed by pound dog  Assessor bitten or mauled by pound dog  Member of the public killed by dog under ARF’s behaviour assessors control  Member of the public bitten or mauled by dog under ARF’s behaviour assessors control  Pound dog injured due to assessor negligence or mishandling (e.g. two dogs in pathway outside kennels get into a fight; assessor drops lead and pound dog injured trying to escape)  Behaviour assessor injured in car accident en route to pound or to home from pound  Unprofessional behaviour displayed by assessor towards pound officer, dog walker or member of the public | Injury (major and minor) or death of behaviour assessor – accidental or negligent  Injury (major and minor) or death of pound dog/s – accidental or negligent  Injury (major or minor) to member of the public – accidental or negligent  Possible damage to key relationships with pounds resulting in ARF’s access to pound being revoked  Possible litigation  Bad press  Reputational damage  Loss of public confidence  **4 - Major** | Negligence (e.g. non-compliance with procedures)  Accidents (e.g. dog fights, dog attacks, mishandling of dogs)  Inexperience | **3 - Possible** | **Unacceptable** | Pound Liaisons ensure behaviour assessors have information about pound dogs before each assessment (i.e. ARF is informed in advance by relevant pound when required to assess high risk dogs)  RSC with pound liaison officers provides training for behaviour assessors  Behaviour training requirements fulfilled by behaviour assessors  Senior behaviour assessor or pound liaison is present when assessments are being undertaken  Behaviour assessors conduct assessments in teams not individually  Behaviour assessors have access to the necessary equipment to mitigate injury to dog or person  Behaviour assessors have access to the necessary advice and equipment to mitigate disease and infection  GSC maintains ARF’s public liability and volunteer work injury insurance coverage  ARF ensures behavioural assessors are fit to perform their duties and non-compliant assessors not permitted to assess pound dogs – necessary for insurance coverage | **3 – Moderate**  **2 – Unlikely** | **Acceptable**  **Insurance covers injury to volunteer workers**  **Public liability insurance in place** |

## 

## Other public facing

| Risk No. | Activity/Asset/ Stakeholder | Risk Event | Consequences and rating (result) | How will risk occur | Likelihood | Risk rating | Current Controls (mitigation) | After controls | Revised risk rating |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | Dog rehoming via Facebook page | Person injured or killed by rehomed dog  Person wants rehomed dog back/ownership dispute  Unprofessional behaviour displayed by ARF volunteers | Injury (major and minor) or death to member of the public  Incorrect advice provided  Possible litigation  Bad press  **4 - Major** | No policies and procedures in place  Lack of accurate information  Inexperience  Negligence | **3 – Possible** |  | Rehoming is not done via Facebook – if interest is via Facebook occurs normal contacts with foster carer/suitability assessment is done | **3 – Possible**  **4 - Major** | **Acceptable** |
| 7 | Foster carer recruitment – ARF home visit officer visits homes of potential foster carers and conducts yard checks | Mentor/volunteer has miscellaneous accident (e.g. trips over, falls up/down stairs, injured by foster carer’s dog)  Unprofessional behaviour displayed | Injury (major and minor) to volunteer or member of the public  Injury (major and minor) to volunteer or member of the public  Possible litigation  Reputational damage  **3 Moderate** | Negligence by volunteer  Non-compliance of volunteer with policies and procedures  Accident (e.g. needle sticks, bites, attacks, car)  Illness – contract infectious disease | **2 - Unlikely** | **Acceptable** | Clear advice available on home visit policies and procedures  Mentors and home visit officers have access to WH&S training | **3 – Moderate**  **2 – Unlikely** | **Acceptable** |
| 8 | Fundraising events – stalls, trivia night or other public event – with and without dogs | Member of the public injured at ARF event  Volunteer hurts back lifting stall components  Volunteer injured in car accident en route to event or to home  Unprofessional behaviour displayed by volunteer in public facing role | Injury to volunteer – major and minor  Injury to member of the public – major and minor  Possible litigation  Bad press  **3 Moderate** | Negligence by volunteer  Non-compliance of volunteer with policies and procedures  Accident (e.g. falls, strains, car accident) | **2 - Unlikely** | **Acceptable** | GSC maintain ARF’s public liability and volunteer worker personal injury insurance  Volunteers have access to WH&S training  Experienced stalls co-ordinator runs each stall  Two volunteers on each stall to lift equipment  ARF provides safety briefing to participants at public events (e.g. point out emergency exits) | **3 – Moderate**  **2 – Unlikely** | **Acceptable** |
| 9 | Use of ARF social media accounts | Unprofessional behaviour displayed by ARF representatives  Accidental personal post on social media | Incorrect advice provided  Possible litigation  Bad press  **3 - Moderate** |  | **2 - Unlikely** | **Acceptable** | Clear advice available on ARF role and policies/procedures  Use of qualifiers in all public advice  Social media policy in place  Only approved ARF officers are permitted to use social media accounts | **3 – Moderate**  **2 – Unlikely** | **Acceptable** |

## 

## Administration and compliance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk No.** | **Activity/Asset/ Stakeholder** | **Risk Event (What will happen?)** | **Consequences and rating (Result?)** | **How will risk occur?** | **Likelihood** | **Risk rating** | **Current Controls (mitigation)** | **After controls** | **Revised risk rating** | **Accepted?** |
| 10 | Functioning website that enables ARF internal processes and the achievement of ARF aims including adoption of dogs and education of the public | Existing website fails before new website is built  New website not built | Foster carers cannot review urgent dogs list  Adopters cannot review available dogs  Missed opportunities for foster dogs to find forever homes  ARF reputational damage  **4 Major** | Behaviour Assessors upload large files to website  Breakdown in relationship with new website contractor | **3 – Possible** | **Unacceptable** | WAG manages construction of new website  ARF provides sufficient numbers of experienced ARF users for acceptance testing during the testing phase to ensure success  ARF provides a decisive project sponsor to eliminate the need for modifications and reworking  External providers manage public and members’ sites  Back-ups in place. Manual records kept as necessary  Web sites monitored and continually updated, and back-ups regularly undertaken  ISP Providers have in place comprehensive contingency plans | **4 – Major**  **2 – Unlikely** | **Acceptable** | Yes |
| 11 | Committee activities:  Compliance with relevant regulation  Decision making  Policies and procedures  Annual General Meeting  Responding to public queries | Delays in decision making puts dogs or foster carers at risk  Failure to identify or consider impact of new regulations for ARF and its members  Key relationships damaged or destroyed (e.g. DAS)  Advice misinterpreted  Fraudulent activity  Misuse of ARF funds  Breakdown of Committee relationships  Breach of regulatory requirements  Membership alienated | Possible injury to people or dogs  Possible prosecution  Possible litigation  Unable to access pounds  Fines  Reduction in volunteer numbers  Loss of public confidence  Unable to perform key corporate responsibilities  Bad press  **3 - Moderate** | Communication failures  Negligence  Correct procedures not followed  No procedures in place  Relationship breakdown  Fraud  Misbehaviour | **3 - Possible** | **Acceptable** | Full visibility of ARF activities provided by subcommittee chairs to all Committee members  All policies/Practices documented  All members briefed on policies and implications of new regulation  Policies/Procedures documented and lodged with appropriate authorities  Committee and Subcommittees regularly engage with ARF members | **3 – Moderate**  **3 – Possible** | **Acceptable** | Yes |

## 

## Assets

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk No.** | **Activity/Asset/ Stakeholder** | **Risk Event** | **Consequences** | **How will risk occur** | **Likelihood** | **Risk rating** | **Current Controls (mitigation)** | **After controls** | **Revised risk rating** | **Accepted?** |
| 10 | Equipment, including:   * Marquee * General goods | Equipment damaged  Equipment stolen or lost  Equipment not returned by foster carers | Possible cost of replacement  **1- Insignificant** | No training to use equipment  Lack of knowledge in handling assets | 3 - Possible | **Acceptable** | Stalls coordinator takes care of equipment  Equipment register in place and equipment tracked and where necessary advice provided on how to use/set up (e.g. dog runs) | 1 – Insignificant  3 – Possible | **Acceptable** | Yes |

# Terminology Utilised for Risk Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Consequences** | | | | | | | **Level** | **Rank** | **Financial Impact** | **Objectives** | **Reputation and Image** | **Activities/Operations** | | **1** | **Insignificant** | Less than $1,000 | Negligible impact upon objectives | Unsubstantiated, low impact, low profile or no news item. | Less than 1 hour | | **2** | **Minor** | $1,000 to $10,000 | Minor effects that are easily remedied | Substantiated, low impact, low news profile. | 1 hour to 1 day. | | **3** | **Moderate** | $10,000 to $50,000 | Some objectives affected | Substantiated, public embarrassment, moderate impact, moderate news profile. | 1 day to 1 week. | | **4** | **Major** | $50,000 to $150,000 | Some important objectives cannot be achieved | Substantiated, public embarrassment, high impact, high news profile, Third Party actions. | 1 week to 1 month. | | **5** | **Severe** | More than $150,000 | Most objectives cannot be achieved | Substantiated, public embarrassment, very high multiple impacts, high widespread multiple news profile, Third party actions. | More than 1 month. |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Likelihoods** | | | | | **Level** | **Descriptor** | **Description** | **Frequency** | | **1** | **Rare** | The event may occur in exceptional circumstances. | Less than once in 30 years. | | **2** | **Unlikely** | The event could occur at some time. | Could occur once in 30 years. | | **3** | **Possible** | The event should occur at some time. | At least once in 10 years. | | **4** | **Likely** | The event will probably occur in most circumstances. | At least once in 3 years. |   **5 – ALMOST CERTAIN** | **Almost Certain** | The event is expected to occur in most circumstances. | More than once per year |

# Risk Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Likelihood** | **Consequences** | | | | |
| **1**  **INSIGNIFICANT** | **2**  **MINOR** | **3**  **MODERATE** | **4**  **MAJOR** | **5**  **SEVERE** |
| **5**  **ALMOST CERTAIN** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **4**  **LIKELY** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3**  **POSSIBLE** |  |  |  | **RN1** |  |
| **2**  **UNLIKELY** |  |  | **RN2** | **RN1** |  |
| **1**  **RARE** |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Level Definition** | | | |
| **Risk Level** | **Definition** | **Acceptable or Unacceptable** | **Action Necessary** |
| **E** | **Extreme** | **Unacceptable** | **Management to instigate policy and have insurance** |
| **H** | **High** | **Unacceptable** | **Management to instigate policy and have insurance** |
| **M** | **Moderate** | **Acceptable** | **Handled by operational formal policies** |
| **L** | **Low** | **Acceptable** | **Handled by day to day operations** |

1. **Risk** is usually defined as an assessment of the **possibility** of some adverse event occurring and the likely **consequences** of this event. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)