

RISK MATRIX FOR REGULATION AND ENFORCEMENT - ENFORCEMENT POLICY

<u>REGULATION AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY</u>	<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
Does the activity involve breaches of criminal legislation?	YES – continue to matrix.	
	NO – then this matrix is not an appropriate method for decision making in relation to the matter.	

People are safe and their wellbeing and safety are assured	No safety or health and wellbeing implications.	0
	Limited possibility of risk to safety and wellbeing.	1
	A high probability that illness or injury will occur or has occurred. Any injuries or illness should be restricted in nature (i.e. not require hospital treatment).	2
	Death, illness, injury (requiring hospital treatment for more than three days sickness absence from work) or has occurred or is likely to occur.	3
Direct or indirect economic implications to legitimate businesses	No implications for legitimate businesses.	0
	Limited consequences to a very small number of legitimate businesses.	1
	A large part of the legitimate business sector will be affected, for example all of those in a particular geographic area or businesses supplying a particular market.	2
	All of the legitimate business sector will be affected.	3
Direct or indirect economic implications to consumers or the wider public	No economic loss to consumers or the wider public.	0
	The economic loss was very small (or was likely to be very small) or to a small group of individuals and the amount of economic loss was very small (or was likely to be very small).	1
	The economic loss was restricted (or was likely to be restricted) to a group of individuals and the amount of economic loss was limited (or was likely to be limited).	2

APPENDIX 2

	Higher level of economic loss to an individual or the economic loss or the probability of such or the amount of economic loss could have potentially affected a higher number of consumers or the wider public.	3
Reputation (risk to the local authorities' reputation) in taking no action	No reputational risk.	0
	Low reputational risk.	1
	Medium reputational risk.	2
	High reputational risk.	3
Likelihood that the infringing activity could have been easily ascertained (for example: the size of the business may be a factor when making this assessment or using a reasonable test; the persons should have known it was wrong or information could be readily discovered online.	Very difficult to ascertain.	0
	Difficult to ascertain.	1
	Could be ascertained with a limited amount of activity on behalf of the business.	2
	Easy to ascertain even with limited knowledge of the subject area.	3
Has the defendant taken reasonable precautions and due diligence in the circumstances to prevent the activity from occurring?	Not applicable.	0
	High level of precautions, training and systems in place and followed the systems.	1
	Some precautions and systems in place and followed but not comprehensive.	2
	No training and systems in place or followed.	3
What is the history of the defendant in relation to regulatory compliance? (The local or national position of a defendant can be taken if appropriate. Considerations of 'culpability' and 'harm'	Not applicable.	0

may be necessary where there has been or would not likely be any local authority history of compliance assessment)		
	The defendant has a good history of proactive work with the Local Authority to achieve compliance in its sector. Previous engagement has found no issues. (Considerations where culpability and/or harm are 'low').	1
	Previous engagement has found issues, however, these have been rectified within a reasonable time frame. (Considerations where culpability and/or harm are 'medium').	2
	The defendant has a poor history of Local Authority engagement and/or previous instructions have been disregarded and/or a high level of non-compliance has been found on previous engagement. (Considerations where culpability and/or harm are 'high').	3
Aggravating features (i.e. length of time activity has been happening for; was the activity purposely covert etc.; was the victim vulnerable; was an attempt made to obstruct an investigation)	Not applicable.	0
	Low level of aggravating features.	1
	Some level of aggravating features, however, limited by time or amount of aggravation.	2
	Higher level of aggravation.	3

<u>KEY</u>	<u>ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>SCORE RATING</u>
3 – high risk	If an activity results in three or more level HIGH RISK scores then formal action should be considered.	Score 12 and above.
2 – medium risk	Consider informal / lower tier action.	Score 2 to 11.
1 – low risk	No action.	Score 1.

The Risk Matrix will be used as a framework to support transparency and consistency of approach and decision making. (For workplace health and safety the Enforcement Management Model (EMM) is used to ensure that enforcement decisions are consistent).

Where the score falls between 2 and 11 and the investigating officer believes the matter should be referred for formal proceedings the case must be reviewed by the operations manager and/or Heads of Service and a record of the decision will be retained.

Where the score is 12 and above and the investigating officer believes the matter should not be referred for formal proceedings the case must be reviewed by the operations manager and/or Heads of Service and a record of the decision will be retained.

Institution of criminal proceedings will only be formally recommended to the relevant Council Director where the Council's Legal Services or Head of Service within Regulation and Enforcement have authorised progression.