[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 27 October 2014 17:00
To: [redacted] (Defra); [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (Defra); [redacted] (Defra)
Subject: RE: WRA Risk Register

Hi [redacted] and Colleagues

Thanks for confirming the source. However, please note the observation of [redacted] in his email of the 24th October with which I agree. Although the general principles of RA and RM are the same for all stressors (including chemical) and harmful outcome, the actual practice is field and context-specific. This may be dictated by specific Regulations or the current prevailing working paradigm in that field (e.g. occupational health and safety, food safety, etc.). This will be, I guess, reflected in the RMM.

I am so sorry I cannot be with you on the 30th October, but I wish you a very productive meeting.

All best wishes from Lyon

[redacted]

[redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted] (Defra) [redacted]
Sent: 27 October 2014 13:03
To: [redacted] Defra); [redacted] (Defra)
Subject: RE: WRA Risk Register

Here you are, link as promised

[redacted]

http://www.hse.gov.uk/risk/evaluate-the-risks.htm

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: 24 October 2014 17:00
To: [redacted] (Defra)

[redacted] (Defra); [redacted] (Defra)
Subject: RE: WRA Risk Register

Dear [redacted]

Thanks for this.

You say "This is what HSE says about evaluating risk". This sounds like helpful guidance. Could you please send the document from which it comes?
You may already have sent it to us- in which case apologies and can you point out where it comes from please?

[redacted]

On Oct 24 2014, [redacted] (Defra) wrote:

>All
>
>
>
>I'll put forward my thoughts because I think that there needs to be a
>little caution in over-complicating this risk register, so that it
>remains focussed and easy for the reader to understand?
>
>
>
>Risk assessment is a widely recognised process. It's about specifying
>what the risks are and looking to see how you can mitigate them so that

>the risk can be reduced to a manageable level; total elimination of a
>risk is not necessarily the goal. This risk register is a tool to
>manage the risks assessed. This is what HSE says about evaluating
risk:
>
>
>
>"Having identified the hazards, you then have to decide how likely it
>is that harm will occur; ie the level of risk and what to do about it.
>Risk is a part of everyday life and you are not expected to eliminate
>all risks. What you must do is make sure you know about the main risks
and
>the things you need to do to manage them responsibly."
>
>
>
>I think that inserting "phasing out" at every opportunity rather misses

>the point of the risk register. As I've said above this process is
>about mitigating the risks identified not eliminating them. I thought
>the Mitigation sub-group had agreed that an overarching statement would

>cover this point of phasing out? That would certainly be one way to
>shorten what is now on the table?
>
>
>

>A couple of other points, I've noticed in the latest detailed version:
>
>- an insertion into the first risk which talks about risks to children
>aged 9 to 18 and then says the risk hasn't been evaluated, but must be
>the same as that to adults? Where is the evidence for this assertion?
>
>- in the second risk, which has been introduced to this document since
>the original iteration, it isn't clear what the risk is? I note in the

>risk assessment (Pg 50) that this isn't highlighted as a potential
>health risk- was this an oversight or is this new risk just a
>separation of one of the original risks?
>
>- in the risk register that was being worked on after the May meeting
>there were 9 risks identified but now there are 18? I can see there has

>been separation of some of the risks (one as detailed above) but more
>markedly on the wildlife side. This adds to making the document quite
>complex and I wonder why this is necessary in view of many of the
>countermeasures being common to each on the wildlife side?
>
>
>
>In summary I would like to see a much more focussed and shorter
>document clearly identifying the risks and what mitigation measures
>might be taken. If the register becomes any more complicated it could
become
>impenetrable for the average reader. However I realise that this is
>not for me, but for the LAG Mitigation group to decide.
>
>
>
>I will see you all on the 30th
>
>
>
[redacted]
>
>
>
>
>
>From: [redacted]
>Sent: 22 October 2014 14:34
>To: [redacted] (Defra);
>[redacted]
>Cc: [redacted]
>Subject: Fwd: WRA Risk Register
>
>
>
>Dear Colleagues,
>
>
>
>I forward [redacted] email which he has copied to me. Comments

>welcome.
>
>
>
>Kind regards and many thanks.
>
>
>
>[redacted]
>
>
>
>Begin forwarded message:
>
>
>
>
>
>From: '[redacted]
>
>Subject: WRA Risk Register
>
>Date: 22 October 2014 13:35:50 BST
>
>To: [redacted]
>
>Cc: [redacted]
>
>
>
>
>
>Dear [redacted]
>
>
>
>On behalf of [redacted] and myself, please find our risk register as
>agreed. It is based on our previous wildlife risk assessment, and on
>Defra's risk register template and guidance notes. We have tried to
>keep it relatively simple as we understood was required. Although
>perhaps it was not for us to address countermeasures and consequent
>residual likelihood/impact risks, we have offered some suggestions that

>seem appropriate, in the hope they are helpful to your Mitigation
>Sub-group's work.
>
>
>
>As also previously indicated, we are attaching some general comments
>relating to the risk register documents circulated earlier by [redacted].
>Under the prevailing circumstances the attached comments could only be
>of a general rather than detailed and specific nature, but again are
>offered in the hope they are helpful.
>

>
>
>With best wishes
>
>
>
>[redacted]
>
>
>
[redacted]
>
>[redacted]
>
>
>
>Please consider the environment. Do you really need to print this
email?
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>_____
>
>Disclaimer: This email and any files transmitted with it are
>confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or
>entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in