



# RISK ASSESSMENT AND TREATMENT PLAN

Version 03\_2024

## Part 1: Objective and Context setting for the risk plan

\*\*\*Attention\*\*\* Hide this row after reading - All 3 parts of the risk plan in the 3 worksheets have to be completed and printed Individually.

<b>Activity / Operation Name</b>	Operation Crystal Brooke - AFC Women's Asia Cup 2026	<b>Command / Function</b>	Specialist Protective Command
<b>Business Area</b>	SPC - SPECIAL EVENT PLANNING TEAM	<b>Contact Person</b>	SPECIAL EVENT PLANNING TEAM

<b>Objectives</b>	Objective 1 (#01): To contribute to the safety and security of the Asian Football Confederation Women's Asian Cup 2026 (AFCWAC26).
-------------------	--

<b>Context</b>	<p>The risk managed under this RATP focuses on the safety and security of deploying AFP members and AFP areas of responsibility.</p> <p>The event owners are the Asia Football Confederation Local Organising Committee, with coordination for the Australian Government's support and response coordinated by the Department of Home Affairs.</p> <p>Department of Home Affairs have compiled a KRA5 Risk Register that covers risks associated with the overall security arrangements for the event. The AFP have endorsed this document.</p>
----------------	---

<b>Date of this risk assessment</b>	20-Feb-26	<b>Review date of risk assessment</b>	23-Feb-26	s 22(1)(a)(ii)	s 22(1)(a)(ii)
-------------------------------------	-----------	---------------------------------------	-----------	----------------	----------------

Part 2: Risk Identification, Analysis, and Evaluation for this activity (Refer to the Guidance Tables worksheet in the Blue tab to complete this section)

\*\*\*Attention\*\*\* Hide this row after reading - Complete Part 1 worksheet Objective and Context setting in the Yellow tab before completing this worksheet.

\*\*\*Attention\*\*\* Hide this row after reading - Rows can be added or deleted depending on the number of sources, consequences, controls etc. Fill info in the order of the column numbers. When you need to insert a new row, do that within the block for the same risk.

IDENTIFICATION					ANALYSIS & EVALUATION								
Risk Ref: No	1 Risk Description (Describe the Risks that could impact the Objectives mentioned in the Part 1 worksheet which is the Yellow tab at the bottom of the page)	2 Objective # of the objective effected by the Risk	3 Source # Sources of the Risk (Briefly describe the potential cause(s) of the Risk)	4 Consequence # Consequences of the Risk (Briefly describe what will be the potential impact(s) if the Risk occurs)	6 Source # / Consequence # related to the Control	5 Existing Controls for each of the Risk (Briefly describe the existing Controls in place for each of the Risk)	7 Control Owner (Position of the person who owns the Control)	8 Control Rating (Fully Effective, Mostly Effective, Partially Effective, Slightly Effective, Ineffective, Unrated)	9 Control Effectiveness (Strong, Incomplete, Weak, Unknown)	10 Current Risk Rating (Assess the Consequence and Likelihood taking into account the effectiveness of the existing Controls)			11 Proposed action to be taken (Avoid, Reduce, Share, Retain)
										10A Consequence	10B Likelihood	10C Rating	
1	Dignitary protection measures for dignitaries attending WAC26 are not commensurate with the threat and risk	1	S1	Inaccurate or incomplete threat and risk assessments	C1	Social or security incident resulting in embarrassment or loss of dignity of visiting dignitary							
			S2	Inadequate consultation with key stakeholders regarding dignitary protection arrangements	C2	Significant security incident resulting in injury or death of visiting dignitary							
			S3	Inadequate or ineffective use of protection resources allocated to visiting dignitaries	C3	Inappropriate handling of an incident may impact international relations or cause a diplomatic incident							
			S4	Inconsistency in allocation of protection resources to visiting dignitaries between jurisdictions	C4	Confidence in Australia's ability to fulfil international protective security obligations undermined							
			S5	Dignitaries arriving without prior notification	C5	Adverse national and international media coverage							
			S6	Lack of visibility of dignitary movements through SCG									
2	Dignity or diplomatic issue involving a dignitary attending WAC26	1	S7	Unlawful behaviour by principal/protectee or member of official entourage	C6	Damage to bilateral relations							
			S8	Serious breach of diplomatic protocol by principal/protectee or member of official entourage	C7	Harm to Australia's national reputation							
			S9	Breach of Australia's cultural/custom norms by principal/protectee or member of official entourage	C8	Harm to reputation of law enforcement agencies							
			S10	Diplomatic incident arising from security overlay	C9	Adverse national and media coverage							
			S11	Diplomatic incident arising from activities of Australian security personnel (police; security agencies; private security;)	C10	Interruption to protectee/principle activity, movement or travel							
			S12	National or International Security incident resulting in the threat level for Australia being raised	C11	Agencies fail to deliver dignitary protection in accordance with national arrangements							

IDENTIFICATION						ANALYSIS & EVALUATION										
Risk Ref: No	1 Risk Description (Describe the Risks that could impact the Objectives mentioned in the Part 1 worksheet which is the Yellow tab at the bottom of the page)	2 Objective # of the objective effected by the Risk	Source #	3 Sources of the Risk (Briefly describe the potential cause(s) of the Risk)	Consequence #	4 Consequences of the Risk (Briefly describe what will be the potential impact(s) if the Risk occurs)	6 Source # / Consequence # related to the Control	5 Existing Controls for each of the Risk (Briefly describe the existing Controls in place for each of the Risk)	7 Control Owner (Position of the person who owns the Control)	8 Control Rating (Fully Effective, Mostly Effective, Partially Effective, Slightly Effective, Ineffective, Unrated)	9 Control Effectiveness (Strong, Incomplete, Weak, Unknown)	10 Current Risk Rating (Assess the Consequence and Likelihood taking into account the effectiveness of the existing Controls)			11 Proposed action to be taken (Avoid, Reduce, Share, Retain)	
												10A Consequence	10B Likelihood	10C Rating		
3	Agency planning and resources are deficient should the terrorism threat level or threat to the security of WAC26 tournament increase	1	S13	Intelligence obtained regarding a credible threat directed specific to WAC26 tournament	C12	Agencies have inadequate resources available to sustain dignitary protection										
			S14	No additional funding available for agency resourcing for WAC26	C13	Strain on Australian Government's protective security arrangements										
			S15	Ineffective or inadequate planning	C14	Inappropriate handling of an incident may impact international relations or cause a diplomatic incident										
4	Team Security Liaison Officers are ineffective, compromised or otherwise unable to perform their role with their assigned team	1	S16	Inadequate planning	C15	Harm to Australia's national reputation										
			S17	Inadequate training	C16	Harm to AFP reputation										
			S18	Inappropriate selection	C17	Inadequate security arrangements for WAC26										
			S19	Member deviates from AFP Commissioners Orders and National Guidelines	C18	Illness, accident or injury										
5	Law enforcement intelligence not disseminated in a timely manner	1	S20	No mechanisms exist to support interoperability and information sharing arrangements	C19	Harm to Australia's national reputation										
			S21	Lack of clarity around roles and responsibilities amongst whole-of-government response	C20	Harm to reputation of law enforcement and other intelligence agencies										
					C21	Inadequate and ineffective security support arrangements for WAC26										
6	Insufficient security and provision of Aviation policing services at airports during WAC26	1	S22	Ineffective or inadequate planning	C22	Harm to Australia's national reputation										
			S23	Ineffective use of available resources	C23	Harm to reputation of law enforcement agencies										
			S24	Delayed or no notification of travel details for teams, officials, VIPs and dignitaries arriving in Australia and/or domestic movements during WAC26 tournament	C24	Adverse national and media coverage										
					C25	Security vulnerability at airports										

IDENTIFICATION						ANALYSIS & EVALUATION									
Risk Ref: No	1 Risk Description (Describe the Risks that could impact the Objectives mentioned in the Part 1 worksheet which is the Yellow tab at the bottom of the page)	2 Objective # of the objective effected by the Risk	Source #	3 Sources of the Risk (Briefly describe the potential cause(s) of the Risk)	Consequence #	4 Consequences of the Risk (Briefly describe what will be the potential impact(s) if the Risk occurs)	6 Source # / Consequence # related to the Control	5 Existing Controls for each of the Risk (Briefly describe the existing Controls in place for each of the Risk)	7 Control Owner (Position of the person who owns the Control)	8 Control Rating (Fully Effective, Mostly Effective, Partially Effective, Slightly Effective, Ineffective, Unrated)	9 Control Effectiveness (Strong, Incomplete, Weak, Unknown)	10 Current Risk Rating (Assess the Consequence and Likelihood taking into account the effectiveness of the existing Controls)			11 Proposed action to be taken (Avoid, Reduce, Share, Retain)
												10A Consequence	10B Likelihood	10C Rating	
7	Unauthorised carriage of firearms, weapons or other prohibited items by Foreign Security officers accompanying visiting dignitaries or teams attending WAC26	1		Inadequate or inaccurate advice provided to foreign security and/or diplomatic and consular corps regarding the Australian Government policy on the non-carriage of firearms	C26	Interruption to airport business									
					S25	Damage to bilateral relations									
					S26	Inappropriate handling of an incident may impact international relations or cause a diplomatic incident									
					S27	Breach of Commonwealth and/or State/Territory laws									
						Use of unauthorised firearms or weapons during a security incident resulting in injury or death to law enforcement or member/s of the public									
8	Foreign Interference of deployed AFP members and/or AFP ICT Assets	1		Deployed AFP members embedded with National Sports Teams from foreign countries	C31	Compromise of deployed AFP members									
					S29	Compromise of AFP ICT assets and/or systems									
					S30										

\*\*\*Attention\*\*\* Delete this row after reading - Complete Part 3 treatment worksheet in the Green tab after completing this work sheet

Part 3 - Risk Treatment for this activity, Monitor and Review

\*\*\*Attention\*\*\* Hide this row after reading - Rows can be added or deleted depending on the number of Treatments.

\*\*\*Attention\*\*\* Hide this row after reading - Rows can be added or deleted depending on the number of Treatments. Fill info in the order of the column numbers. When you need to insert a new row, do that within the block for the same risk.

TREATMENT PLAN

Risk Ref: No	1 Risk Description (Transfer the Risk Descriptions from part 2 column B, of the Risk Assessment for the Risks where Treatments have been identified)	4 Source # / Consequence # related to the Treatment (Relate to sources and consequences identified in part 2 columns E and G)	Treatment #	2 Risk Treatment Description (Describe the new activity(ies) to be undertaken to further reduce the Current Risk Rating)	3 Treatment Owner (Position of the person who owns the Treatment)	5 Due Date (Date the Treatment is due for completion)	6 Progress on Treatment Implementation			7 Residual Risk Rating (What is the expected risk rating after additional Treatments are in place?)		
							6 Progress on Treatment Implementation			7 Residual Risk Rating		
							6A Progress Rating	6B Comments (Provide any updates on the progress of the treatment) (Overwrite the embedded formula in this column when the treatment has been approved to commence)	7A Consequence	7B Likelihood	7C Rating	
	Dignitary protection measures for dignitaries attending WAC26 are not commensurate with the threat and risk  Agency planning and resources are deficient should the terrorism threat level or threat to the security of WAC26 tournament increase  Insufficient security and provision of Aviation policing services at airports during WAC26  Law enforcement intelligence not disseminated in a timely manner  Team Security Liaison Officers are ineffective, compromised or otherwise unable to perform their role with their assigned team   Foreign Interference of deployed AFP members and/or AFP ICT Assets	S12-S27 C11-C30	T1									
		S16-S19 C15-C18	T2									
		S16-S19 C15-C18	T3									
		S16-S19 C15-C18	T4									
		S1-S27 C1-C30	T5									
		S1-S27 C1-C30	T6									

THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982

s 37(2)(c), s 47E(d)

\*\*\*Attention\*\*\* Completed treatments should be transferred to the Controls in place (Part 2, Column 8) then reassessed.

### Risk Assessment Guidance Tables

Table 1

Control Effectiveness	
Rating	Description
<b>Strong</b>	Controls are as strong as they need to be or stronger to effectively mitigate the risk they control to an acceptable level. There may be an opportunity for efficiencies in the overall control environment.
<b>Incomplete</b>	Controls do not completely mitigate the risk they control.
<b>Weak</b>	Controls have limited or no effect on mitigating the risk.
<b>Unknown</b>	Risk author does not have sufficient knowledge to determine the strength of the Controls.

Table 2

Control Rating	
Rating	Description
<b>Fully Effective</b>	Control: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is effective all the time, and/or</li> <li>is operating reliably all of the time</li> <li>has a Fully established, robust internal and external oversight, reporting line through Boards/Committees and supporting Governance</li> </ul> And Control is as strong as it needs to be or stronger. If substantially stronger, there may be opportunity for efficiency in the overall control environment.
<b>Mostly Effective</b>	Control: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is effective almost all the time, and/or</li> <li>is operating reliably most of the time</li> <li>has a Mostly established, robust internal and external oversight, reporting line through Boards/Committees and supporting Governance</li> </ul> But Control doesn't quite meet all the (design or implementation) minimum requirements to operate as intended in controlling (or contributing to the control of) a source or consequence.
<b>Partially Effective</b>	Control: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is effective at least half of the time, and/or</li> <li>is operating reliably at least half the time</li> <li>has a Partially established, internal and external oversight, reporting line through Boards/Committees and supporting Governance</li> </ul> But Control doesn't meet all the (design or implementation) minimum requirements to operate as intended in controlling (or contributing to the control of) a source or consequence.
<b>Slightly Effective</b>	Control: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is effective less than half of the time, and/or</li> <li>is operating reliably less than half of the time,</li> <li>has a Slightly established, internal and external oversight, reporting line through Boards/Committees and supporting Governance</li> </ul> And Control falls short of the minimum requirements to operate as intended in controlling (or contributing to the control of) a source or consequence.
<b>Ineffective</b>	Control: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is not reliable effective, and/or</li> <li>has few / none of the required elements in place</li> <li>doesn't have established, internal and external oversight, reporting line through Boards/Committees and supporting Governance</li> </ul> And Control falls considerably short of its minimum requirements.
<b>Unrated</b>	Control: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is no longer effective in risk environment and/or</li> <li>is under review by a Strategic Oversight Board</li> <li>has not been reviewed by the Control Owner within a 12-month period</li> </ul> Only the Risk and Assurance Team may declare an Enterprise Risk Control as Unrated and report it through to relevant Boards and Committees. If a Control cannot be rated, consideration should be given to its uses within risk assessments.

Table 3

Consequence rating Consequence type	Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Severe
<b>Consequence affecting individual or discrete activity, operation, project or program</b>					
<b>Project/program delivery (risk to project/program)</b>	A minor delay, cost increase or scope change for some deliverables that doesn't impact on overall delivery.	A delay causing cost increase or scope change for multiple deliverables that doesn't impact on overall delivery.	A delay to the timetable or change to the scope that results in delays to overall delivery.	Unacceptable delay due to the timetable, scope or benefits changing, or a significant cost increase.	A scope, cost or timetable change that fundamentally changes the project making it no longer viable.
<b>Operational outcomes</b>	Infrequent or inconsequential delay or amendment of outcomes.	Achievement of objectives delayed or amended but still within acceptable tolerances.	Achievement of objectives delayed or require amendments beyond acceptable tolerances.	Achievement of objectives threatened.	Achievement of objectives not possible.
<b>Consequence affecting the AFP as a whole or a significant portion of the AFP's business</b>					
<b>People, wellness and safety (includes mental health)</b>	No or minimal medical treatment or internal counselling required. No work time lost.	Medical treatment required or external expert advice required. Negligible work time lost. Minor breaches of legislation.	Potentially significant harm to health or potentially life-threatening injury. Moderate breaches of legislation causing injury or psychosocial hazards.	Could reasonably be expected to directly threaten or lead to the loss of life of an individual or small group. Significant criminal breaches of legislation/law causing death.	Undermining people's safety that could reasonably be expected to directly lead to the death of many people.
<b>Our reputation</b>	Internal AFP impact only in a small part of the organisation. Freedom to operate unaffected.	Some external awareness of issue, limited external interest.	Media interest and brand impact.	National public, political, regulatory or media scrutiny and concern. AFP's abilities/trust is restricted.	International concerns, Governmental Inquiry, sustained adverse national/international media. Brand impact significantly affects confidence in the AFP.
<b>Stakeholder relationships</b>	No effect on the AFP, or slight inconvenience only including services which can easily be accessed from other stakeholders.	Minor impact on the AFP due to deterioration of stakeholder relationship. May lead to temporary disruption or reduction in service requiring minimal time and resources to source a replacement.	Considerable impact on the AFP due to strained relationships or extended disruption or reduction in service resulting in decreased operational effectiveness and interoperability.	Major impact on the AFP due to fractured relationship. No interoperability. Substantial reduction to critical stakeholder services or support. No alternative sources available.	Severe impact on the AFP due to termination of relationships. Indefinite disruption or total loss of service or capability with no alternative solutions available. Inability of continued operation.
<b>Operational outcomes (the AFP's ability to achieve operational outcomes)</b>	Infrequent or inconsequential delay of outcomes.	Temporary delay or postponement of outcomes which are managed locally.	Inability to sustain or maintain services or capabilities required for the ongoing successful achievement of operational outcomes.	Delays or inability to provide or maintain key activities required for the successful achievement of operational outcomes.	Multiple and systemic points of failure prohibiting achievement of successful operational outcomes organisationally, which are likely to require significant time and resources to rectify.
<b>Compliance</b>	Negligible non-compliance with known internal and external requirements.	Minor non-compliance of a nature not attracting attention. Able to be identified and rectified through internal monitoring, compliance, and/or training processes.	Breach or non-compliance of a nature which could be reasonably expected to lead to criticism of the AFP. Ongoing breaches without evidence of 'lessons being learnt'.	Places objectives at serious risk of failure. Exposes the AFP to major litigation, ministerial concerns and/or media scrutiny. Review/loss of some AFP powers or abilities.	Very serious external compliance implications. Will immediately place objectives at high risk of failure, and breach of legislation. Serious, wilful breach; criminal negligence or act; prosecution; dismissal; ministerial censure. Severe reputational consequences.
<b>Information, privacy, Information Management and security</b>	Compromise or corruption of information held that is otherwise available in the public domain.	Compromise of information that could impact upon functional or business area interests. Compromise of <b>OFFICIAL: Sensitive</b> information.	Compromise of information that could impact upon the AFP daily operations. Compromise of <b>PROTECTED</b> information.	Compromise of information sensitive to the AFP's organisational interests. Security integrity compromised. Significant operational compromise. Compromise of <b>SECRET</b> information.	Compromise of information with significant ongoing impact. Inability to communicate with stakeholders. Compromise of <b>TOP SECRET</b> information.
<b>Financial impact</b>	Slight financial issue manageable within current budget allocation.	Limited financial impact requiring some financial reprioritisation within current budget allocations.	Significant financial impact which may exceed current budget allocation. Requires additional central funding resources (AFP internal release) and financial reprioritisation.	Serious financial implications requiring significant financial reprioritisation at the AFP level and service provision adjustments.	Grave financial implications requiring major service cutbacks, Ministerial approval to overspend the AFP level budget or additional Government funding.
<b>Capability</b>	Minimal impact on noncore business operations or the impact can be dealt with routine activities.	Some impact on business areas in terms of delays and/or system quality but does not threaten the objectives.	Impact on the objectives resulting in reduced performance such that targets are not met.	Breakdown of key activities leading to serious reduction in performance resulting in a major threat to achieving the objectives.	Critical failures prevent core activities from being performed resulting in failure to achieve the objectives.
<b>Fraud and Corruption</b>	Negligible non-compliance with business and legislative requirements.	Minor impact on business areas and/or breaches of policy.	Financial impact on business area's performance. Business area accountability and transparency in doubt.	Significant impact of the AFP's ability to achieve outcomes. Criminal breaches of the law. Reputational damage to the AFP leading to lack of community support and engagement. Reputational damage potentially causing reduction of government trust in the AFP.	Failure to provide core capabilities and/or functions. Significant reputational damage, including failure to provide accountability and transparency to the community. Significant reduction of government trust in the AFP.

## Risk Assessment Guidance Tables

Table 4

Risk Likelihood Table			
Likelihood	Probability of event occurring	Chance	Control Rating
Almost certain	>95%	There are indicators that the event is imminent or the event may already be happening, and/or high level of recorded incidents and/or strong anecdotal evidence; and/or a strong likelihood the event will re-occur. The event is expected to occur in most circumstances.	Less than 25% of the Controls associated with the risk are rated Mostly Effective or above. Without control improvement, it is almost certain that the risk will eventuate at some point.
Likely	65% - 95%	There are indicators to suggest that this event is likely to occur if current conditions remain or data/intelligence predictions are accurate, and/or regular recorded incidents, and/or considerable opportunity, reason or means to occur. The event will probably occur in most circumstances.	25%-50% of the Controls associated with the risk are rated as Mostly Effective or above. Without control improvement, it is more likely than not that the risk will eventuate.
Possible	35% - 65%	There are indicators to suggest that the potential for this event to occur may increase if not managed effectively, and/or few, infrequent, random recorded incidents. The event might occur at some time.	50%-70% of the Controls associated with the risk are rated as Mostly Effective or above. Without control improvement, the risk may eventuate.
Unlikely	5% - 35%	No or minimal indication of potential occurrence under current conditions, or as shown by available data/intelligence. The event could occur at some time.	70%-90% of the Controls associated with the risk are rated as Mostly Effective or above. The strength of this control environment means that it is more than likely that the risk eventuating would be caused by external factors not known to the AFP.
Rare	<5%	No indication of potential occurrence under current or foreseen conditions or as shown by available data/intelligence. The event may occur only in exceptional circumstances.	Greater than 90% of the Controls associated with the risk are rated as Mostly Effective or above, and regular reviews of the risk indicate that no other Controls for this risk are required. The strength of this control environment means that if this risk eventuates, it is most likely a result of external factors outside the control of the AFP.

Table 5

Proposed Action To Be Taken	
Categories	Description
<b>Avoid</b>	A risk can be avoided by discontinuing or changing the proposed activity in order to avoid an unacceptable level of risk
<b>Reduce</b>	A risk can be reduced by implementing treatments to favourably affect the likelihood or consequence, or by removing a source of risk
<b>Share</b>	A risk can be shared with other entities e.g. insurance, specialists, negotiated contracts
<b>Retain</b>	A risk can be retained by accepting the level of risk based on informed decision. All stakeholders should be consulted if considering acceptance of a level of risk above the AFP's risk appetite and risk tolerance

Table 6

Current Risk Rating - Required Action	
Rating	Description
<b>Critical</b>	<p><b>Risk exceeds the AFP's current risk appetite and requires action.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical risks are unacceptable and require action to reduce this rating as soon as possible. Critical risks require very timely attention</li> <li>Critical risks which cannot be mitigated should be briefed to the relevant <b>Deputy Commissioner</b> (or equivalent level)</li> <li>Critical risks require active management and review on a monthly basis</li> </ul>
<b>High</b>	<p><b>Risk exceeds the AFP's current risk appetite and requires action.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High risks are unacceptable and require additional action to mitigate. Appropriate actions need to be identified and implemented as soon as possible</li> <li>High risks which cannot be mitigated should be briefed to the relevant <b>Assistant Commissioner/National Manager</b></li> <li>High risks require continuous review on a quarterly basis</li> </ul>
<b>Significant</b>	<p><b>Risk exceeds the AFP's current risk appetite and requires action.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant risks should only be accepted following consultation and in the absence of available actions to mitigate. The decision to accept a significant level of risk should also be reviewed as part of this consultation</li> <li>Commander level ownership of significant risks is appropriate. <b>Commander/Manager</b> should be mindful of the AFP's risk tolerance if considering acceptance of a significant level of risk</li> <li>The effectiveness of existing Controls and planned Treatment strategies should be reviewed in consultation with key stakeholders. Risks above the AFP's risk appetite should be closely monitored</li> <li>Significant risks require periodic review on a six-monthly basis</li> </ul>
AFP's Risk Appetite - Medium	
<b>Medium</b>	<p><b>Risk within the AFP's current risk appetite and requires regular review of risk levels and confirmation that Controls continue to be effective.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Medium risks may be acceptable in the absence of cost-effective mitigations. The AFP's risk tolerance should be considered as part of a decision to accept medium level risks</li> <li>Medium risks should be monitored as part of ongoing risk management to ensure the risk remains acceptable</li> <li>Medium risks require review on an annual basis</li> </ul>
<b>Low</b>	<p><b>Risk within the AFP's current risk appetite and requires periodic confirmation that Controls continue to be in place.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low risks are acceptable. Low risks should be reviewed periodically as part of ongoing risk management processes</li> <li>Consideration may be given to increasing the risk in order to pursue an opportunity</li> <li>Low risks require review on an annual basis</li> </ul>

Table 7

AFP Risk Level Matrix						
Likelihood	Almost Certain	Low	Medium	Significant	High	Critical
	Likely	Low	Medium	Significant	High	High
	Possible	Low	Medium	Medium	Significant	Significant
	Unlikely	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium
	Rare	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Medium
		Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Severe
	Consequence					

← AFP's Risk Appetite

Table 8

Delegate Approval for RATPs	
Category	Delegate
<b>Command RATPs</b>	Assistant Commissioner/National Manager is the appropriate Delegate. If the current risk rating of one of the assessed risks is <b>Critical</b> , the RATP must be signed off by a <b>Deputy Commissioner</b> (or equivalent level).
<b>Branch/Functional RATPs</b>	Commander/Manager is the appropriate Delegate. If the current risk rating of one of the assessed risks is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Critical</b>, the RATP must be signed off by a <b>Deputy Commissioner</b> (or equivalent level)</li> <li><b>High</b>, the RATP must be signed off by an <b>Assistant Commissioner/National Manager</b></li> </ul>
<b>Operational/Project/Event RATPs</b>	Superintendent/Coordinator or Inspector/Senior Team Leader or Sergeant/Team Leader is the appropriate Delegate. If the current risk rating of one of the assessed risks is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Critical</b>, the RATP must be signed off by a <b>Deputy Commissioner</b> (or equivalent level)</li> <li><b>High</b>, the RATP must be signed off by an <b>Assistant Commissioner/National Manager</b></li> <li><b>Significant</b>, the RATP must be signed off by a <b>Commander/Manager</b></li> </ul>
<b>Note:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All RATPs, irrespective of whether all assessed risks are rated as Medium or below, must be signed off by <b>Sergeant/Team Leader or above</b></li> <li>It is imperative to ensure that the approver and the individual completing the RATP are not the same person</li> </ul>	

Please refer to the following links for further guidance:

- [Minimum requirements for documented risk assessment](#)
- [Risk and Assurance hub page](#)
- [AFP National Guideline on risk management](#)
- [AFP Risk Assessment Guidance Tool](#)
- [Commonwealth Risk Management Policy](#)
- [Risk Fact sheets](#)