

## IALA CHANGE OF STATUS RISK REGISTER

No.	Risk description	Consequence	Risk estimation* (prior to mitigation)		Control & Treatment	Risk estimation (post mitigation)		Additional actions (to reduce further the likelihood of adverse events and mitigate residual impact if they occur)	Residual risk** : Reported to and owned/Monitored by:
			Probability	Impact		Probability	Impact		
1	<b>Membership</b> <b>i) Loss of existing members</b>  <b>ii) Loss of industrial members (greater than normal turnover levels)</b> <b>Governments do not allow industrial members to join</b>	Loss of income loss of influence Loss of experience & knowledge	High	Very High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General Assembly Resolution to prepare IALA for Change of Status.</li> <li>• Establishment of Change of Status Advisory Group.</li> <li>• Propose suitable model in draft Convention &amp; General Regulations to be presented to Governments.</li> <li>• IALA to seek to be involved in Inter-Governmental diplomatic process to finalise Convention.</li> <li>• Convention to provide for deposit of sufficient number of instruments including that of Host Nation before entry into force.</li> </ul> Transitional arrangements so that Governments that do not sign may continue as Affiliate Members. Adoption of models used by other IGOs where different membership categories are in place (eg. ILO)	Low	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective change management and communications strategy with existing membership.</li> <li>• International legal advice.</li> <li>• Promotion of the benefits of IALA IGO membership to increase membership in the longer term.</li> </ul>	Secretary General
			High	High		Low	High		
2	<b>Financial</b>  <b>Cost of operation</b> (NB. IGO status may lead to a less onerous fiscal regime for IALA)  <b>Contributions may come only from Contracting Parties (loss of industrial and associate members' fees).</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Larger Secretariat required, eg. more technical staff needed, larger office requirement.</li> <li>• Potential requirement for more official languages.</li> </ul>	High	Very High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of future structure.</li> <li>• Draft Convention and General Regulations.</li> <li>• Headquarters Agreement with Host Nation.</li> <li>• Less onerous fiscal regime consequent upon IGO status.</li> <li>• CoS Working Group on financial aspects formed.</li> </ul>	Medium	Medium	Establishment of Finance Sub-Group	Council
3	<b>Loss of flexibility</b>	Lengthier processes to gain agreement to recommendations and standards.   Limitation on the issues that IALA can choose to allocate to Committees.	Very High	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of future structure.</li> <li>• Development of draft Convention and General Regulations as per 1. above.</li> <li>• Adapt frequency of GA meetings, give greater decision authority to Council.</li> </ul> Adoption of modern, adaptable working arrangements.	Medium	Medium	Agree appropriate split of responsibilities between General Assembly & Council and meeting frequency cycle for General Assembly & Council.	Council

No.	Risk description	Consequence	Risk estimation* (prior to mitigation)		Control & Treatment	Risk estimation (post mitigation)		Additional actions (to reduce further the likelihood of adverse events and mitigate residual impact if they occur)	Residual risk** : Reported to and owned/Monitored by:
			Probability	Impact		Probability	Impact		
4	AtoN providers may be replaced by increased bureaucratic influence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical representatives may be replaced by diplomats at meetings.</li> <li>Meetings become more bureaucratic.</li> <li>Output documents are weaker.</li> </ul>	Medium	High	Lack of interest by diplomats in technical matters. Committees will still be attended by technical expert.	Low	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IALA part of diplomatic process as lead consultee.</li> <li>Course of action adopted by Denmark to explain position to Danish Parliament (see Danish Parliament Website).</li> </ul>	Council
5	Relationship with IMO & IHO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No recognition from IMO &amp; IHO.</li> <li>Potential loss of influence or credibility if so.</li> <li>lack of clear parameters between organisations.</li> <li>Perception IALA overstressing itself.</li> <li>Conflict between bodies.</li> </ul>	Medium	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of a trilogy (IMO &amp; IHO).</li> <li>Understanding of the remit of IMO within IALA.</li> <li>Close liaison with senior IMO &amp; IHO officials.</li> <li>Communication plan with IMO members, IHO and other maritime related IGOs.</li> </ul>	Low	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear framework for the future in terms of respective responsibilities.</li> <li>MoUs with IMO and IHO.</li> <li>Communication Plan.</li> </ul>	Secretary General
6	Diplomatic process	Loss of control by current IALA resulting in a new organization different from that intended.	High	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sign-off of draft Convention by Council before the diplomatic process starts.</li> <li>CoS Advisory Group on diplomacy formed.</li> </ul>	Medium	High	IALA to monitor and seek withdrawal if necessary	Council
7	Agreed Action Plan timetable is not met	Process become stalled	High	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change of Status Advisory Group.</li> <li>Project Initiation Document.</li> </ul>	Medium	Medium	Council to receive progress reports.	Council
8	Draft Convention text is not agreed by Council	Process becomes stalled. Loss of reputation.	High	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change of Status Advisory Group.</li> <li>Advice from LAP.</li> <li>Project Initiation Document.</li> </ul>	Medium	Medium	Council to receive progress reports	Council

Key: \* Probability of occurrence is calculated according to the table at right.  
\*\* Named individual responsible for managing each risk.

Probability of Occurrence and Impact			
Estimation	Description	Indicators	Consequence of Impact
Very High	Very likely to occur within 1 year or more than 80% chance of occurrence.	Has occurred within last 1 to 2 years.	Financial impact on IALA likely to exceed 250,000 EUR. Major impact on IALA strategic plans and delivery of operational services. Major political and stakeholder concern. Very low defensibility of realisation of risk. Reinstatement to pre-risk condition extremely difficult requiring considerable resources and possible additional funding
High	Likely to occur every 1 to 2 years of 50% to 80% chance of occurrence.	Potential of it occurring within 5 years. Has occurred.	Financial impact on IALA likely to be in the region of 100,000 to 250,000 EUR. Significant impact on IALA strategic plans and delivery of operational services. Significant political and stakeholder concern. Low defensibility of realisation of risk. Reinstatement to pre-risk condition extremely difficult requiring commitment of a high level of resources.

<b>Medium</b>	Possibility of occurrence in 10-year period or 20% to 50% chance of occurrence.	Has occurred, to varying degrees, within last 10 years. History of some occurrence.	Financial impact on IALA likely to be in the region of 25,000 to 100,000 EUR. Moderate impact on IALA strategic plans and delivery of operational services. Moderate stakeholder impact/concern. Some defensibility of realisation of risk probable. Reinstatement to pre-risk condition possible with the commitment of a moderate level of resources.
<b>Low</b>	Unlikely to occur in a 10-year period or 10% to 20% chance of occurrence.	Has not occurred in last 10 years. Low history of occurrence.	Financial impact on IALA likely to be in the region of 5,000 to 25,000 EUR. Low impact on IALA strategic plans and delivery of operational services. Low stakeholder impact/concern. Defensibility of realisation of risk likely. Reinstatement to pre-risk condition likely to be achieved with the minimum commitment of resources.
<b>Very Low</b>	Highly unlikely to occur in a 20-year period or less than 10% chance of occurrence.	Has not occurred. Occurrence more than 20 years ago.	Financial impact on IALA likely to be below 5,000 EUR. Very low (if any) impact on IALA strategic plans and delivery of operational services. Little (if any) stakeholder impact/concern. Excellent prospect of defensibility of realisation of risk likely. Reinstatement to pre-risk condition very likely to be achieved.