

**Improved Terminology and Language for HSEQ Risk & Opportunity Conversations ROC Talk
when Risk & Opportunity Based Thinking [ROBT]**

Traditional & Colloquial Terminology / Expressions	Explanation of the Preferred & Recommended Risk / Opportunity Based Language during ROC Talks
Bad / Good Luck	Bad / Good Luck are colloquial expressions for the occurrence of low probability, apparently random, unforeseen or unpredictable or uncontrollable negative / positive outcomes. They have no value as an ROBT concept, as they are “cop-out” denials of predictability, lack of control or ability to manage and hence denial of any responsibility & any accountability. A much better risk philosophy to adopt as a basis for meaningful Risk & Opportunity Based Thinking ROBT is to be always diligent & vigilant in attempts to predict & manage every R&O [not necessarily <i>prevent</i> in the old language] even if it is often very difficult to do so.
Act of God	Act of God as a belief, concept or expression also has no value in proactive ROBT. The expression was invented by insurance companies as another “cop-out” denial of, predictability or ability to manage or control outcomes, and also denial of any responsibility & accountability on their part. Religious beliefs known to the author appear to NOT actually exclude the possibility & indeed necessity for individual believers to exert some influence over their own destinies by managing their risks and opportunities proactively to the best of their abilities, not just passive, fatalistic acceptance of some inescapable vulnerability to an internal or external omnipotent destiny or fate.
Quality - as a double negative -absence of defects, or -absence of non-conformities	Quality , as a double positive - presence of conformance - achievement of objectives
Opportunity as a risk with a positive outcome	Pursuing or enabling or exploiting an Opportunity is to maximise the chances of a desired positive objective not just a risk of a negative that doesn’t eventuate.
Safety - as a double negative -absence of harm, Or -absence of injury, ill health	Safety , as a double positive - presence of wellbeing
Environmental Safety – as a double negative -absence of E harm, E impact	Environmental Safety , as a double positive - presence of environmental protection & wellbeing
Loss Control / Loss Prevention Inferiority Control	Risk Management – profits as well as losses – enabling positive outcomes as well as preventing negatives – maximizing the chances of gains, profits, benefits – about a focus on <i>maximizing chances of gains</i> NOT <i>minimizing chances of losses</i>
HSEQ Acts / Behaviours HSEQ Conditions SWPs / SOPs /	When referring to :- Acts / Behaviours / Conditions / Work Procedures / Operating Procedures, then ALWAYS use adjectives, “ Standard ” or “ Agreed ” instead of “ safe ” etc. And use “Non-Standard” or “Non-Agreed” instead of meaningless “unsafe” or “at risk” or “Inferior” or “Non-Quality”
“At-risk” Acts, Behaviors, Conditions	NOT helpful because ALL behaviors are “at-risk” & - judged according to whose STANDARD? Every act / behavior is “at-risk” - even following a formal Procedure involves some residual risk. Prefer to use terms such as Non-standard or Non-agreed or <i>Sub-Standard</i>Acts, Behaviors, Conditions...etc. Also see ‘ <i>violation</i> ’ on P3
Prevent, Stop, Eliminate	Absolute words which give false-confidence – imply that zero risk is achievable - use simple realistic terms such as “ <i>manage</i> ” “ <i>control</i> ” - or better “ <i>reduce the risk</i> ”
Pre-Accident Investigation	Unnecessary nil value adding terminology - Simply it is a – ‘ <i>Risk Assessment</i> ’
Accident Precursors	Ditto – they are simply ‘ <i>Risk Factors</i> ’

Risk Control, Risk Avoidance Risk Sharing	All 3 are valid options for Risk Treatment
Opportunity Controls	Opportunity Enablers
To accept an actual, or risk of, a defect or non-conformity, injury, illness, E impact To accept..... is passive, defeatist, fatalist	To tolerate an actual, or risk of an, incident, defect / non-conformity – working with a managed risk but, never passively accepting it- always uncomfortable – looking for how to improve by managing the risk better. SOFAIRP - So Far As is Reasonably Practicable or ALARP - As Low As Reasonably Practicable. or SAHARA – Standards As High As Reasonably Achievable To tolerate... is dynamic, active, positive, always concerned, not defeatist nor fatalist, always “chronic unease” that risk controls remain effective as intended
Acceptable Risk of, Risk Acceptability of..... Risk Acceptance of.....	Tolerable Risk of....., Risk Tolerability of, Risk Tolerance of
Negligible or Insignificant Risk or Opportunity	The term ‘negligible’ implies that a risk or opportunity can be ‘neglected’. Any R or O could increase very quickly if a risk factor is volatile. Better to use ‘very low’
Acceptable Risk Threshold	Tolerable Risk Threshold or Risk Limit or Risk Tolerance or Risk Threshold or Risk Tolerability Criteria e.g. ALARP - As Low As Reasonably Practicable or SOFARP - So Far As is Reasonably Practicable – NOT Zero Risk or SAHARA – Standards As High As Reasonably Achievable
Risk Appetite	Recommend only use “Appetite” for non- OHS risks. Use Risk Limit or Risk Tolerance or Risk Threshold or Risk Tolerability Criteria e.g. ALARP - As Low As Reasonably Practicable [NOT Zero Risk] or SOFARP - So Far As is Reasonably Practicable [NOT Zero Risk] or SAHARA – Standards As High As Reasonably Achievable [NOT Zero Risk]
Zero Incidents Zero Harm Zero defects Zero non-conformities Zero Impacts Always Safe	Any one of these expressions is the ONLY valid HSEQ objective any organisation should adopt, BUT needs an additional qualifier as shown in the expressions below Zero Incidents – this job and the next OR Zero Incidents – this product or service and the next OR Zero Defects – this batch and the next OR Zero Incidents – today and tomorrow OR Zero Harm – this job Without the qualifier , they can be confused with, or equated to, Zero Risk , and interpreted wrongly that Zero Risk can be an achievable permanent “Nirvana” state or destination – as implied in expressions such as “We are on a journey to Zero Harm” . Avoid using the word ‘journey’ to imply an achievable destination. But with any one of the qualifiers above, everyone recognises that <i>Zero Incidents</i> etc. is an achievable inspiration¹ NOT JUST an anticipative aspiration¹ . Without one of the qualifiers, then there is an implication of an achievable state of permanent <i>Zero Risk of Incidents</i> which is an invalid prospective expectation, which cannot be a valid HSEQ Risk Management System RMS objective. Instead it can be a valid and frequent retrospective observation. Note ¹Inspiration comes from external influences – Aspiration is from within, internally generated. Leaders and colleagues <i>inspire</i> , individuals <i>aspire</i> to achieve their own goals and ambitions.
Perfect conformance	Risk of Defect / Non-conformity is being managed to a variation level e.g. Six Sigma Presence of Conformity or Absence of Non-Conformity
Accountable person(s)	Risk & Opportunity Owner(s) or PCBU [Person(s) in Charge of a Business Undertaking]
Documented Issues	Risk & Opportunity Registers or Logs or Profiles as Records

Risk Description	Verbal and/or Graphical Representation of all the causes/events/outcomes being considered. The more detailed & complete & agreed, the better the assessment.
Events / Scenario of Events and Circumstances Conditions Causal & Risk Factors	Reserve the term event for each discrete happening or action and the term scenario for the combination of all the individual events and circumstances needed to describe the How / When / Where / Who / What re an Incident that DID occur or re a Risk & Opportunity that COULD be realized. If these 2 terms event and scenario are used interchangeably, this creates confusion. e.g. The expression:- 1. <i>“The same single event can ultimately lead to different consequences”</i> is a valid statement BUT the statement :- 2. <i>“The same scenario can lead to different consequences”</i> is NOT a valid statement! because at least one or more events or circumstances in the scenario needs to be different to produce a different consequence.
The statement / exhortation / meaningless but well – intentioned statement :- If HSEQ outcomes are involved, or “at risk”, then money doesn’t count!	Sounds like a good ethical business philosophy but it is an untrue unbelievable statement which corrodes & erodes credibility, trust and respect and hence culture. Better to use expressions such as: WHEN a HSEQ risk exceeds our agreed Risk Limit – the defined intolerable threshold level - and IF continued exposure to the HSEQ risk is needed or desirable for valid reasons there is no limit to time, money, effort needed to reduce the HSEQ risk below the agreed intolerable threshold. The reduced risk then also needs to be shown as ALWAYS being managed SOFARP or ALARP or SAHARA – not just at one point in time. <i>Tolerable</i> means BOTH below intolerable & being kept ALARP at all times. SOFARP = So Far As is Reasonably Practicable ALARP = As Low As Reasonably Practicable SAHARA = Standards As High As Reasonably Achievable
Alertness Vigilance	Situational Awareness, and Mindfulness – Chronic unease
Violation, Breach, Failure, Negligent, Reckless	These negative expressions are judgmental, legalistic, counter-productive “culture carcinogens”. Always better to use neutral terms such as - Variation, Alternative, Deviation, Work-around, Improvisation - Work As Done WAD compared with Work As Intended WAI , and to <i>look for the deeper underlying root causes of the variations.</i>
Shortcut	Simply meant a smarter way of doing a job which can be an approved variation of a work method or procedure but only after a formal authorization / approval process involving qualitative or Semi-Quantitative risk assessments. (Whiting, 2014) Always distinguish between - finding a shortcut (<i>which is smart</i>) and - taking a shortcut without being authorized after risk assessment (<i>which is dumb</i>)
Corrective Action, CA Control Measure, Preventive Action, Safeguard, Barrier, Layers of Protection, LOP Mitigating Factor,	Use the single term ‘ Risk Control ’ for ALL of them [<i>Enabling / Promoting /Enhancing Controls</i> or Factors are used for <i>Opportunities</i>]
Causes of Incidents & Risks	All causes are missing or ineffective risk controls but they are always due to deeper underlying root causes which are created by inadequate or non-implemented systemic, physical and work environment control measures.
Behavioral causes	Behaviors are NEVER root causes in themselves, rather they are always Consequences of deeper root causes. We are never “stupid careless lazy”– there are always underlying systemic, physical or work environment root causes.
Human Error	Better to use the term Human Factor in preference to Human Error to emphasize that <i>Error</i> is not a treatable cause of an incident or of a risk of an incident. It is a consequence of the underlying human factors mismatches between a job’s requirements and the person’s capabilities and limitations. The mismatches are usually created or due to systemic, physical, & work environmental factors or root causes to be managed.

<p>Possible, Probable, Potential</p> <p>The 3 words are often used interchangeably and hence confusingly</p>	<p>Possible = absolute term, implies YES / NO, black / white</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – “possible” means it is or it isn’t – it has no range of values – “possible” cannot be used to express a level of Likelihood or Probability – We cannot use meaningless terms such as <i>Quite Possible</i> or <i>Remotely Possible</i> as measures of Likelihood or Probability
	<p>Probable = relative not an absolute term – can use <i>likelihood, chances, odds</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – always has a range of values – can be used meaningfully to express a level of likelihood
	<p>Potential = confusing because it can be used to express either <i>Possible</i> or <i>Probable</i>. <i>A Hazard</i> is often called anything that has the ‘<i>potential</i>’ to cause harm. An <i>Opportunity</i> is anything that has the ‘<i>potential</i>’ to lead to a positive consequence. In both statements, it is NOT clear that ‘<i>potential</i>’ refers to <i>possibility</i> or <i>probability</i>.</p>
<p>Probability</p>	<p>For non-quantitative users, the terms Likelihood, Chances, Odds are preferred and note that in many risk domains 1 in 100 chances or 1% is a high not low probability. Even for quantitative users, avoid fractions of % e.g. “1 in 1000 chances” is preferred to 0.1%</p>
<p>SIF Serious Injury & Fatality Potential - SIF potential</p>	<p>Simply avoid confusion due to multiple meanings of “potential” and call it for what it is - SIF Risk level</p>
<p>Exposure to a Threat or Opportunity</p>	<p>How often [Frequency] or How long [Duration] the risk target is exposed to the <i>Threat</i> or <i>Opportunity</i> (<i>In financial Risk Management “exposure” is the \$ quantum of the outcome or consequence or impact of interest or concern</i>)</p>
<p>Frequency of Exposure</p>	<p>How often the exposure occurs – always expressed as a rate with a denominator – usually time periods. e.g. that piece of silverware was tarnished [incident] or could be tarnished {risk} due to <i>exposure</i> to a harsh atmosphere each day for a week.</p>
<p>Duration of Exposure</p>	<p>How long in time the exposure exists e.g. a waiter has a risk of poor performance with decreased quality of service due to fatigue <i>exposure</i> of many routine shifts of 14 hours duration over a 1 month period.</p>
<p>Likelihood is the general word which can be expressed as either a Frequency or a Probability</p>	<p>Frequency can be used <i>retrospectively</i> to indicate how often an actual HSEQ incident <i>has been occurring</i> in the past AND ALSO It can be used <i>prospectively</i> to predict / forecast / estimate the likelihood of <i>how often</i> the risk of a HSEQ incident <i>may occur in the future</i>. <i>F</i> always needs a rate denominator which is usually time. e.g. 2 defects per day ; or once in the next 100 batches;</p>
	<p>Likelihood, Chances, odds can be used ONLY prospectively to express a predictive / forecast estimate of how likely the risk scenario could occur in the future.</p>
	<p>Probability – pure number less than 1.0 and has no rate denominator - Often better to use the everyday colloquial terms “<i>chances</i>” or “<i>odds</i>” <i>With non-quantitative audience, DON’T use decimal notation 0.001 or unfamiliar exponential notation such as 1E-03</i> Instead preferably use expressions such as “ 1 defect in 1000 samples” Or – “1 <i>chance</i> in 1,000, the valve assembly operation produces defects.” The “<i>odds</i> that drilled holes will be non-conforming are 1 in 1,000 holes”</p>
	<p>Avoid using fractions of % as it is usually hard to interpret them e.g. use expression <i>1 chance in 1000</i> NOT 0.1% - definitely NOT 1E-3 for communicating with non-mathematical risk assessors similarly <i>1 chance in 1 million</i> – NOT 0.0001%</p>
	<p>Always doubt and question any risk assessor’s perception or statement that :- 1% or 1 <i>chance in 100</i> is a small likelihood. For most risk categories / risk domains, 1% or 1 <i>chance in 100</i> is often a LARGE likelihood.</p>
	<p>Avoid using fractions of % as it is usually hard to interpret them e.g. use expression <i>1 chance in 1000</i> NOT 0.1% - definitely NOT 1E-3 for communicating with non-mathematical risk assessors similarly <i>1 chance in 1 million</i> – NOT 0.0001%</p>
<p>Uncertainty & Complexity [VUCA or Cynefin Models]</p>	<p>Two very important aspects of the rationale of risk management. Usually associated with lack of adequate or complete knowledge or information or understanding. A state of having limited knowledge where it is impossible to confidently or exactly describe the existing state, a future outcome, or more than one possible outcome.</p>
<p>OTHERS?</p>	<p>Email me details of any suggestions you think I should add.</p>

