

Taking the **subjectivity** out of Risk Management

Gavin Steinberg

Managing Director Satori Group Australia



Complacency may be the next biggest risk companies face in this decade





Two Emerging Themes

Move away from Risk Registers

Emergence of Key Risk Indicators

(KRIs)



Key Risk Indicators (KRIs)

Re-defining Risks

Ongoing Quantitative Assessment of

- Corporate Risk
- Risk Categories
- Emerging Risks
- Leading indicator of area of focus
- Great <u>communication</u> technique

Data Driven



Why use Data to Drive Risk Assessment

- Risk assessment relies primarily on qualitative and subjective measures
- Corporate risk profiling is time consuming to prepare and is typically only updated once a year
- Corporate risk profiling does not allow you to examine organisational entity/activity impact on risk
- Examine the different risk categories (e.g., financial, HR, operational, strategic, legal, technological, etc.)



Who is involved / Benefits

Audit

- Ongoing assessment of risks and controls
- Identification of specific audits; drilldown into risks; refine audit objectives
- Annual risk-based audit planning

Corporate Risk Officer

- Support for corporate risk profile
- Assessment of risk mitigation efforts
- Ongoing assessment of current and emerging risks

Finance

- Financial monitoring and control testing
- Assessment of new opportunities
- Statement of assurance



Objective of KRIs

Assessment of **each organisational entity** to determine impact on **each** risk category and to develop an of overall risk ranking (Low, Medium, High)

- For each Corporate Risk
- For each Category



Developing Data-Driven Risk Indicators for Corporate Risk – Intellectual Property

Risk Sub-category

R&D – failure to manage research and development projects.

Safeguarding of IP - failure to implement safeguards to prevent theft of IP by employees.

IT Controls – failure to implement IT controls to protect IP.



Combine Data Assessment across Corporate

Org Entity	Corp Risk 1	Corp Risk 2	 Corp Risk n	Rank
Entity 1	3.5	3.7	2.3	Low
Entity 2	3.5	4.5	4.6	High
Entity X	4.8	2.8	4.4	Medium



Developing Data-Driven Risk Indicators for HR Risk Category

Risk Sub-category

Recruiting – failure to attract people with the right competencies.

Resource Allocation – failure to allocate resources in an effective manner to support the achievement of goals and objectives.

Retention – failure to retain people with the right competencies and match them to the right jobs.

Work environment – failure to treat people with value and respect.



Developing Data-Driven Risk Indicators for Finance Risk Category

Risk Sub-category	Risk Results / Impact	Risk Indicator
 Failure to establish a proper financial framework 	 Errors and corrections Losses Suspense transactions 	 % JV and reversals % Losses % Suspense account
 Failure to establish budgeting and forecasting processes 	 Over expenditures Late expenditure decisions Poor commitment accounting ? 	 Actual > Planned % expenditures period 12+ % not referencing a commitment or PO
Failure to manage financial structure	Complex financial structure	 # of funds / fund centres Use of Internal orders / WBS # of currencies
	Discretionary expenses	% discretionary expenses



Combine across all Entities

Org Entity	Financial	HR	 Operational	Rank
Entity 1	3.2	3.2	4.3	Low
Entity 2	6.5	5.5	3.6	High
Entity X	4.3	1.8	4.4	Medium



Risk Categories

- External environment
- Legal and regulatory
- Strategy
- Governance
- Operational

- Information
- Human resources
- Technology
- Financial and administrative



Example – Project KRIs

- # of project Managers
- # days without Project Manager
- Steering Committee
- # of Steering Comm Meetings
- Days to go in project (risk highest in last 20%)
- % spend of budget
- Risk of project

. . . .

- Size of project (\$ and complexity)
- Days since last audit
- # incidents (safety)
- # of people on project



Data-Driven Indicators

Volume / Size

– # of employees

Variability/Change

- Avg age; avg age of senior managers
- Avg years of pensionable service; % who can retire < 2 years
- Experience years in dept / position / classification
- % Fulltime employees; % affected by org change
- % acting ; % new hires
- Leave: total leave taken; avg sick; avg vacation; avg unpaid

Complexity

- # types of employee; # classifications; # locations; # unions
- % employee with non-std hours

Other

- % Sex (M/F); % FOL (Eng/Fr/Mand)



rand	Division Select a Division	•	Month-	ugust, 2014	15	igger: Overal	I Risk Score				
			Froman [119054 2011	15	uggen [overal	LINISK SCOLL				
Business	Monthly Trend Drill Down							N n 14		Nov 13	
0186 Vanguard											
296200	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							3 %	48 %	23 %	
314400	Brand > Division: FC > Mon	th: AUG 14	4 > T2: 29620	0 > T3: Abnorma	l Margın Volume			3 %	48 %	28 %	
13203								3 %	43 %	28 %	
11903	Full Audit		RISK	Profile Rating:	87%	Days Since La	ist Audit: 42	3 %	43 %	28 %	
303400	Metric Name	Μ	letric Value Curr.	Metric Value Prev.	Rating Curr. Month	Rating Prev. Month	Risk Rating (Movement)	3 %	38 %	28 %	
32003	Abnormal Margin Volume		102	169	5 %	<mark>5</mark> %	۲	3 %	38 %	28 %	
678400	Audit Score		68	68	15 %	15 %	۲	3 %	33 %	28 %	
542100	Cash Reversal Volume		13	8	10 %	10 %		3 %	33 %	28 %	
48300	Max Annual Leave Balance		14.16	12.46	5 %	5 %	۲	3 %	38 %	28 %	
169500	Miscellaneous Transaction Volume		8	8.5	0 %	0 %	۲	3 %	33 %	28 %	
678700	Non-Current Debit Ledger	%	92.40%	98.33%	10 %	10 %	۲	3 %	38 %	23 %	
	Shop Leadership	т	eam Leader	Team Leader	0 %	0 %					
661600	Staff Turnover		25.77%	19.49%	7 %	7 %	۲	3 %	33 %	28 %	
292300	Total TTV		627841	575373	15 %	10 %		3 %	38 %	28 %	
505600	Writeoff Commission		0.026	0.0242	10 %	5 %		3 %	38 %	28 %	
759800	Writeoff Volume		13	10	10 %	5 %					
532300	(BUH) 15 %	15 %	20 %	10 %	10 %	23-%	23 %				
1288 Illumo-Nation											
603000		63 %	75 %	65 %	43 %	53 %	48 %	48 %	53 %	73 %	
41501	75 %		75 %	70 %	55 %	53 %	53 %	53 %	53 %	77 %	
04101	72 %	62 %	65 %	78 %	67 %	43 %	38 %	48 %	43 %		
29801	72 %	70 %	60 %	60 %	40 %	43 %	43 %	43 %	43 %	53 %	

CONTROL PLAN REPORT ANALYSE IMPROVE

T2 Country	Т3	Business	Risk Score	Staff Turnover	Shop Leadership	Total TTV	Write-off Volume	Write-Off % Commission	Audit Score	Re Vi
0177			90 %	14.%		696,240	12	2.52 %	81	
0142			87.%	11.%	Team Leader	765,550	17	14.62 %	-44	
1474			83 %	0 %		449,740	15	3.34 %	63	
1474			82 %	13.%	Team Leader	719,460	18	1.85 %	26	
0143			80 %	0.%	Team Leader	944,840	11	2.65 %	79	
0185			80 %	0.%	Team Leader	531,870	20	5.93 %	67	
0185			80 %	0.%	Team Leader	727,500	11	2.49 %	67	
0142			80 %	0.%	Team Leader	606,240	20	2.92 %	37	
1288			80 %	0.9%	Team Leader	679,320	18	10.07 %	64	
0185			80 %	0 %	Team Leader	616,470	25	7.79 %	51	
0142			80 %	0.%	Team Leader	742,320	15	5.24 %	69	
0142			78 %	0 %		445,450	9	3.17 %	60	
1268			78 %	0 %		383,400	24	9.20 %	57	
0142			78 %	0 %		900,520	7	2.97 %	80	
1268			77 %	10 %	Team Leader	1,088,170	17	1.75 %	71	
0142			77 %	14.%	Team Leader	730,960	6	5.56 %	77	
0177			75 %	0 %	Team Leader	771,610	11	2.64 %	71	
0142			75 %	0.%	Team Leader	554,420	8	5.99 %	63	
0177			75 %	0 %	Team Leader	566,750	15	2.76 %	67	
0195			75 %	0.%	Team Leader	845,990	24	4.53 %	69	
1474			75 %	23.%		293,010	12	4.68 %	83	
0142			75 %	22.%		206,770	21	9,46 %	68	
</td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.004.000</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				0.004.000						



12 Country	13	Business	-off % mission	Audit Score	Cash Reversal Volume	Miscellaneous Transaction Volume	Non-Current Debit Ledger	Max Annual Leave Balance	Abnormal Margin Volume
0177			52 %	81	10	25	58 %	24	120
0142			.62 %	- 44	11	25	93.%	20	123
1474			34 %	63	з	27	97.%	16	86
1474			55 %	26	з	37	63 %	42	131
2143			55 %	79	11	39	28 %	19	121
0165			93 %	67	16	47	73.%	28	94
185			49.96	67	8	74	46 %	15	93
142			92 %	37	10	31	17.%	42	113
288			.07 %	64	18	11	75 %	26	107
185			79 %	51	5	24	69 %	37	119
142			24 %	69	7	18	63 %	26	164
142			17 %	60	7	10	83 %	22	53
288			20 %	57	9	13	90 %	22	66
142			97 %	80	5	26	97.%	21	79
288			75 %	71	6	20	29 %	26	288
142			56 %	77	20	16	90 %	24	108
177			54 %	71	4	25	94 %	20	82
142			99 %	63	15	32	64.%	26	102
177			76 %	67	14	23	21 %	13	92
0195			53 %	69	44	29	0.%	20	121
(474			58 %	83	7	15	100 %	23	81
0142			46 %	68	0	7	98.%	17	60
¢			11237				343661		1:



1

	Current Weightings	Modified Weightings
taff Turnover	7 %	7 %
hop Leadership	8 %	8 %
Total TTV	15 %	15 %
/rite-off Volume	10 %	10 %
Vrite-off % Comm	10 %	10 %
Audit Score	15 %	15 %
Cash Reversal Volume	10 %	10 %
liscellaneous Volume	5 %	5 %
Ion-Current Debit Ledgers	10 %	10 %
1ax Annual Leave	5 %	5 %
Abnormal Margin Volume	5 %	5 %
Fotal Weightings	100 %	100 %

By default all risk factors are weig	phted equally. En	ter the desired risk factor weight.	
Volume		Complexity	
Total Expenses	1.0	Number of object categories	1.0
Total Revenue	1.0	Number of funds	1.0
Total Assets	1.0	Number of Cost Centres	1.3
Number of Invoices	0.7	Number of GLs	1.0
Number of PRIs	1.0	Number of currencies	1.0
Number of acquisition cards	1.0	Number of document types	1.0
V Idu		Number of Internal Orders	1.0
Variability	1.0	Number of POs and FRs	1.0
Pct discretionary spending	1.3	Number of material documents	1.0
Pct period 12 or later	1.3	Number of Assets	1.0
Number of JVs	1.0	Number of real estate blocks	1.0
Number of suspense recs	1.0	Number of WBS documents	1.0
Number of loss recs		Pct Overtime to Salary	1.0
Number or reversal recs	1.0	Pct Invoice Date Errors	1.2
Number or reversal recs	1.0	Pct Invoice Date Errors	1.2



Dave Coderre 2014

Data-driven risk indicators

Ideally the indicators:

- Quantitative (data-driven)
- By-product of operational systems (e.g., financial, HR systems)
- React to changes in risk levels
- Support the assessment risk at any organizational level
- Support annual and ongoing risk assessment process
- Easy to update (monthly/quarterly)



Development of KRIs

Steps:

- 1. Ensure that your Audit Universe is aligned to Strategic Initiatives that are tied to Corporate Objectives
- 2. Develop KRIs for each corporate risk and for all corporate risk categories
- Perform ongoing assessment of corporate risks and risk
 categories by audit entity or any slice of the organization
- 4. Select activities/entities to audit which have highest corporate or risk category ratings.



Benefits of ongoing Data Driven Risk Assessment

 Auditors can be more proactive in assessing corporate risks and emerging areas of risk

Takes the <u>subjectivity</u> out of risk assessment

 Predictive business performance measures will help drive productivity by 20% by 2017



Benefits of ongoing Data Driven Risk Assessment

 Managers that persist in using historical measures miss the opportunity to capitalise on opportunities that would increase profit or fail to intervene to prevent an unforeseen event, resulting in a decrease in profit

 ERM is more reliable and effective when ERM frameworks are shown to produce credible and useful risk-adjusted performance measures on an ongoing basis

Gavin Steinberg Managing Director Satori Group Pty Ltd

gsteinberg@satorigroup.com.au