

Strategy & Research Division/Branch Risk Register - Current and Future Risks as at April 2018

| Risk ID | Risk Title | Description of Risk | Key Stakeholders | Source(s) of the Risk | Potential Consequence | Potential Likelihood | Inherent Risk Rating | Controls being Maintained | Control Effectiveness | Control Owner | Consequence | Likelihood | Residual Risk Rating | Risk Steward | Division | Branch | |
|---------|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--------|--|
| | <i>This number uniquely identifies each risk. e.g. RAB-01 for a risk being managed by Risk and Audit Section</i> | <i>Short form description of the risk so you can easily see what it is about at a glance</i> | <i>A description of the risk. The event we are considering. It needs to be defined clearly and be easily understood by someone reading the document</i> | <i>Internal and external parties that hold responsibility for an aspect of the risk. That may include exposure to consequences, ability to influence control, or ability to sense risk</i> | <i>Those areas or things from which a risk event could arise or be manifested. Risk sources can be generic e.g. the regulatory environment, or specific e.g. the "how and why" a particular risk could occur. Sources include environmental factors that contribute to the existence or severity of a risk such as budget constraints, manpower constraints, or sub-optimal infrastructure.</i> | <i>Building on the description of the risk, what would be the material outcome of the realisation of the risk.</i> | <i>The probability that something may occur based on circumstances, predicted frequency, analysis, or the occurrence of past similar events. An input to determining a risk rating.</i> | <i>An assessment of the potential severity of the risk considered without the application of discretionary controls to manage it i.e. if we were aware of this risk or not managing it at all, how bad would it be?</i> | <i>A summary of the controls currently being employed to manage this risk. Controls are actions or systems which reduce the likelihood of the risk or its potential impact. Controls must be assigned an owner, either within or outside of the Department.</i> | <i>The level of control effectiveness maturity and assurance. How well do the existing controls manage either the likelihood or consequence of this risk?</i> | <i>Assigned person or position responsible in maintaining controls (as per Column H). Control owner could be either within or outside the Department.</i> | <i>The effect that a risk may have on a business objective if it occurs. An input to determining a risk rating.</i> | <i>The probability that something may occur based on circumstances, predicted frequency, analysis, or the occurrence of past similar events. An input to determining a risk rating.</i> | <i>Considering the controls in place, how severe is the risk now? Where current controls are considered effective, the residual risk should be less severe than the inherent risk.</i> | <i>The person or position responsible for actively monitoring the risk. Specifically, this includes monitoring changes in the external or internal environment, including the controls currently in place, to ensure the risk severity is not changing or likely to change. Where treatments are proposed, the Risk Steward should monitor the progress of the implementation. The CRO is not the Steward of your risks.</i> | | |
| BCAR1 | Data is leaked or provided to unauthorised person/s | Bureau staff don't adhere to data governance requirements Inadequate security is applied to data holdings within the Bureau | ELT Chief Information Officer General Counsel Chief Economist EL2 Data Science and Analytics System administrators (internal e.g. IMS and POMS and external e.g. ASG) Bureau staff Data owners | Inadequate or immature data governance frameworks departmental IT systems and controls (policies and encoded in the system) and/or a lack of compliance with the controls required for handling sensitive data. Immature awareness of security requirements | Major The Bureau provides data to an individual or organisation who is not authorised to receive it The Bureau or Department is not able to accept required datasets because the appropriate structures are not in place. This could lead to an inability for the Department to fully deliver on a policy priority | Possible | Significant | IT can limit access to data saved in specific places (although may not be able to monitor access) (CIO) Bureau-specific protocols and monitoring arrangements which will eventually form part of the broader departmental governance framework under development by IT Branch (CE) Regular evaluation and monitoring within the Branch including ongoing assessment against requirements under individual performance plans (CE) Awareness raising and compulsory security training (CE) | Marginal | Chief Economist Chief Information Officer | Major | Medium | Chief Economist | Strategy and Research | Bureau of Communications & Arts Research | | |
| BCAR2 | Bureau provides incorrect advice or flawed advice | Bureau provides or publishes incorrect or flawed advice | Government/Minister ELT All Bureau staff Contractors Secondes Peer reviewers | Inability to recruit suitably skilled staff or to procure sufficient expertise for peer review Inadequate quality assurance processes | Moderate Loss of credibility for the Department and possibly the Government Loss of confidence in the work of the Bureau from the Department's Executive and the Minister's Office Cause of embarrassment for the Department and possibly the Government | Possible | Medium | Strict clearance/quality assurance processes occurring throughout the lifecycle of the project (CE) Use of external experts for peer review (CE) External experts and secondes are selected on the basis of subject matter expertise references qualifications and work experience (CE) | Strong | Chief Economist (CE) | Moderate | Medium | Chief Economist | Strategy and Research | Bureau of Communications & Arts Research | | |
| BCAR3 | Shortfall in economics and data science expertise and leadership hampers capacity to deliver work program to the required standard | Staff working on projects aren't suited to deliver the required outputs | FAS Strategy and Research Bureau leadership team DoCA HR team (recruitment) | Inability to recruit suitably skilled replacements for expected vacancies due to limited skills pool | Moderate Slippage in timing or non delivery of projects. External resources may need to be procured to fill capability gaps. Project to be re-scoped timing changed or removed from work plan if skills are unavailable. Project delivered to a lower-than-usual standard. | Possible | Medium | Recruitment and retention (HR) Regular communication with ELT and policy teams at the SES and EL2 level (ELT) (CE) Regular communication with the Minister's Office (FAS) Links with the Comms team to publish and publicise papers (EL2s) | Effective | Chief Economist (CE) AS HR (HR) BCAR EL2s (EL2s) | Moderate | Medium | Chief Economist | Strategy and Research | Bureau of Communications & Arts Research | | |
| BCAR4 | Work plan is not aligned to the Government's/Department's priorities | The Bureau is not involved at the appropriate stage of business planning or policy development The Bureau's work plan is agreed in isolation from the key priorities of the Department and the Government | ELT Chief Economist All Bureau staff | Lack of awareness of the Bureau's capability and/or how this can be used to support the Government's/Department's priorities. Insufficient consultation with the Minister/Department in developing the work plan. | Moderate The work the Bureau undertakes is not focussed on the highest priorities. The Bureau's work is not used effectively within the Department or by the Government as an evidence base | Possible | Medium | Recruitment and retention (HR) Regular communication with ELT and policy teams at the SES and EL2 level (ELT) (CE) Regular communication with the Minister's Office (FAS) Links with the Comms team to publish and publicise papers (EL2s) | Effective | ELT FAS Strategy & Research (FAS) Chief Economist (CE) BCAR EL2s (EL2s) | Moderate | Medium | FAS Strategy & Research | Strategy and Research | Bureau of Communications & Arts Research | | |
| BCAR5 | Procurement plan does not support business continuity | Business discontinuity due to non-availability of data processing platforms/capacity | Chief Information Officer Chief Economist | Procurement plan developed without considering detailed business use cases business environment or Departmental IT | Moderate Non-delivery delay or inadequate delivery of the work plan | Possible | Medium | Ongoing consultation with IT and OGC on procurement requirements and ongoing evaluation of business requirements (CE) (CIO) | Effective | Chief Economist (CE) Chief Information Officer (CIO) | Moderate | Medium | Chief Economist | Strategy and Research | Bureau of Communications & Arts Research | | |
| S1 | Staff experience skills and capabilities | Current staff do not have required skills experience and capabilities to deliver Branch work program. May be difficult to attract suitably skilled and experienced staff to the Branch. | AS Strategy FAS Strategy and Research HR Branch ELT | Inability to attract suitably skilled and experienced replacements for vacancies Budget constraints Lack of internal mobility may lead to inability to attract/secure suitable staff Lack of clarity about optimal skills sets needed | Moderate Reputational damage to the Branch Inability to deliver on work program External resources may need to be procured to fill capability gaps Work deliverables may need to be re-scoped timing changed or removed from work program if skills unavailable. | Likely | Significant | Resourcing plan being developed Undertaking recruitment Assessing the skills required Scoping work program thoroughly Developing capabilities of current staff Liaising with equivalent strategy functions in other Departments | Effective | AS Strategy | Moderate | Medium | AS Strategy | Strategy and Research | Strategy | | |
| S2 | Quality and accuracy of advice provided by Strategy Branch | Advice provided by Branch is either inaccurate incorrect or seen as poor standard | AS Strategy FAS Strategy and Research ELT and Senior Management cohort | Inadequate quality assurance of work products Inadequate research and consultation in developing work products Poorly constructed or unrealistic work program Budget constraints Inadequate resourcing skills and capabilities to deliver work program Poor strategic alignment with Department/Portfolio/broader related Government work priorities and objectives | Moderate Reputational damage to the Branch Loss of confidence in Branch by ELT and Minister's Office Inability to deliver on work program | Possible | Medium | Governance mechanisms in place External assurance in place where required Stakeholder engagement plans in place Research methodology in place | Effective | AS Strategy | Minimal | Low | AS Strategy | Strategy and Research | Strategy | | |
| S3 | Acceptance of Strategy Branch role in Department | Role and function of Strategy Branch is not embedded in the culture of the Department | AS Strategy FAS Strategy and Research ELT and Senior Management cohort | Insufficient support from ELT and senior management cohort for role of Strategy Branch Lack of alignment with Department's strategic priorities Strategy Branch doesn't engage sufficiently across the Department Branch work plan is not reflective of current and future Department strategic priorities | Moderate Reputational damage to the Branch Loss of confidence in Branch by ELT and Minister's Office Inability to deliver on work program | Possible | Medium | Branch work program is approved and regularly reviewed by ELT Regular internal and external stakeholder engagement Regular review and reporting to ELT on work progress against work plan and lessons learnt as the function matures Regular check of work program against Department's strategic priorities to ensure alignment | Effective | AS Strategy | Minimal | Low | AS Strategy | Strategy and Research | Strategy | | |

| Strategy & Research Division/Branch Risk Register - Current and Future | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|---|--------------------|
| Risk ID | Risk Title | Description of Risk | Tolerability | Proposed Treatments - Additional Controls | Target Risk Rating |
| <small>Not for reporting at this time however branches should be considering new treatments for those risks rated as a 'no' for tolerability and/or rated as a go figure (orange) or high (red). This information will be called for at a later date.</small> | | | | | |
| <small>This number uniquely identifies each risk. e.g. RAB-01 for a risk being managed by Risk and Audit Section</small> | | | | | |
| <small>Short form description of the risk so you can easily see what it is about at a glance</small> | | | | | |
| <small>A description of the risk. The event we are considering. It needs to be defined clearly and be easily understood by someone reading the document</small> | | | | | |
| <small>Is the residual risk acceptable? Determined during risk evaluation, tolerability is recorded as either yes or no. If no, additional treatments will need to be applied.</small> | | | | | |
| <small>New or modified controls which are to be implemented to better manage this risk. An implementation lead is to be specified for all treatments.</small> | | | | | |
| <small>The level of risk being sought after taking into consideration the additional activities (treatments) to be undertaken in reducing the risk.</small> | | | | | |
| BCAR1 | Data is leaked or provided to unauthorised person/s | Bureau staff don't adhere to data governance requirements Inadequate security is applied to data holdings within the Bureau | | | |
| BCAR2 | Bureau provides incorrect advice | Bureau provides or publishes incorrect or flawed advice | | | |
| BCAR3 | Shortfall in economics and data science expertise and leadership hampers capacity to deliver work program to the required standard | Staff working on projects aren't suited to deliver the required outputs | | | |
| BCAR4 | Work plan is not aligned to the Government's/Department's priorities | The Bureau is not involved at the appropriate stage of business planning or policy development The Bureau's work plan is agreed in isolation from the key priorities of the Department and the Government | | | |
| BCAR5 | Procurement plan does not support business continuity | Business discontinuity due to non-availability of data processing platforms/capacity | | | |
| S1 | Staff experience skills and capabilities | Current staff do not have required skills, experience and capabilities to deliver Branch work program. May be difficult to attract suitably skilled and experienced staff to the Branch. | | | |
| S2 | Quality and accuracy of advice provided by Strategy Branch | Advice provided by Branch is either inaccurate, incorrect or seen as poor standard | | | |
| S3 | Acceptance of Strategy Branch role in Department | Role and function of Strategy Branch is not embedded in the culture of the Department | | | |