| Risk Worksheet | Ontario Arts Council | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Risk Enter brief description of risk. | | Impact & Scope Description (Consequences) Identify impact if risk occurs; both financial and non-financial (operational, reputation, etc.). Review data, statistics or historical information where possible. Quantify consequences in relation to cost, quality, time (include exact figures and dates). | Impact: Low, Medium or High | Mitigation Strategies (Action Plans) Mitigation strategies should not include 'aske' for increased provided that on the strategies of th | Overall Risk Assessment | Risk/Mitigation Funded? Has the cost of risk mitigation or entire risk been included in budget allocations? | Risk Owner Position responsible for mitigation strategy and ensuring issue or risk is managed. | Target Dates fo Mitigation Strate | |
| Risk Category: | objectives whose achievement is l | highly dependent on other initiatives. | | status of mitigation strategy. operly support business needs; include stakeholder and | public perception/reputation | | | | |
| Failure to demonstrate value for money for grant dollars. | Strategic priority - Invest in Ontario's vital artists and arts organizations would be affected. | Consequences are significant. Government could lose confidence in OAC's ability to meet mandate and as a result reduce funding to OAC - reduction in revenue. | Likelihood: Low Impact: High | Monitoring of performance measures; public reporting of performance measures; expanded research and analysis of impacts; survey and consultation as part of strategic planning process; MPP communications strategies; new / revised performance measures to be developed as a result of the new strategic plan. | Low Risk | Yes | Director & CEO | On-going | |
| Inappropriate use of grant fund dollars. | Strategic priority - Invest in Ontario's vital artists and arts organizations would be affected. | Consequences are significant - Public perception that one case is not isolated and results in generalizations for all funding. Could result in reduced confidence by government. | Likelihood: Low Impact: High | Review by officers of applications and final reports; peer assessment review process; internal grant review process (officers with senior management) to review recommendations; imposing conditions before funds are released; Board approval for all advised grants over \$30,000; strong communications protocols to respond to media inquiries. | Low Risk | Yes | Director & CEO | On-going | |
| Low investment returns on private funds donated to create restricted and endowment funds (Market value of investments: \$27.8 million - December 2014). | Strategic priority - Invest in Ontario's vital artists and arts organizations would be affected. | Program spending on awards and programs that depend on investment returns could be reduced significantly. | Likelihood: Medium Impact: Medium | Board Finance and Audit Committee reviews its investment policy, asset mix and meets managers annually; committee has reviewed diversification and considered its allocation in alternative investments; further consideration to growth investment managers may be considered; long-term approach is adopted in determining annual disbursements. | Medium Risk | Yes | Finance and Audit Committee / Director of Finance & Administration | On-going | |
| Reduction of provincial government grant to OAC, flatlined budget in context of increased demand. | All strategic priorities would be affected but in particular the investment in Ontario's vital artists and arts organizations. | Investment in arts organizations and support to artists could be significantly reduced; some programs may have to be discontinued. Reduction in admin expenses; cuts to staff. | Likelihood: Medium Impact: High | Expanded communication with MPPs to demonstrate the contributions the arts make at the local level through government funding and support; expanded research and public awareness efforts; strict control over administration costs to maximize program spending; funding framework for 2015-16 includes a reduction to 95% for all operating grant recipients. | Medium Risk | Yes | Board and Director & CEC | On-going | |
| Inability to assess whether targets in the strategic plan are achieved or not, arising from a failure to establish performance metrics to measure results. | | Failure to demonstrate how we are doing against a multi year plan that takes time to show progress and achievement. | -Likelihood: Medium Impact: Medium | Comprehensive performance measures were developed and monitored annually; public reporting of performance measures; expanded research and analysis of impacts and implications. New or revised performance measures to be developed as part of the new strategic plan. | Low Risk | Yes | Directors' Committee | On-going | |
| Failure of the new strategic plan launched in October 2014 to meet the expectations of our various key stakeholders. | All four goals of the strategic plan would be affected. | Expectations are varied and any significant changes to existing funding levels will be met with resistance to change. Potential resistance from large organizations to the new Major Organizations program. | Impact: Medium | Funding framework for 2015-2016 includes a 5% across- the-board reduction to all operating and project programs. Letters, electronic communication and Town Hall meetings in 14 communities are part of our communication strategy for the new Strategic Plan.One-on-one meetings were held with each of the former Anchor organziations to explain rationale and approach of new Major Organizations program. | Medium Risk | yes | Directors' Committee | Implementation of t grant changes in 20 2016 | |

| Risk | Related Strategic Priority | Impact & Scope Description (Consequences) | Likelihood and Impact | Mitigation Strategies (Action Plans) | Overall Risk Assessment | Risk/Mitigation Funded? | Risk Owner | Target Dates for Mitigation Strategie |
|---|--|---|---|---|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Enter brief description of risk. | | Identify impact if risk occurs; both financial and non-financial (operational, reputation, etc.). Review data, statistics or historical information where possible. Quantify consequences in relation to cost, quality, time (include exact figures and dates). | Likelihood: Low, Medium, or High Impact: Low, Medium or High | Mitigation strategies should not include 'aska' for increased provincial flanding or resources. Please describe agency strategies to manage risk. Identify whether this strategy is already in place or when it will be implemented (with exact dates). Identify the expected residual risk remaining after strategy has been implemented. State current status of mitigation strategy. | Low, Medium, High | Has the cost of risk mitigation or entire risk been included in budget allocations? | Position responsible for mitigation strategy and ensuring issue or risk is managed. | |
| Failure to meet objectives of the strategi plan and expectations of the public / government / arts community. | c All strategic priorities would be affected. | Potential loss of credibility within the arts community could result in reduced confidence by government; | Likelihood: Medium Impact: Medium | Comprehensive performance measures were developed and monitored annually; new / revised performance measures to be developed as a result of the new strategic plan; Town Hall meetings were held in the fall of 2014 across the province; one-on-one meetings held with fomer Anchor organizations to let them know about change switch to new Majors program | Medium Risk | Yes | Directors' Committee | On-going |
| Risk Category: | Governance/Organizational - inclustational - inclustation | ide risks related to the organizations structure, accou | intabilities, or responsibilities; | risks that culture and management commitment do not | support formal structures, in | clude controllership/accou | nting risks; and issues rais | sed by staff, partners, |
| Failure to comply with new government accounting standards for government- controlled organizations. | Business objective of appropriate financial reporting. | Inappropriate recording and reporting of financial transactions; increased audit time and resources; delays in timing of financial reports. | Likelihood: Low Impact: Medium | On-going discussions with the Office of the Auditor General and KPMG to provide guidance, direction, assistance and training. No significant challenges expected this year. | Low Risk | Yes | Director of Finance and Administration | On-going |
| Risk Category: | Legal/Compliance - include risk o | f litigation, risks from non-compliance to applicable la | aws, acts, and policies, and ris | ks related to contract management | | | | |
| Terms and conditions of OAC grant payments are not in accordance with the Transfer Payment Accountability Directive (TPAD). | Business Priority - strong administrative compliance with government policy and direction. | Government could lose confidence that OAC is operating as expected; funding could be reduced. | Likelihood: Low Impact: High | Periodic review of compliance of OAC policy manual with TPAD; annual review and update to Risk Register; periodic reviews by Ministry Internal Audit. | Low Risk | Yes | Director of Granting and Director of Finance & Administration | On-going |
| Liability exposure to OAC for individual artists (grant recipients) working with vulnerable persons in community settings, schools, etc. | Business Priority - strong administrative compliance with laws and 'duty of care.' | Potential lawsuit for OAC not managing this concern proactively. | Likelihood: Low Impact: Medium | Requirement for individual artists, collectives and organizations applying to OAC programs (other than creation) to deliver arts programs in educational or community settings are required to obtain (where required) a police background check or vulnerable sector verification; OAC has purchased Directors' and Officers' insurance. | Low Risk | Yes | Director of Granting | On-going |
| Failure to comply with all government directives: travel, meal and hospitality, procurement directive, memorandum of understanding, conflict of interest, etc. | Business Priority - strong administrative compliance with government policy and direction. | Inappropriate spending of funding; negative reporting in the media. Government could lose confidence in OAC. | Likelihood: Low Impact: Medium | On-going management reports to Board Committees and to the full Board; orientation of new Board members and new staff; review by external auditors of a limited sample of travel expense claims; public disclosure of Board and senior staff expenses in 2015. | Low Risk | Yes | Director & CEO | On-going |
| Risk Category: | Operational/Service Delivery - ind | lude risks that products or services will not be comp | leted or delivered as expected | ; capital or other project delays; level of program efficien | cy, effectiveness, customer. | <u> </u> | | |
| Significant increase in applications result in not being able to meet turnaround target of 4 months. | Business Priority of efficiency dealing with applications in a timely manner. | Additional costs may be incurred in staffing and assessment panels that were not anticipated and budgeted for, resulting in unbudgeted costs. | Likelihood: Medium Impact: High | Transition to the new electronic Grant Management System / Client Relationship Management (Nova) in 2015- 2016 | Medium risk | Yes | Human Resources Committee, Corporate Systems Steering Committee and Directors' Committee | Summer/fall 2015 |

| | Risk | Related Strategic Priority | Impact & Scope Description (Consequences) | Likelihood and Impact | Mitigation Strategies (Action Plans) | Overall Risk Assessment | Risk/Mitigation Funded? | Risk Owner | Target Dates for Mitigation Strategies |
|----|--|---|--|---|--|-------------------------|---|--|---|
| | Enter brief description of risk. | | Identify impact if risk occurs; both financial and non-financial (operational, reputation, etc.). Review data, statistics or historical information where possible. Quantify consequences in relation to cost, quality, time (include exact figures and dates). | Likelihood: Low, Medium, or High Impact: Low, Medium or High | Miligaton strategies should not include 'aske' for increased provincial funding or resources. Please describe agency strategies to manage risk. Identify whether this strategy is already in place or when it will be implemented (with exact dates). Identify the expected residual risk remaining after strategy has been implemented. State current status of mitigation strategy. | Low, Medium, High | Has the cost of risk mitigation or entire risk been included in budget allocations? | Position responsible for mitigation strategy and ensuring issue or risk is managed. | |
| 13 | Applicants find the application process cumbersome, resulting in complaints. Starting in 2015 we will be rolling out electronic applications as part of our IT strategy. | Priority of making the application process simpler. Electronic applications will allow for more verification at the time of submission. | Artists and arts organizations spend an inappropriate amount of time and resources completing applications instead of focusing on their artistic mission. | Likelihood: Medium Impact: Medium | A roll-out plan for Nova is required and assistance (both technical and content) will be required to work with applicants. Service level agreement (SLA) required to determine appropriate assistance to meet expectations. A process to handle paper submissions is under review. OAC led development of CADAC to reduce amount of time applicants spend submitting financial information to OAC, Canada Council and municipal arts councils. | /ledium Risk | Yes | Director of Granting | On-going |
| | Risk Category: | Workforce - include workforce co | mpensation, labour relations and human resources ris | sks; workforce data showing t | high turnover, imminent retirement, high illness rates, sta | ff complaints | | | |
| 14 | Failure to have appropriate representation on Board – geographically and skills – currently two vacancies as of January 2015. | | A full Board complement would be 12 members. As of mid-January 2015 we are at 10 members, having had long-serving members leave in the past few months. Effective governance requires diverse views around the Board table. Currently no Vice-Chair and the current Chair's term ends February 2015. | Likelihood: High Impact: Medium | Encourage government to fill vacant positions by suggesting suitable candidates for consideration; annual Board Effectiveness Survey review by Governance Committee and Board; review of 'master' board profile / skills annually led by Governance Committee. | vledium Risk | Yes | Board Chair | On-going |
| 15 | Succession planning for Senior management - Directors. | Strategy in leadership, management and support to Board. | t Challenges in knowledge transfer and corporate history; inefficiencies, errors and delays. Risk associated with unexpected absence of key personnel. | Likelihood: Medium Impact: Medium | Current complement of senior management is strong and I capable of filling in as required in an emergency; succession planning is reviewed annually. | /ledium Risk | Yes | Director & CEO | On-going |
| 16 | Increase in employees' work-related stress. | Priority for employees to have an appropriate work-life balance. | A large increase in applications over the past seven years - productivity issues, labour relations issues, absenteeism resulting in additional administrative costs. Employees' participation in developing new IT project for electronic grant applications and contact management have placed added demands on staff. | Likelihood: Medium Impact: High | On-going discussions with officers and senior management, improved and increased communications by Director & CEO; revised timeline developed for Nova project that allows for more time for the process. | Medium Risk | Yes | Director & CEO | On-going |
| 17 | Increase in labour relations matters due to certification of bargaining unit representative (AMAPCEO) in February 2012. | Effective management of human resources and compensation. | Currently in bargaining for a first collective agreement. | Likelihood: Medium Impact: Medium | Negotiating Committee participated in training and professional development to acquire skills in bargaining and the administration of a collective agreement. Legal counsel selected through a competitive process to provide leadership and direction on this first agreement. Meetings with the bargaining unit commenced in September 2012 and are ongoing. Ratification is pending at this time. | vledium Risk | Yes | Director & CEO and the Negotiating Committee | expected timeframe for completion of negotiations and ratification - February 2015 |

| | Risk | Related Strategic Priority | Impact & Scope Description (Consequences) | Likelihood and Impact | Mitigation Strategies (Action Plans) | Overall Risk Assessment | Risk/Mitigation Funded? | Risk Owner | Target Dates for Mitigation Strategies |
|----|--|---|---|---|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | Enter brief description of risk. | | Identify impact if risk occurs; both financial and non-financial (operational, reputation, etc.). Review data, statistics or historical information where possible. Quantify consequences in relation to cost, quality, time (include exact figures and dates). | Likelihood: Low, Medium, or High Impact: Low, Medium or High | Mitigation strategies should not include 'asks' for increased provincial funding or resources. Please describe agency strategies to manage risk. Identify whether this strategy is already in place or when it will be implemented (with exact dates). Identify the expected residual risk remaining after strategy has been implemented. State current status of mitigation strategy. | Low, Medium, High | | Position responsible for mitigation strategy and ensuring issue or risk is managed. | |
| 18 | Risk of not having the right number of staff, mix of staff levels and skills to achieve strategic goals and manage the granting process. | Business strategies of administrative efficiencies. | Additional funds are spent on administration; work is not done efficiently and effectively. | Likelihood: Low Impact: Medium | New position of Manager of Information Technology started in April 2013. With the implementation and completion of Nova, on-going staffing needs within IT (considering internal needs and skills) will be required. | Low Risk | Yes | Human Resources Director; Human Resources Committee | On-going. |
| | Risk Category: | Information Technology & Infrastr | l ucture - include capital project delays, risks related to | o organizational assets, physic | al safety and security risks | | | 1 | |
| 19 | Risk of IT projects taking longer than planned, cost overruns. | Business strategies of administrative efficiencies. | Identified inefficiencies with additional costs will continue; customer expectation for electronic access will be delayed; unbudgeted expenditures could occur. | Likelihood: Medium Impact: Medium | Corporate Systems Steering Committee (consisting of all Directors and IT staff) to approve plans, review projects, monitor implementation. Detailed project budgets and timetables have been prepared. Build Phase nearing completion for Nova. | Medium Risk | yes | Director of Finance and Administration | on-going |
| 20 | Change management issues as we transition to electronic grant applications and other significant changes in corporate information systems. | Business strategies of administrative efficiencies and changes to job functions, procedures. | Impact on staff in dealing with new ways of working, some current job functions may no longer be required over time; new skills may be necessary; transition period as we accommodate both paper and electronic filing. | Likelihood: Medium Impact: Medium | Corporate Systems Steering Committee (consisting of all Directors) and PMT (Project Management Team) to approve plans, review projects, monitor implementation, review training and transition plans. | Medium Risk | yes | Directors' Committee | on-going |
| 21 | Change management issues as we consider new ways of working in order to reduce real estate footprint. | | At current office size, OAC's rental costs will increase by 50% in 2016 when current lease expires. This must be mitigated by reducing footprint but will mean staff have to relinquish private offices. | Likelihood: Medium Impact: Low | Currently engaged with Infrastructure Ontario and a real estate broker to request proposals from selected landlords for locations on our short list. | Low | yes | Directors' Committee | on-going over the next months |
| | Risk Category: | All other Risks - Risks that do not | fit in any of the above categories. Corporate Social R | esponsibility concerns - Envi | ronment, Climate Change, Energy Management , Health P | romotion, Waste Reduction. | Include risks relating to this | rd parties such as service | e or goods providers. |
| 22 | External issues / factors: economic environment of OAC-funded arts organizations; adapting to changing technology, especially related to visitor / audience engagement; compensation, succession and training; legislative framework - see environmental scan. | All strategic priorities could be affected, in particular: invest in Ontario's vital artists and arts organizations (to ensure long-term sustainability of the sector); strengthen skills/share knowledge; and support public engagement. | Impact varies on individual organizations and may have common issues in particular sectors. | Likelihood: Medium Impact: Medium | OAC, through consultation and discussion, decides if and how we will assist the arts organizations in these areas. OAC may convene groups of organizations in facilitated discussion, conduct research, etc. Consultation through Strategic Planning process, Town Hall meetings throughout Ontario in fall 2014 with Director & CEO and Director of Granting. | Medium Risk | yes | Directors' Committee | On-going |

Note: The Ontario Public Sector corporate risk categories do not include a separate 'Financial Risk' category. Every risk can have financial and or non-financial impact, as such, the financial impact should be assessed for every risk. If meeting financial budgets/commitments is of concern, risks causing these shortfalls should be identified.