

**Institute of Risk Management
Innovation, Value Creation and Opportunity Special Interest Group**

Record of Meeting - 17th March 2009, 400pm

Location: KPMG, Salisbury Sq

Attendees:

Clive Thompson (Acting Chairman)	CT	Willis
Ian Fraser	IF	IRM
Nicolas Vioix	NV	Westfield
Louis Cooper	LC	Horwath Clark Whitehill
Mark Boulton	MB	DNV
Bill Mitchell (Secretary)	BM	The Carbon Trust
Marilize Copley	MC	KPMG

1. Apologies received from Andy Bye.
2. The main purpose and priority of the meeting was to take the development of the risk game concept to a workable game. The game would be used in the IRM Risk Forum (Sept 2009) and made more widely available to risk managers etc., as a training and awareness raising resource targeted at senior management.
3. MB had requested suggested questions for the game prior to the meeting and presented the responses collated. LC had had a recent discussion with David Hillson, who had developed a day-long risk management game and had ideas that LC presented to the SIG meeting in a one page document. The outcomes needed to be simple and clear. Time management was crucial.
4. The main features preferred were;
 - a. MB said there needed to be a clear beginning 'opener' question to get the game started, a middle and a 'wrap up' at the end. The learning points from the game needed to be brought out at the end of the game, rather than throughout the game, as there was not enough time during the game.
 - b. Also, a degree of role play kind was necessary for participants to understand risk from different perspectives in an organisation. For example, each team should have individual members acting as the finance director and the chief executive roles, to ensure the differing perspectives on risk should be considered.
 - c. Being a game, there needed to be an objective and a means by which 'winning' would be defined – points or £s accrued over the game by the teams. There could be key questions with a range of standard answers, each accruing points if the team get the right answers. Responding most appropriately to accelerator questions would gain points too. IF said that competition would be a good thing to engage the participants.
 - d. In terms of format, an electronic format, probably PowerPoint would be easiest and most universal. It should be able to be printed out too.
 - e. BM suggested that scenarios were a good way to get participants to think 'outside of the box' and show the depth and breadth of what risk management was about.
 - f. NV concerned that the game needed to show the value delivered by risk management.

- g. Using the Risk Management Standard was a good as a point of reference for the game for the novices to risk management and for those who needed a refresher. However, there was not time to focus on each stage or element in depth, in the game.
5. Other points came of out the discussion:
 - a. 90 minutes time limit means that only a few number of questions are possible to allow for depth of answers and discussion.
 - b. The PowerPoint screen should have a clock to ensure that answers are timed, to allow for the game to flow and be completed.
 - c. Each team could represent different companies in the same business sector and, therefore, competitors. Could get them to think about the competitor's
 - d. There could be a risk management score card around the risk management standard.
 - e. Better answers to the accelerators, accelerators a team through the game, awarding them more points.
 - f. Would be useful to have the facilitator developing own disrupter questions, to make the game relevant to the teams participating (for example, medical scenarios for a hospital).
 6. Structure of game should be around the key stages of risk management and should include the following considerations:
 - a. *Identification & analysis* – comprehensiveness of risks? What are the 3 top risks of the organisation? How comfortable are you about these? Do you agree what the 3 top risks are and what are the 3 top mitigations? Are they both the same for your competitors?
 - b. *Key controls* – want to bring in appetite but not mention the word directly, as people do not understand the term. Ask things such as do we know what risk we want to take in the organisation? Do we know how much risk we are taking?
 - c. *Structure and Administration* – [this came from the survey – question not discussed]
 - d. *Reporting and Monitoring* - [this came from the survey – question not discussed]
 - e. *Need to consider other areas* [not discussed in the meeting].
 - f. LC had drafted a scope document (attached – Appendix A), which could be used.
 7. It was agreed MC would start on a Powerpoint framework to which the team could then contribute. All thanked her for taking on this task.
 8. Agreed the Secretary would arrange further meeting after MC had developed initial ideas – to be arranged early April.

W Mitchell

Appendix A. Louis Cooper Scope Document

1. Team Roles

Assign roles/focus areas:

1. CEO – Leader, Strategy, Commercial
2. CFO – Finance, Costs, IT
3. NED – Reputation, Challenge, Compliance
4. Internal Audit – Assurance, Controls, Systems
5. Risk Manager – Risk Process, Sounding board, Recorder

Plus a Facilitator/Coach

2. Aim/objective

Use the RM Standard 5/6 steps (see MB summary) to establish a new/refreshed RM approach – competition to collect key points to present at game conclusion.

3. Game

- 5/6 stages
- 15/20 mins. per stage (timed to move on)
- 1 Question to answer each stage, plus thrown in 'accelerator'/'disrupter' scenario at 2 stages in the process
- Document key points on a template (Powerpoint pages with headings)
- Use roles to put forward ideas/answers (ie. What is the angle of 'role')

4. Resources

- Computer with RM Template approach
- Brief organisation overview (or use own organisation details)
- Glossary of term definitions (key terms explained)
- Question cards
- RM Extract/example documents (Likelihood/Impact charts etc.)

5. Feedback/conclusion

Each team takes it in turn to present key points agreed under each section.
Share/ compare / contrast / discuss outputs

Points given by facilitator (swop groups to be independent):

- a. Number of accepted points raised
- b. Technical application
- c. Innovation
- d. Teamwork