

### Organisation Risk Assessment - Activity Details

Organisation name	Australian Injecting and Illicit Drug Users League Incorporated (AIVL)				
ABN	20 467 449 392				
Date risk assessment last reviewed	4/02/2021	Date of next review	1/09/2021	Template updated July 2020	

Risk Rating	Performance Management	Issues Management	Governance	Viability	Financial Management	Overall Risk Rating
	Low	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Medium

Grants (agreement level)	Enter grant information below					
Grant name	GPS ID (if known)	Grant type	Start date	End date	Value (ex. GST)	Program risk rating
Blood Borne Viruses and Sexually Transmissible Infections - Payments to Community Based Organisations	2-M9KZZA	Service delivery	1/03/2021	31/12/2022	\$1,363,103.00	Low

Answer the following questions about the funded organisation to inform the risk register on the next page.

[See also the Organisation Risk Tool User Guide](#)

ID	Question	Answer	Evidence/Comments
1	Has the department previously funded this organisation?	Yes	long standing funding relationship
2	Is the organisation funded to deliver essential services in areas where there are no viable alternatives?	Alternative providers in regional area would struggle to meet demand	
3	What is the potential for harm to the public as a direct result of the activities the organisation is funded to deliver?	No adverse impact on health and wellbeing	
4	How politically significant is the organisation?	Long established major player in the sector	
5	How politically significant are the activities the organisation is funded to deliver?	Policy response to issue attracting significant national media coverage	
6	Could failure of this organisation or the activities it delivers impact on other health services?	Major widespread impact	
7	How frequently has the organisation submitted performance reports significantly late during the past three years?	Sometimes - 50% of the time	often seeking extensions
8	How frequently has the organisation submitted financial reports significantly late during the past three years?	Sometimes - 50% of the time	
9	Does the organisation have a history of failing to deliver outputs in line with performance requirements?	Never / Unknown	
10	Does the organisation have a history of poor engagement or relationships with stakeholders and/or clients?	Rarely - 25% of the time	recent external evaluation suggests need to work more closely with member organiations
11	Has the organisation been unresponsive to any requests made by the department which are in accordance with the grant agreement?	Never / Unknown	
12	Have there been negative media articles and/or has the department received complaints about the organisation?	Never / Unknown	
13	How long does the organisation take to resolve issues?	Generally quick to respond	
14	Has the organisation failed to maintain any required accreditations, certifications, qualifications or insurances?		
15	Has the organisation had problems maintaining or replacing staff in key positions?	Never / Unknown	
16	Does the organisation experience governance issues that could impact on delivery?	One-off	recent external evaluation suggests some governance improvements may be needed
17	Is the organisation currently subject to any legal proceedings or investigations?	No / Unknown	
18	Does the organisation have a history of significant under-expenditure (i.e. more than 10% deviation from budget)?	Never / Unknown	
19	Does the organisation have a history of significant over-expenditure (i.e. more than 10% deviation from budget) or requesting additional funds for activities they are already funded to deliver?	Never / Unknown	not possible with grants
20	How frequently has the organisation requested that payments are brought forward?	Never / Unknown	
21	Does the organisation have a history of misusing funds (e.g. expenditure on activities not permitted under the grant agreement or transactions with related parties)?	Never / Unknown	
22	If required under the grant agreement, is the auditor's opinion in the organisation's most recent audited financial statement qualified?	No / Unknown	
23	Is the organisation reliant upon any other sources of income to deliver the grant activities the department is funding?	Not reliant on other income	
24	Have clients or members of the public been injured or killed as a result of their interactions with the organisation?	Never / Unknown	

### Organisation Risk Assessment: Australian Injecting and Illicit Drug Users League Incorporated (AIVL)

Risk ID	Risk event	Impact	Likelihood	Consequence	Risk rating	Comments
1	The organisation submits performance reports unacceptably late or not at all.	Department is unable to determine whether activities are being delivered as required.	Likely	Insignificant	Low	often seeking extensions
2	The organisation submits financial reports unacceptably late or not at all.	Department is unable to determine whether funds are being expended as required.	Likely	Insignificant	Low	
3	The organisation fails to deliver outputs in line with performance requirements specified in the grant agreement.	Funding objectives are only partially achieved or not achieved at all. Department cannot determine effectiveness of policy.	Unlikely	Minor	Low	
4	The organisation does not act on requests made by the department which are in accordance with the grant agreement.	Funding objectives are only partially achieved or not achieved at all. Department cannot determine effectiveness of policy.	Unlikely	Minor	Low	
5	Negative media articles and/or complaints about the organisation.	Potential for reputational damage to the department or Minister. Loss of confidence in funded services.	Rare	Insignificant	Low	
6	The organisation does not take action to resolve issues.	Issues may escalate. Funding objectives are only partially achieved or not achieved at all.	Unlikely	Minor	Low	
7	The organisation does not have required accreditations, certifications, qualifications or insurances.	Organisation may not be legally able to deliver activities.	Unlikely	Minor	Low	
8	The organisation cannot maintain or replace staff in key positions.	Organisation is unable to deliver outputs effectively. Funding objectives are only partially achieved or not achieved at all.	Possible	Insignificant	Low	
9	Ineffective governance of the organisation negatively impacts delivery.	Organisation is unable to deliver outputs efficiently or effectively. Funding objectives are only partially achieved or not achieved at all.	Unlikely	Minor	Low	recent external evaluation suggests some governance improvements may be needed
10	Ineffective stakeholder engagement by the organisation negatively impacts delivery.	Organisation is unable to deliver outputs efficiently or effectively. Services are inaccessible or not aligned to need. Funding objectives are only partially achieved or not achieved at all.	Rare	Minor	Low	recent external evaluation suggests need to work more closely with member organisations
11	The organisation does not expend grant funds before the end of the funding period.	Opportunity cost to the department and the Australian Government. Increased workload for department to recover funds.	Rare	Minor	Low	
12	The organisation runs out of money to deliver the activity.	Organisation may be unable to deliver outputs without additional funding. Funding objectives are only partially achieved.	Unlikely	Minor	Low	not possible with grants
13	The organisation loses other sources of income required to deliver the grant activities.	Organisation may be unable to deliver outputs without additional funding. Funding objectives are only partially achieved.	Unlikely	Minor	Low	
14	Grant payments to the organisation do not align with the timing of delivery expenses.	Organisation is unable to deliver outputs effectively. Funding objectives are only partially achieved or not achieved at all.	Unlikely	Minor	Low	

### Organisation Risk Assessment: Australian Injecting and Illicit Drug Users League Incorporated (AIVL)

15	The organisation is unable to account for grant funds.	Organisation may not reliably manage funds. Department is unable to determine whether funds are being expended as required.	Rare	Minor	Low	
16	Misuse of funds by the organisation (i.e. expenditure on activities not permitted under the grant agreement).	Funding objectives are only partially achieved or not achieved at all. Department cannot determine effectiveness of policy. Financial loss or poor value with relevant money.	Rare	Insignificant	Low	
17	Injury or death as a result of funded activities.	Loss of confidence in the organisation. Potential reputational damage to the department and the Minister. Possible legal action.	Rare	Major	Medium	
18	Legal action, a significant financial matter or criminal investigation prevents the organisation from delivering grant activities.	Organisation is unable to deliver activities. Funding objectives are only partially achieved or not achieved at all. Interruption to service delivery to the public.	Rare	Insignificant	Low	
19	The organisation becomes insolvent.	Organisation is unable to deliver activities. Funding objectives are only partially achieved or not achieved at all. Interruption to service delivery to the public.	Unlikely	Minor	Low	

Risk Management Actions: Australian Injecting and Illicit Drug Users League Incorporated (AIVL)

Grant	
-------	--

**Note:** Where the minimum set of controls for the grant program exceeds the recommended actions below, use the grant program controls. The recommended actions are intended to increase the level of control in proportion to the risk of funding the organisation.

Category	Recommended Actions
Performance reporting	Please select a grant from the list at the top of this page.
Financial reporting	Please select a grant from the list at the top of this page.
Other reporting	Please select a grant from the list at the top of this page.
Work plan & budget	Please select a grant from the list at the top of this page.
Final report	Please select a grant from the list at the top of this page.
Payments	Please select a grant from the list at the top of this page.
Certificates	Please select a grant from the list at the top of this page.
Governance	Please select a grant from the list at the top of this page.

Risk Management Actions: Australian Injecting and Illicit Drug Users League Incorporated (AIVL)

Grant	
-------	--

**Note:** Where the minimum set of controls for the grant program exceeds the recommended actions below, use the grant program controls. The recommended actions are intended to increase the level of control in proportion to the risk of funding the organisation.

Category	Recommended Actions
Relationship management	Please select a grant from the list at the top of this page.
Review frequency	Please select a grant from the list at the top of this page.

Organisation Events and Issues Log: Australian Injecting and Illicit Drug Users League Incorporated (AIVL)

Date	Grant	Contact	Issue category	Details	TRIM reference	Next steps	Action officer

Risk Matrix	Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost Certain
Severe	High	High	Extreme	Extreme	Extreme
Major	Medium	Medium	High	High	Extreme
Moderate	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	High
Minor	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	High
Insignificant	Low	Low	Low	Low	Medium

Likelihood Matrix	
Qualitative Likelihood Rating	Description
Almost certain	<p>Controls are completely ineffective at preventing all known causes of this risk from occurring.</p> <p>Expected to occur/recur in most circumstances. Has happened more than once before and circumstances have not changed.</p>
Likely	<p>Weak or patchy controls are ineffective at preventing most known causes of this risk from occurring.</p> <p>Will probably occur/recur in most circumstances. Has happened before and circumstances are comparable.</p>
Possible	<p>Controls are effective at preventing some known causes of this risk from occurring, but other causes are not effectively controlled.</p> <p>Could occur/recur at some time. May have happened before, but circumstances are different now.</p>
Unlikely	<p>Controls are effective at preventing most known causes of this risk from occurring, but some causes are not effectively controlled.</p> <p>Not expected to occur/recur. May have happened before, but past causes have been effectively mitigated.</p>
Rare	<p>Controls are effective at preventing all known causes of this risk from occurring.</p> <p>Exceptional circumstances only. No precedent has been set.</p>



# Consequence Matrix

Qualitative Impact Rating	Reputation	Health and Safety	Financial (Loss or Cost to Rectify)	Performance
<b>Severe</b>	Media or political pressure on Ministers/Secretary to resign	Death or life threatening injuries	More than \$5,000,000 in one financial year / More than 30% deviation from budget	Could significantly compromise the PBS Program.  Grant objectives cannot be achieved.
<b>Major</b>	Sustained negative national media coverage for greater than two weeks and political condemnation	Hospitalisation required	Between \$1,000,001 and \$5,000,000 in one financial year /  11% to 30% deviation from budget	Could compromise this grant program and/or noticeable impact on other grant programs or the PBS Program.  Some outputs will not be delivered at all / grant objectives will only be partially achieved.
<b>Moderate</b>	Short term negative national media coverage for less than two weeks and political criticism	Medical attention required	Between \$500,001 and \$1,000,000 in one financial year /  6% to 10% deviation from budget	Noticeable impact on this grant program and/or some impact on other grant programs or the PBS Program.  Most outputs are not of the required standard, but will broadly achieve grant objectives.
<b>Minor</b>	Localised negative media attention / ministerial correspondence	First aid required	Between \$250,000 and \$500,000 in one financial year /  Up to 5% deviation from budget	Impact is manageable and limited to this grant program.  Some outputs are not of the required standard, but little impact on grant objectives.
<b>Insignificant</b>	No adverse impact on reputation / departmental correspondence	Incident, but no adverse health and wellbeing impact	Less than \$250,000 in one financial year	Minimal negative impact on Government policy outcomes.  Minimal impact on grant outputs and objectives.

Escalation

Risk Rating	Level of Management
Extreme	Risk must be escalated to SES immediately. Treatments must be implemented to reduce the level of risk to as low as reasonably possible. If the level of risk cannot reasonably be reduced then the risk should be avoided if possible, else actively managed and monitored. Keep detailed records of issues, actions, contact and decisions. Review risk rating bi-monthly and adjust management accordingly.
High	Risk must be escalated to director level and actively managed, including implementation of treatments to reduce the level of risk to as low as reasonably possible. Keep detailed records of issues, actions, contact and decisions. Review risk rating quarterly and adjust management accordingly.
Medium	Risk must be managed and monitored at officer level. Additional treatments are optional. Record issues and decisions. Record actions and contact if managing an issue. Risk rating should be reviewed six monthly and management adjusted accordingly.
Low	Risk should be managed and monitored with minimal allocation of resources. Record issues and key decisions which may alter the risk profile. Risk rating should be reviewed annually.

Date	Time	User	Risk ID	Risk event	Impact	Likelihood	Consequence	Risk rating	Comments
------	------	------	---------	------------	--------	------------	-------------	-------------	----------

**Instructions**

The update button will update the content of this risk tool to the latest version.

Before pressing the button, download the latest version of the risk tool and save it to a local folder, such as My Documents or your Desktop (i.e. not TRIM).

When you press the update button you will be prompted to locate the update file on your computer.



**Version 1.1**