

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 | 11/08/2021 | Date of next review | 11/11/2021 | Template updated July 2020 |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Risk Rating | Performance Management | Issues Management | Governance | Viability | Financial Management | Overall Risk Rating |
| | Low | Medium | High | Low | Low | High |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| 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 | \$2,827,921.00 | Low |

| |
|--------------|
| \$214,285.00 |
| \$681,818.00 |
| \$250,000.00 |
| \$625,000.00 |
| \$681,818.00 |
| \$375,000.00 |

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 organisations |
| 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. | Likely | Moderate | High | CEO resignation effective and no replacement appointed |
| 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. | Possible | Minor | Medium | 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 |
|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Severe | 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. |
| Major | 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. |
| Moderate | 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. |
| Minor | 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. |
| Insignificant | 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.

