



**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
ESTIMATES AND FINANCIAL OPERATIONS**

**Inquiry into Western Australian Tourism Commission's Involvement in  
Major Tourism Events**

**Public Sector Commission – Supplementary Information**

**Supplementary Information No B1**

***Procedures and guidance given to departments and CEOs to deal with situations where public sector employees dealing with a private sector entity on a particular project are approached with an employment offer.***

The Commissioner has a role under s.21 of the *Public Sector Management Act 1994* (The PSM Act) to establish a code of ethics for the Western Australian public sector and assist public sector bodies and their employees to comply with this code and monitor and report on their compliance.

Public sector employees, including CEOs, are required under s.9 of the PSM Act to comply with the Western Australian Public Sector Code of Ethics and their own agency's code of conduct. These codes outline the requirement to act impartially and use official information in a responsible and accountable manner.

The Commission communicates these accountability requirements to public sector bodies and employees through a range of products including the *Accountable and Ethical Decision Making* program, the *Conduct Guide*, *Managing Interests a Checklist*, and the lessons learnt series: *Professional Decision Making*.

The Commission, as a member of the Integrity Coordinating Group, has taken the lead on the development on two key products: the *Conflicts of Interest Guidelines* and *Integrity in Decision Making*.

The Commission hosts an induction program for public sector employees. This program focuses on the ethical obligations of employees including identifying and managing conflicts of interest. A regular feature on the Commission's professional development calendar is the *Managing Conflict of Interest* session. These sessions cover key issues such as identifying and managing conflicts of interest.

Under s.102 of the PSM Act employees must seek written permission from their employing authority before accepting any secondary employment outside of government. This requirement is articulated within the Commission's products and professional development.

If a public sector employee contacted the Commission for advice about an employment offer whilst holding a position within a public sector agency the information provided by the Commission is to assist them to comply with the relevant ethical codes, identify and manage any potential conflict of interest and, if relevant, remind them of their obligations under s.102 of the PSM Act.

#### **Supplementary Information No B2**

***Letter indicating that the Commission is satisfied that Tourism WA have adhered to and met the five recommendations in the report titled "Report on Allegations of a Conflict of Interest Involving a Tourism WA employee and the One Movement Music Festival".***

Letter provided at Attachment 1.

#### **Supplementary Information No B3**

***Employees' responses, agency by agency, from the sample of agencies that participated in the Employee Perceptions Survey program for the 2010/11.***

The Employee Perception Survey (EPS) is a survey that is provided directly by the Commission to employees in public sector agencies. By administering the survey directly, the Commissioner is able to assure respondents that the confidentiality of their answers is protected. The survey provides an opportunity for employees in public sector agencies to provide their perspective on how well integrity and human resource management policies and practices are operating in their agency. It asks more than 70 questions.

The survey program has carried over from the OPSSC and there is a decade of responses that are used in monitoring trends and issues in the public sector. The survey allows the Commission to assess the level of employee awareness and understanding about core accountability measures and policies such as the Standards in Human Resource Management, Public Sector Code of Ethics, Public Interest Disclosure legislation and Equal Employment Opportunity obligations.

The Employee Perception Survey is treated as an indicator and not a measure of the climate in an agency. It is considered to be an effective instrument for:

- Gauging the broad level of awareness of code of conduct, Standards and PID obligations
- Comparing the workforce management climate of an agency to the sector as a whole
- Assisting agencies to focus their own Organisational Development strategies and system improvement actions
- Informing priority areas for practice improvement or for more targeted monitoring strategies by the Public Sector Commission.

The EPS is not used primarily as a performance management tool. However, outcomes of the EPS surveys do influence the focus of other oversight activities and are frequently a catalyst for conversations between senior Commission staff, the Commissioner, CEOs and their Corporate Executive teams about workplace culture and management practices occurring in an agency.

The sampling approach applied each year in deploying the survey is designed to achieve a representative sample by size and Ministerial portfolio. In very large agencies the sampling approach covers different locations or regions each year rather than the entire agency periodically. In medium and large agencies, the entire agency is surveyed, on average, once every five to six years. Departmental splits, mergers and restructures can influence the program and the use of comparative time series data.

In addition to the Commission monitoring outcomes, the EPS process provides target agencies with insight into the culture of their organization. At the conclusion of the process the Commission provides a detailed feedback report and presentation to the agency's corporate executive group. The information provided with this briefing includes copies of these reports. Presentations may also be supported with additional support or follow up.

In the period 2010-2011 (covering OPSSC and the Commission), the EPS was provided to 25,000 officers employed in 21 agencies. The average response rate was 45% on a per agency basis and 28% for all surveys sent within the reporting period.

Agency	Close Date	Surveys Sent	Responses received	Response rate
<b><i>Surveys coordinated by OPSSC</i></b>				
Department of Local Government	02-Aug-10	125	58	46.4%
WA Country Health Service – Goldfields	02-Aug-10	533	231	43.3%
Wheatbelt Development Commission	02-Aug-10	18	10	55.6%
Department of State Development	17-Aug-10	167	72	43.1%
Department of Culture and the Arts	27-Aug-10	1,048	348	33.2%
Office of the Public Sector Standards Commissioner	27-Aug-10	28	23	82.1%
Department of Planning	27-Aug-10	861	297	34.5%
Public Sector Commission	27-Aug-10	103	58	56.3%
Edith Cowen University	03-Nov-10	3,344	1,070	32.0%
Total for OPSSC		6,227	2,167	34.8%
<b><i>Surveys coordinated by PSC</i></b>				
Small Business Development Corporation	21-Mar-11	53	35	66.0%
Department for Child Protection	25-Mar-11	2,424	755	31.1%
Department of Transport	01-Apr-11	1,438	692	48.1%
Dental Health Services	02-Apr-11	818	328	40.1%
Country High School Hostels Authority	08-Apr-11	160	64	40.0%

Zoological Parks Authority	15-Apr-11	247	86	34.8%
Aqwest - Bunbury Water Board	20-May-11	35	31	88.6%
Department of Education North Metro District*	14-Jun-11	12,605	2,435	19.3%
Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions	14-Jun-11	259	109	42.1%
Drug and Alcohol Office	01-Jul-11	231	103	44.6%
Western Australian College of Teaching	01-Jul-11	41	28	68.3%
West Coast Institute of Training	01-Jul-11	553	135	24.4%
Total for PSC		18,864	4,801	25.5%
Overall Total		25,091	6,968	28%
Overall average per survey				45.1%

Copies of the EPS results for each of the above agencies are provided in the file provided titled *Attachment 2 – Employee Perception Survey Program 2010-11*.

#### **Supplementary Information No B4**

***With reference to the document entitled “Principles of Good Corporate Governance for Western Australian Public Sector Boards and Committees” issued in 2009, what is the level of awareness and understanding from agency boards of that document.***

Since 2009 the Commission has undertaken the following activities to raise the level of awareness of Boards and Committees with the principles contained within the *Good Governance* document and online tool:

- Key stakeholders, including Board Chairs, were involved in the *Good Governance* development.
- *Good Governance* was introduced to Board Chairs at three forums hosted by the Commission. An active demonstration of the product was conducted at this time (May-June 2009). Fifty-six Board Chairs attended. Feedback indicated an improved understanding of governance issues and a high level of satisfaction with the information provided.
- 796 registered users access the *Good Governance* website with approximately 1,401 visits per month.
- The Commissioner has written to public sector Boards annually with the offer to deliver professional development on the *Accountable and Ethical Decision Making (AEDM)* training program.
- The AEDM program delivered to boards incorporates the *Good Governance* principles. Since 2009 the Commission has conducted these sessions to 24 boards with a total number of 156 participants. This includes the delivery of training to all 9 regional development commissions.

- Three governance forums for Boards have been conducted by the Commission to 78 participants on topics contained within *Good Governance* including performance and evaluation and governance improvement practices.
- In 2011 the Commission, in conjunction with the Chartered Secretaries Institute, presented two workshops to 23 Board Chairs on establishing the principles of *Good Governance* within their Boards.
- In total the Commission has provided 86 public sector boards with professional development in *Good Governance* or AEDM. A full list of Boards and Committees that the Commission has assisted is provided at Attachment 3.
- The Commission will continue to hold annual forums for Board Chairs and Board and Committee members. These forums will focus on key ethical and governance issues and will be linked to the *Good Governance* principles, Codes of Conduct and ethical induction.
- The Commission will continue to offer to assist Boards and Committees by delivering AEDM and *Good Governance* development. The Commissioner will also continue to attend Board meetings on request.

#### **Supplementary Information No B5**

***Guidelines for agencies to guide CEOs and top management about setting delegated authority for the individual risk those agencies encounter, recognizing that the agencies will encounter different kinds of risks. Data from three random agencies and a fourth being Tourism Commission.***

Public Sector Commissioner's Circular 2009-19 titled *Risk Management and Business Continuity Planning* requires that all public sector bodies practice risk management, regularly undertake a structured risk assessment process to identify the risks facing their organisations, be able to demonstrate the management of risks, and where appropriate, have continuity plans to ensure they can respond to and recover from any business disruption.

A copy of the Circular is provided at Attachment 4.

The Circular requires details of risk management policies, assessment processes and continuity plans to be submitted to RiskCover. RiskCover is a business division of the Insurance Commission of Western Australia.

RiskCover have provided Risk Reference Tables for the following four agencies:

1. Department of Transport;
2. Aquwest Bunbury Water Board;
3. Central Institute of Technology; and
4. Tourism Western Australia.

The RiskCover tables are provided at Attachment 5.

As part of the Commission's Annual Agency Survey, CEOs are asked to self assess their agency's maturity in relation to risk management. The responses provided to the 2010/11 survey by the above four agencies is provided at Attachment 6.

#### **Supplementary Information No B6**

***Copy of the written letter of offer to [redacted] from Sunset Events.***

Copies of two letters to [redacted] from Sunset Events are provided at Attachment 7, dated 3 October 2008 and 9 October 2008 respectively.

Investigation notes confirm that [redacted] evidence was that she was directly approached with a verbal offer of employment by Mr Chitty of Sunset Events shortly after the Heads of Agreement had been signed. On Sunday 28 September 2008 she met with three Directors of Sunset Events. The following week, mid week, she participated in a telephone hook up with the same Directors and the company's American connections. She received the first of the above letters of offer on 3 October 2008.

Investigation notes also confirm that [redacted] spoke with Mr Hamilton, Mr van Ooran and Mr Muirhead of Tourism WA after receiving the written offer to seek their career guidance on whether or not she should take up the opportunity. The second letter, dated 9 October 2008, indicates that [redacted] had yet to make a final decision regarding acceptance of the offer on that date.

#### **Supplementary Information No B7**

***The difference in time between the informal discussion between [redacted] and Sunset Events and the written offer to [redacted].***

5 calendar days.

## **Attachment 1**



21 September 2011

Ms Carolyn Malouf  
Committee Clerk  
Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations  
Parliament House  
Perth WA 6000

Dear Ms Malouf

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE, FRIDAY 2 SEPTEMBER 2011, PUBLIC SECTOR  
COMMISSION, SESSION 2 – SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION B2**

I refer to the above transcript of evidence, and the request by the Committee through the Honourable Ms Liz Behjat that myself or Ms Fiona Roche provide a letter saying that the Commission is satisfied that the five recommendations contained in the Commission's report titled "*Report on Allegations of a Conflict of Interest Involving a Tourism WA employee and the One Movement Music Festival*" have been adhered to and met by Tourism WA.

I am pleased to provide such a letter as requested. I confirm that recommendations 1 to 4 have been implemented in full. In relation to recommendation 5, Tourism WA have progressed that recommendation through a number of separate policies on conflicts of interest, gifts and outside employment rather than through the development and implementation of one policy as recommended. While this is a different approach to that I had in mind, I am satisfied that this work meets the intent of the recommendation and have indicated to Tourism WA that my office would be pleased to work with them to progress more specific strategies in this area.

I would appreciate you bringing this confirmation to the attention of the Committee.

Yours sincerely



M C Wauchope  
PUBLIC SECTOR COMMISSIONER



## **Attachment 2**

**Refer to file provided titled:**

**Attachment 2 - EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION  
SURVEY PROGRAM 2010-11**

## **Attachment 3**

**Public sector boards and committees the Commission has assisted through Good Governance or AEDM professional development**

Number	Public Sector Boards and Committees
1	Aboriginal Cultural Material Committee
2	Aboriginal Lands Trust
3	Adoption Applications Committee
4	Agriculture Protection Board of WA
5	Animal Ethics Committee
6	Architects Board of WA
7	Armadale Redevelopment Authority
8	Art Gallery of WA
9	Biosecurity Council of WA
10	Board of Examiners
11	Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority
12	Builders Registration Board
13	Building Surveyors Qualification Committee
14	Bunbury Water Board - AQWEST
15	Busselton Water Board
16	Central TAFE Governing Council
17	Central West College of TAFE Governing Council
18	Chemistry Centre of WA
19	Conservation Commission
20	Construction Industry Training Fund - Baord
21	Country Housing Authority
22	C Y O'Connor Governing Council
23	Dental Prosthetists Advisory Council
24	Disability Services Commission
25	East Perth Redevelopment Authority
26	Economic Regulation Authority
27	Edith Cowan University
28	FESA Superannuation Board
29	Fire and Emergency Services Authority
30	Geraldton Port Authority Board
31	GESB
32	Goldfields Esperance Development Commission
33	Great Southern TAFE Governing Council
34	Heritage Council of Western Australia
35	Independent Market Operator
36	Keep Australia Beautiful Council WA
37	Kimberley TAFE Governing Council

Number	Public Sector Boards and Committees
38	Landgate Board of Management
39	Land Surveyors Licensing Board
40	Land Valuers Licensing Board
41	Law Reform Commission
42	Legal Aid Commission
43	Legal Practices Board
44	Local Health Authorities Analytical Committee
45	Lotterywest
46	Marine Parks and Reserves Authority Commission
47	Mental Health Review Board
48	Metropolitan Cemeteries Board
49	Midland Redevelopment Authority
50	Motor Vehicle Industry Board
51	Nurses Board of WA
52	Occupational Therapists Registration Board of WA
53	Optometrists Board
54	Osteopaths Registration Board
55	Peel Development Commission
56	Perth Market Authority
57	Perth Zoo Board
58	Pharmaceutical Council of WA
59	Pharmacists Registration Board of WA
60	Physiotherapists Registration Board or WA Review Committee
61	Physiotherapy Board of WA
62	Pilbara Development Commission
63	Potato Marketing Board
64	Prisoners Review Board
65	Public Housing Review Panel
66	Radiological Council
67	Real Estate and Business Agents Supervisory Board
68	Settlement Agents Supervisory Board
69	Small Business Development Corporation
70	South West Regional College of TAFE Governing Council
71	State Review Boards Secretariat
72	TAFE, Swan
73	Tourism WA
74	Training Accreditation Council
75	Veterinary Surgeons' Board
76	WA Sports Centre Trust
77	Waste Authority of WA
78	Water Corporation Board of Directors

Number	Public Sector Boards and Committees
79	West Coast TAFE Governing Council
80	Western Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council
81	Western Australian Alcohol and Drug Authority
82	Western Australian College of Teaching
83	Western Australian Meat Industry Authority Board
84	Western Power
85	Wheatbelt Development Commission
86	WorkCover WA

## **Attachment 4**





## PUBLIC SECTOR COMMISSIONER'S CIRCULAR

**Enquiries To:** Don Williams, 9264 3400  
Manager, RiskCover Division  
Insurance Commission of WA  
**Supersedes:** Premier's Circular 2006/03

**Number:** 2009-19  
**Issue Date:** 08 May 2006  
**Review Date:** 23 March 2011

---

**TITLE: RISK MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS CONTINUITY PLANNING**

---

### POLICY

All public sector bodies must practise risk management, regularly undertake a structured risk assessment process to identify the risks facing their organisations, be able to demonstrate the management of risks, and where appropriate, have continuity plans to ensure they can respond to and recover from any business disruption.

All public sector bodies have been required to submit details of their risk management policy, assessment processes and continuity plans to RiskCover. Public sector bodies must ensure that risk management policies and continuity plans are maintained and reviewed on a regular basis.

### BACKGROUND

Risk management has been a feature of the operation of the public sector for many years, with such requirements included in the Treasurer's Instructions. The Insurance Commission of Western Australia through its RiskCover Division has a mandate to manage and administer risk management arrangements on behalf of public authorities and to provide advice to the Government on matters relating to risk management.

Planning for major risk events, such as natural disasters, often receives special focus with a great deal of planning and mitigation work undertaken to deal with potential issues. However, it is a matter of good corporate governance that risk assessment and continuity planning are subject to continual review at the highest levels of an organisation. In more recent times the threat of terrorism and the possibility of an influenza pandemic have reinforced the need for government agencies to be prepared and able to continue to deliver services no matter the circumstances.

The proclamation of the *Emergency Management Act 2005* together with other State initiatives such as the Western Australian Management Plan for Pandemic Influenza, are parts of the process of ensuring that the public sector and the community are well prepared for emergencies of any kind.

Many agencies will already have well developed risk management processes while others may be less well prepared.

RiskCover consultants will continue to be available to guide and assist agencies to enable them to meet the requirements (contact Mr Jim Hodges, Risk Management Services Manager, RiskCover 9264 3702). Education and training in risk management and business continuity planning is also available through RiskCover.

M C Wauchope  
PUBLIC SECTOR COMMISSIONER

Other relevant Public Sector Commissioner's Circulars:	n/a
--	-----

## **Attachment 5**

## Risk Reference Tables

## QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF CONSEQUENCE OR IMPACT

LEVEL	RANK	COMMERCIAL	FINANCIAL	PERSONNEL INCIDENT OR INJURIES	POLITICAL	SOCIAL	TECHNICAL / OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY
1	Insignificant	Minimal impact	Less than \$10,000	No injuries	Minimal Disruption	Minimal Disruption	Minimal Disruption
2	Minor	Claims from business or repair to other services. Consumers Inconvenienced.	\$10,000 to \$50,000	First aid treatment	Minor impact or interest. Questions raised in local forums. Local media reports.	Some disruption to normal supply	Limited disruption & some loss of supply
3	Moderate	Significant claims	\$50,001 to \$500,000	Medical treatment required	Disruption to public. Questions raised in Parliament.	Community discussion. Broad media coverage	Significant disruption with loss of water for 1 day
4	Major	Operating licence comes under scrutiny by government	\$500,001 to \$5 million	Extensive injuries	Loss of confidence in facility management. Corporate credibility affected.	Extensive disruption	Loss of significant plant or main > 1 day
5	Catastrophic	Loss of operating licence	> \$5 million	Death, or severe permanent disablements	Public furore and investigations. Management changes discussed.	Broad impact on community	Extensive disruption with impact on other resources. Total loss of production

Aqwest Bunbury Water Board  
Risk Reference Tables

QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF CONSEQUENCE OR IMPACT

LEVEL	RANK	ENVIRONMENTAL	PROJECT
1	Insignificant	Negligible impact	< 1% over budget, or < 5% delay or < 1% variation to deliverables
2	Minor	Minor impact	< 5% over budget, or < 10% delay or < 5% variation to deliverables
3	Moderate	Medium intervention to bring about recovery	< 10% over budget, or < 25% delay or < 10% variation to deliverables
4	Major	High level but recoverable damage or contamination	< 20% over budget, or < 100% delay or < 20% variation to deliverables
5	Catastrophic	Extensive or permanent damage or contamination	Over 20% over budget, or > 100% delay or > 20% variation to deliverables

Aqwest Bunbury Water Board  
Risk Reference Tables

QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF LIKELIHOOD

LEVEL	DESCRIPTOR	DETAILED DESCRIPTION	FREQUENCY
1	Rare	The event may occur only in exceptional circumstances.	Less than once in 30 years
2	Unlikely	The event could occur at some time	At least once in 30 years
3	Moderate	The event should occur at some time.	At least once in 10 years
4	Likely	The event will probably occur in most circumstances	At least once per 5 years
5	Almost Certain	The event is expected to occur in most circumstances	More than once per year

EXISTING CONTROLS

LEVEL	DESCRIPTOR	FORESEEABLE	DETAILED DESCRIPTION
E	Excellent	More than what a reasonable person would be expected to do in the circumstances.	Controls fully in place and require only ongoing maintenance and monitoring. Protection systems are being continuously reviewed and procedures are regularly tested.
A	Adequate	Only what a reasonable person would be expected to do in the circumstances.	Being addressed reasonably. Protection systems are in place and procedures exist for given circumstances. Periodic review.
I	Inadequate	Less than what a reasonable person would be expected to do in the circumstances.	Little to no action being taken. No protection systems exist or they have not been reviewed for some time. No formalised procedures.

## Risk Reference Tables

RISK ASSESSMENT CRITERIA TABLE

CONSEQUENCE		LIKELIHOOD				
		1	2	3	4	5
		Rare	Unlikely	Moderate	Likely	Almost Certain
1	Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5
2	Minor	2	4	6	8	10
3	Moderate	3	6	9	12	15
4	Major	4	8	12	16	20
5	Catastrophic	5	10	15	20	25

RISK ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA TABLE

LEVEL OF RISK	DESCRIPTOR	INFORMATION
1 - 3	Acceptable	Acceptable with adequate controls. Operational Manager is responsible.
4 - 5	Monitor	Acceptable with adequate controls. Operational Manager is responsible.
6 - 9	Management Control Required	Acceptable with adequate controls. Operational Manager is responsible.
10 - 14	Urgent Management Attention	Only acceptable with excellent controls. Responsibility of Operational Manager, advise CEO, advise Risk Management Committee
15 - 25	Unacceptable	Requires excellent controls. Responsibility of CEO, advise Risk Management Committee, Chairman of Board

Approved as at ...../...../..... By: ..... Title: .....



## QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF CONSEQUENCE OR IMPACT

LEVEL	RANK	INJURIES	OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY	PROJECT - COST	PROJECT - QUALITY	PROJECT - TIME	FINANCIAL LOSS
1	Insignificant	No injuries	Little impact	Less than 5% over project budget.	Less than 5% deviation in some of the project specifications / deliverables (either per project phase or whole of project).	Less than 5% over project time frame (either per project phase or whole of project).	Less than \$50,000
2	Minor	First aid treatment	Inconvenient delays	More than 5% and less than 10% over project budget.	More than 5% and less than 10% deviation in some of the project specifications / deliverables (either per project phase or whole of project).	More than 5% and less than 10% over project time frame (either per project phase or whole of project).	\$50,000 to \$250,000
3	Moderate	Medical treatment required	Delays in major deliverables	More than 10% and less than 30% over project budget.	More than 10% and less than 30% deviation in some or most of the project specifications / deliverables (either per project phase or whole of project).	More than 10% and less than 30% over project time frame (either per project phase or whole of project).	\$250,000 to \$1 million
4	Major	Death or extensive injuries	Non-achievement of major deliverables	More than 30% and less than 50% over project budget.	Non-achievement of the project specifications / deliverables (either per project phase or whole of project).	More than 30% but less than 50% over project time frame (either per project phase or whole of project).	\$1 million to \$3 million
5	Catastrophic	Multiple deaths or severe permanent disablements	Non-achievement of major key objectives	More than 50% over project budget.	Non-achievement of the project objective(s).	More than 50% over project time frame (either per project phase or whole of project).	More than \$3 million

Central Institute of Technology  
Risk Reference Tables

QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF CONSEQUENCE OR IMPACT

LEVEL	RANK	INTERRUPTIONS TO SERVICES	REPUTATION AND IMAGE	PERFORMANCE
1	Insignificant	Less than 1 day	Unsubstantiated, low in-house impact, low profile or no news item. Dealt with by Local Management.	Up to 5% Variation in KPI or objective.
2	Minor	1 day to 3 days	Substantiated, low in-house impact, low news profile. Dealt with by Local Management.	5% to 10% Variation in KPI or objective
3	Moderate	3 days to 1 week	Substantiated, low level public embarrassment. Dealt with by Managing Director or Department.	11% to 15% Variation in KPI or objective
4	Major	1 week to 1 month	Substantiated, public embarrassment, news profile, one off third party actions, Ministerial involvement.	16% to 25% Variation in KPI or objective
5	Catastrophic	More than 1 month	Substantiated, public embarrassment, high ongoing news profile, multiple third party actions. Parliamentary involvement.	More than 25% in Variation in KPI or objective

Central Institute of Technology  
Risk Reference Tables

QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF LIKELIHOOD

LEVEL	DESCRIPTOR	DETAILED DESCRIPTION	FREQUENCY
1	Rare	The event may occur only in exceptional circumstances.	Less than once in 10 years
2	Unlikely	The event could occur at some time.	At least once in 5 years
3	Moderate	The event should occur at some time.	At least once in 3 years
4	Likely	The event will probably occur in most circumstances.	At least once per 1 year
5	Almost Certain	The event is expected to occur in most circumstances.	More than once per year

EXISTING CONTROLS

LEVEL	DESCRIPTOR	FORESEEABLE	DETAILED DESCRIPTION
E	Excellent	More than what a reasonable person would be expected to do in the circumstances.	Controls fully in place and require only ongoing maintenance and monitoring. Protection systems are being continuously reviewed and procedures are regularly tested.
A	Adequate	Only what a reasonable person would be expected to do in the circumstances.	Being addressed reasonably. Protection systems are in place and procedures exist for given circumstances. Periodic review.
I	Inadequate	Less than what a reasonable person would be expected to do in the circumstances.	Little to no action being taken. No protection systems exist or they have not been reviewed for some time. No formalised procedures.

## Risk Reference Tables

RISK ASSESSMENT CRITERIA TABLE

CONSEQUENCE		LIKELIHOOD				
		1	2	3	4	5
		Rare	Unlikely	Moderate	Likely	Almost Certain
1	Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5
2	Minor	2	4	6	8	10
3	Moderate	3	6	9	12	15
4	Major	4	8	12	16	20
5	Catastrophic	5	10	15	20	25

RISK ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA TABLE

LEVEL OF RISK	DESCRIPTOR	INFORMATION
1 - 3	Low risk. Acceptable with Adequate Controls. Subject to annual review as part of Operational Planning.	To be managed at the Manager level. Any increase in risk to be reported to the Director /LPM.
4 - 9	Medium risk. Acceptable with Adequate Controls. Subject to annual review as part of Operational Planning. Note: Any risk with a Consequence OR Likelihood rating of 5 to be reviewed by the Director / LPM.	To be managed locally at unit/portfolio level. Any increase in risk level is to be reported to the General Manager. Any increase in risk level is to be reported to the General Manager. Note: Any risk with a Consequence OR Likelihood rating of 5 to be reported to the General Manager / Executive Director on a Quarterly basis. Note: Any risk with a Consequence OR Likelihood rating of 5 to be reported to the General Manager / Executive Director on a Quarterly basis.
10 - 14	High risk. Acceptable with Excellent Controls. Subject to quarterly Business Performance Review. Note: Any risk with a Consequence OR Likelihood rating of 5 to be reviewed by the Director / LPM.	To be managed at the General Manager level. Treatment Action Plans (TAP) to be developed, endorsed by Corporate Executive and implemented. Risks, controls and status of TAPs to be reported to Corporate Executive by General Manager on a quarterly basis. Note: Any risk with a Consequence OR Likelihood rating of 5 to be reported to the General Manager / Executive Director on a Quarterly basis.

Central Institute of Technology  
Risk Reference Tables

RISK ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA TABLE

LEVEL OF RISK	DESCRIPTOR	INFORMATION
15 - 25	Critical risk. Acceptable with Excellent Controls. Subject to Quarterly Business Performance Review. Note: Any risk with a Consequence AND / OR Likelihood rating of 5 to by the Director / LPM.	To be managed at the Executive level. Treatment Action Plans (TAP) to be developed, endorsed by Corporate Executive and implemented. Status of TAPs and controls reported to Corporate Executive by General Manager on a monthly basis until the risk rating is reduced below 15 (if appropriate). In addition, risks, controls and status of TAPs are to be reported to the Finance Audit and Risk Management Committee on a quarterly basis. Note: Any risk with a Consequence AND / OR Likelihood rating of 5 to be reported to the General Manager / Executive Director on a Quarterly basis.

Approved as at ...../...../..... By: ..... Title: .....

Tourism Western Australia  
Risk Reference Tables

QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF CONSEQUENCE OR IMPACT

LEVEL	RANK	FINANCIAL	SAFETY	REPUTATION	REGULATORY AND/OR CONTRACTUAL	POLITICAL	MANAGEMENT EFFORT
1	Insignificant	Less than \$500,000	First aid treatment required	Local media and/or Public Complaints	Minor breaches by contractors, suppliers or committees	Precautionary advice to Board and Minister	An event which can be absorbed through normal activity
2	Minor	\$500,000 to \$1 million	Medical treatment required	Adverse capital city press and/or minor political criticism	Act or Code infringement or Contract Dispute	Demand from Minister for internal review. No external press.	An event, the consequences of which can be absorbed, but management effort is required to minimise the impact.
3	Moderate	\$1 million to \$3 million	Extensive injuries, evacuation and/or hospitalisation	Adverse national press criticism and/or repeated adverse capital city press and/or major political criticism	Penalties under code or TPA legislation or threats of loss of Contract and third party claims	Minister required to report to Parliament resulting in adverse press.	A significant event which can be managed under normal circumstances
4	Major	\$3 million to \$5 million	Death	Forced cessation of some event or promotion and/or Parliamentary inquiry	Severe fines and threat of Contract cancellation	Premier required to defend publicly	A critical event which with proper management can be endured
5	Catastrophic	More than \$5 million	Multiple deaths	Curtailement of activity. Serious breach of legislation. Continual public criticism.	Fines and prison sentences. Major contractual breaches, financial damages, claims from third parties	A critical exposure with the potential to lead to collapse of the business or Government.	A critical exposure with the potential to lead to collapse of the business or Government

Tourism Western Australia  
Risk Reference Tables

QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF CONSEQUENCE OR IMPACT

LEVEL	RANK	BUSINESS PERFORMANCE (KPIs)
1	Insignificant	Target failure in 1 KPI.
2	Minor	Target failure in 2 KPIs.
3	Moderate	Target failure in 3- 4 KPIs.
4	Major	Target failure in 5-7 KPIs.
5	Catastrophic	Target failure in more than 7 KPIs.



## QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF LIKELIHOOD

LEVEL	DESCRIPTOR	DETAILED DESCRIPTION	FREQUENCY
1	Rare	The event may occur only in exceptional circumstances.	Less than once in 10 years
2	Unlikely	The event could occur at some time.	At least once in 10 years
3	Possible	The event should occur at some time.	At least once in 5 years
4	Likely	The event will probably occur in most circumstances.	At least once per year
5	Almost Certain	The event is expected to occur in most circumstances.	More than once per year

## EXISTING CONTROLS

LEVEL	DESCRIPTOR	FORESEEABLE	DETAILED DESCRIPTION
S	Satisfactory	.	The control measures are operating effectively and efficiently, providing a reasonable level of assurance that objectives are being fully achieved.
R	Reasonable	.	The control measures are generally acceptable, however, areas of improvement have been identified. Tourism WA may not have direct control of the issue but has implemented controls to minimise the risk.
U	Unsatisfactory	.	The control environment is not at an acceptable standard. Reasonable assurance does not exist that objectives will be achieved.

Tourism Western Australia  
Risk Reference Tables

RISK ASSESSMENT CRITERIA TABLE

CONSEQUENCE		LIKELIHOOD				
		1	2	3	4	5
		Rare	Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Almost Certain
1	Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5
2	Minor	2	4	6	8	10
3	Moderate	3	6	9	12	15
4	Major	4	8	12	16	20
5	Catastrophic	5	10	15	20	25

RISK ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA TABLE

LEVEL OF RISK	DESCRIPTOR	INFORMATION
1 - 4	Low Risk	Acceptable with reasonable controls. Executive Director is responsible.
5 - 9	Medium Risk	Acceptable with reasonable controls. Executive Director is responsible.
10 - 16	High Risk	Only acceptable with satisfactory controls. Responsibility of Chief Executive Officer.
17 - 25	Very High Risk	Only acceptable with satisfactory controls. Responsibility of Chief Executive Officer.

Approved as at ...../...../..... By: ..... Title: .....

Department of Transport  
Risk Reference Tables

QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF CONSEQUENCE OR IMPACT

LEVEL	RANK	HEALTH & SAFETY	FIN LOSS POST 27-6-11	FIN LOSS PRE 27-6-11	REPUTATION AND TRUST	BUSINESS EFFECTIVENESS CAPABILITY AND CAPACITY	ENVIRONMENTAL
1	Insignificant	No medical treatment required	Less than \$50,000	Less than \$50,000	Isolated local community or individuals issue-based concerns. Low profile media attention	Low impact of Service disruption and effectiveness of DoT. Impact can be managed through routine activities	Local negligible impact. Simple treatment or none. No lasting effect or significance.
2	Minor	First aid treatment	\$50,000 to \$500,000	\$50,000 to \$100,000	Local community impacts & concerns. Occasional one-off negative media attention. Trust issues raised	Ability to achieve objectives & deliver outcomes is affected. Efficiency of elements of the organisation is reduced. Impact requires additional local management effort or redirection of resources to respond.	Local minimal impact. Standard treatment. Minor local short-term residual effect.
3	Moderate	Medical treatment required	\$500,000 to \$5 million	\$100,000 to \$500,000	Sectional community impacts & concerns publicly expressed. Increased negative media attention. Loss of confidence & trust by community & stakeholders in DoT processes & capability. DoT integrity in question. Relationships compromised (dispute)	Efficiency of major elements of DoT is reduced & one or more projects is significantly impaired. Impact requires management and resources from a key area of the organisation to respond.	Local significant impact. Significant treatment/monitoring. Significant medium term residual effect
4	Major	Extensive injuries (whether physical &/or psychological). Single Death	\$5 million to \$20 million	\$500,000 to \$1.5 million	Considerable & prolonged community impact & dissatisfaction publicly expressed. Consistent negative media attention, criticism & loss of confidence/trust by community & stakeholders in DoT processes & capability. relationships damaged (third party intervention). Ministerial intervention	Continual capability of organisation is threatened. One or more critical programs or projects cannot be delivered. Impact requires long term significant management and organisational resources to respond.	Local and offsite severe impact. Major treatment/ monitoring. Major medium term residual effect.
5	Catastrophic	Multiple Deaths or severe permanent disablement	More than \$20 million	More than \$1.5 million	Significant adverse community impact and condemnation. Extreme negative media attention. Consistent ongoing community loss of confidence & trust in DoT capabilities and intentions. Relationships breakdown (Legal intervention). Government intervention	Majority of critical programs or projects cannot be delivered. Ministerial intervention. Impact cannot be managed within the organisations existing resources and threatens survival of the organisation.	Widespread severe impact. Major long term treatment / monitoring. Major long term residual effect.

Department of Transport  
Risk Reference Tables

QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF CONSEQUENCE OR IMPACT

LEVEL	RANK	INT CRITICAL SERVICES POST 27-6-11	INT CRITICAL SERVICES PRE 27-6-11	LEGAL AND COMPLIANCE
1	Insignificant	Services receive minimal damage or are only temporarily unavailable. Less than 1 hour.	Services receive minimal damage or are only temporarily unavailable. Less than 1 hour.	Legal issues managed by routine procedures. Little to no level of legal prosecution.
2	Minor	A number of services unusable but can be replaced within acceptable timeframes. 1 hour to 1 day.	A number of Services unusable but can be replaced within acceptable timeframes. 1 to 4 hours.	Complex legal issue to be addressed. Likely level of legal prosecution. Potential public liability claim.
3	Moderate	A range of Services including some significant Services are unusable for 1 day to 1 week.	A range of Services including some significant Services are unusable for 24 hours. 4 to 24 hours.	Serious incident requires investigation to determine legal liability. Non-compliance with regulation. High level of legal prosecution.
4	Major	Significant disruption to Services for up to one month. 1 week to 1 month.	Significant disruption to Services for up to one month. 24 hours to 1 month.	Major breach of regulation. Major litigation and / or prosecution. Major litigation and/or prosecution. Major public liability claim.
5	Catastrophic	Significant disruption to Services for more than 1 month. More than 1 month.	Significant disruption to Services for more than 1 month. More than 1 month.	Significant prosecution and fines. Major litigation involving class actions. Major non-compliance with Legislation.

Department of Transport  
Risk Reference Tables

QUALITATIVE MEASURES OF LIKELIHOOD

LEVEL	DESCRIPTOR	DETAILED DESCRIPTION	FREQUENCY
1	Rare	The event may occur in exceptional circumstances (less than once every 15 years)	>15 years
2	Unlikely	This event could occur at some time (between 10 and 15 years)	10 - 15 years
3	Moderate	This event should occur at some time (between 5 and 10 years)	5 - 10 years
4	Likely	This event is likely to occur at some time (between 1 and 5 years)	1 - 5 years
5	Almost Certain	This event will probably occur in most circumstances (more than one per year)	> 1 year

EXISTING CONTROLS

LEVEL	DESCRIPTOR	FORESEEABLE	DETAILED DESCRIPTION
E	Excellent	More than what a reasonable person would be expected to do in the circumstances.	Controls fully in place and require only ongoing maintenance and monitoring. Protection systems are being continuously reviewed and procedures are regularly tested.
A	Adequate	Only what a reasonable person would be expected to do in the circumstances.	Being addressed reasonably. Protection systems are in place and procedures exist for given circumstances. Periodic review.
I	Inadequate	Less than what a reasonable person would be expected to do in the circumstances.	Little to no action being taken. No protection systems exist or they have not been reviewed for some time. No formalised procedures.

Department of Transport  
Risk Reference Tables

RISK ASSESSMENT CRITERIA TABLE

CONSEQUENCE		LIKELIHOOD				
		1	2	3	4	5
		Rare	Unlikely	Moderate	Likely	Almost Certain
1	Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5
2	Minor	2	4	6	8	10
3	Moderate	3	6	9	12	15
4	Major	4	8	12	16	20
5	Catastrophic	5	10	15	20	25

RISK ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA TABLE

LEVEL OF RISK	DESCRIPTOR	INFORMATION
1 - 8	Low.	Risk is manageable through existing controls and/or routine procedures. Review by Risk Owner & Director. Annual reporting to Director.
9 - 14	Medium.	Risk may be acceptable and should be monitored. Review by Risk Owner, Director & Office of DG. Bi-annual reporting to Corpex.
15 - 19	High.	Risk treatment strategies should be considered and implemented where possible. Review by Risk Owner, Director and Office of DG. Quarterly reporting to Corpex.
20 - 25	Extreme.	Risk treatment strategies must be considered and implemented where possible. Review by Risk Owner, Director and Office of DG. Quarterly reporting to Corpex.

Approved as at ...../...../..... By: ..... Title: .....

## **Attachment 6**



Annual Agency Survey 2011 – Questions relating to risk management. Responses from identified sample agencies.

Agency	Size cat	AAS Qs	Self assessed maturity (0-5)	Maturity Rating Description	Agency explanatory text (optional)
Bunbury Water Board	Small	59	4	Policies, practices and processes exist for the governance and management of material risks. This includes all aspects of the organisation's business ranging from reputational, financial or physical to occupational safety and health. (This may include a comprehensive risk management plan or individual policies or procedures for managing specific risks.)	
		60	4	The organisation's risk exposure is evaluated and remediation plans and preventative measures are implemented.	
Central Institute of Technology WA	Medium	59	4	Policies, practices and processes exist for the governance and management of material risks. This includes all aspects of the organisation's business ranging from reputational, financial or physical to occupational safety and health. (This may include a comprehensive risk management plan or individual policies or procedures for managing specific risks.)	Central with the assistance of Riskcover have set up an extensive risk database covering all levels of risk, strategic, operational and project risks. The institute also has extensive risk management policies and procedures. The maturity level of this item has increased from last year as risk management continues to be embedded across the Institute. The institute is also intending to undertake a complete audit of our risk management and business continuity programs, during 2011/12.
		60	3	The organisation's risk exposure is evaluated and remediation plans and preventative measures are implemented.	Central's risk management policy provided detailed process for the evaluation of risks and the implementation of preventative measures. Risk Management performance is reviewed regularly by Executive and the Finance, Audit and Risk Management (FARM) committee which is a subcommittee of Governing Council. Treatment action plans are mandatory for any risk with a risk rating level higher than 25. The maturity level of this item will increase following the audit as outlined above.
Department of Transport		59	3	Policies, practices and processes exist for the governance and management of material risks. This includes all aspects of the organisation's business ranging from reputational, financial or physical to occupational safety and health. (This may include a comprehensive risk management plan or individual policies or procedures for managing specific risks.)	Engaged Risk Cover. Adopted Risk Base as risk management tool. Strategic and Operational risk assessment currently being undertaken.
	Large	60	3	The organisation's risk exposure is evaluated and remediation plans and preventative measures are implemented.	Same as above in addition to risk also applied to major projects. Approximately 75% completion of targets. Completion December 2011.
Western Australian Tourism Commission	Small	59	4	Policies, practices and processes exist for the governance and management of material risks. This includes all aspects of the organisation's business ranging from reputational, financial or physical to occupational safety and health. (This may include a comprehensive risk management plan or individual policies or procedures for managing specific risks.)	Relevant policies published on the intranet. Risk Manager position is responsible for organisational governance and risk management framework. There is a structured process in place for financial decisions at Executive and Board level.
	Small	60	4	The organisation's risk exposure is evaluated and remediation plans and preventative measures are implemented.	Risk management is embedded in Board level decision making. Risk Management Framework in process of review and to be audited in 2011/2012.

## **Attachment 7**



**sunset events**

ABN 50 230 353 163  
PO Box 111 Fremantle WA 6959  
ph 08 9336 2837 fax 08 9336 1074  
email [Info@sunsetevents.com.au](mailto:Info@sunsetevents.com.au)

9 October 2008

Dear

**EMPLOYMENT AT SUNSET EVENTS – EVENT DIRECTOR**

This letter is to confirm that we would like to offer you the above position with Sunset Events. As discussed during the interview process, the role will substantially comprise the role of Event Director for One Movement in accordance with the key competencies and job outline (attached).

Once you have additional capacity beyond fulfilling that role, work in the area of business/event development for Sunset Events will be included as part of your job role. There may be some immediate work of this nature associated with Sunset's current and other proposed projects however this will be subject to your capacity in your primary role with One Movement.

The agreed salary will be

Annual leave is based on 4 weeks per year.

There is no time-in-lieu package, however "informal" or additional leave time following very busy event periods can be discussed.

The position is a permanent full time role.

An employment contract outlining full terms and conditions of employment and a job description based on the above roles will be provided to you when you commence. Other key terms will be:

- International air travel will be business class if required to ensure that you can perform properly at meetings. Economy will be used if your schedule allows enough proper rest/sleep at the other end prior to work duties.
- An expense allowance for meals and incidentals (not accom) on overseas trips of \$100 per day will apply. This may be reviewed given the collapse of the dollar.
- Accom will be a good 3\* or 4\* room.

If you would like to accept this position please countersign the attached copy letter and return to us.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Chernov  
Director  
Legal and Business Affairs  
Sunset Events

COPY



**sunset events**

ABN 50 230 353 163  
PO Box 111 Fremantle WA 6959  
ph 08 9336 2837 fax 08 9336 1074  
email info@sunsetevents.com.au

9 October 2008

Dear

**EMPLOYMENT AT SUNSET EVENTS – EVENT DIRECTOR**

This letter is to confirm that we would like to offer you the above position with Sunset Events. As discussed during the interview process, the role will substantially comprise the role of Event Director for One Movement in accordance with the key competencies and job outline (attached).

Once you have additional capacity beyond fulfilling that role, work in the area of business/event development for Sunset Events will be included as part of your job role. There may be some immediate work of this nature associated with Sunset's current and other proposed projects however this will be subject to your capacity in your primary role with One Movement.

The agreed salary will be . Annual leave is based on 4 weeks per year.

There is no time-in-lieu package, however "informal" or additional leave time following very busy event periods can be discussed.

The position is a permanent full time role.

An employment contract outlining full terms and conditions of employment and a job description based on the above roles will be provided to you when you commence. Other key terms will be:

- International air travel will be business class if required to ensure that you can perform properly at meetings. Economy will be used if your schedule allows enough proper rest/sleep at the other end prior to work duties.
- An expense allowance for meals and incidentals (not accom) on overseas trips of \$100 per day will apply. This may be reviewed given the collapse of the dollar.
- Accom will be a good 3\* or 4\* room.

If you would like to accept this position please countersign the attached copy letter and return to us.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Chernov  
Director  
Legal and Business Affairs  
Sunset Events

signed \_\_\_\_\_

date \_\_\_\_\_



**sunset events**

ABN 50 230 353 163  
PO Box 111 Fremantle WA 6959  
ph 08 9336 2837 fax 08 9336 1074  
email [info@sunsetevents.com.au](mailto:info@sunsetevents.com.au)

3 October 2008

Dear

**EMPLOYMENT AT SUNSET EVENTS – EVENT DIRECTOR**

This letter is to confirm that we would like to offer you the above position with Sunset Events. As discussed during the interview process, the role will substantially comprise the role of Event Director for One Movement in accordance with the key competencies and job outline (attached).

Once you have additional capacity beyond fulfilling that role, work in the area of business/event development for Sunset Events will be included as part of your job role. There may be some immediate work of this nature associated with Sunset's current and other proposed projects however this will be subject to your capacity in your primary role with One Movement.

The agreed salary will be . Annual leave is based on 4 weeks per year.

There is no time-in-lieu package, however "informal" or additional leave time following very busy event periods can be discussed.

The contract period will be full time until the end 20 November 2009. Subject to adequate performance a longer term contract can be discussed.

An employment contract outlining full terms and conditions of employment and a job description based on the above roles will be provided to you when you commence.

If you would like to accept this position please countersign the attached copy letter and return to us.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Chernov  
Director  
Legal and Business Affairs  
Sunset Events

COPY



**sunset events**

ABN 50 230 353 163  
PO Box 111 Fremantle WA 6959  
ph 08 9336 2837 fax 08 9336 1074  
email [info@sunsetevents.com.au](mailto:info@sunsetevents.com.au)

3 October 2008

Dear

**EMPLOYMENT AT SUNSET EVENTS – EVENT DIRECTOR**

This letter is to confirm that we would like to offer you the above position with Sunset Events. As discussed during the interview process, the role will substantially comprise the role of Event Director for One Movement in accordance with the key competencies and job outline (attached).

Once you have additional capacity beyond fulfilling that role, work in the area of business/event development for Sunset Events will be included as part of your job role. There may be some immediate work of this nature associated with Sunset's current and other proposed projects however this will be subject to your capacity in your primary role with One Movement.

The agreed salary will be . Annual leave is based on 4 weeks per year.

There is no time-in-lieu package, however "informal" or additional leave time following very busy event periods can be discussed.

The contract period will be full time until the end 20 November 2009. Subject to adequate performance a longer term contract can be discussed.

An employment contract outlining full terms and conditions of employment and a job description based on the above roles will be provided to you when you commence.

If you would like to accept this position please countersign the attached copy letter and return to us.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Chernov  
Director  
Legal and Business Affairs  
Sunset Events

signed \_\_\_\_\_

date