



Risk Management Policy and Framework

| Area | Document Information |
|-------------------------|---|
| Author | Head of Governance and Compliance |
| Owner | Chief Operations Officer |
| Reference number | xxxxx |
| Version and Date | V2, 23 rd November 2022 |
| Status | Approved |
| Approved by | Governing Body |
| Approval date | 30th November 2022 |
| Document Classification | TU Dublin Public |
| Revision | Updated following Internal Audit Interim Review |
| Next Review Date | 23 rd November 2023 |

Contents

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 1. | Introduction | 4 |
| 2. | Purpose | 4 |
| 3. | Scope | 4 |
| 4. | Definitions | 5 |
| 5. | Risk Management Roles and Responsibilities | 8 |
| 5.1 | Governing Body (GB) | 9 |
| 5.2 | Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) | 9 |
| 5.3 | Internal Audit | 9 |
| 5.4 | President | 10 |
| 5.5 | University Executive Team (UET) | 10 |
| 5.6 | Chair of the Risk Management Committee | 10 |
| 5.7 | Risk Management Committee | 10 |
| 5.8 | Head of Governance and Compliance | 11 |
| 5.9 | Risk and Insurance Senior Manager | 11 |
| 5.10 | Risk Management and Development Coordinator | 12 |
| 5.11 | Faculty Deans, Vice Presidents and Heads of Service | 12 |
| 5.12 | University Employees | 12 |
| 6. | Risk Appetite Statement | 13 |
| 7. | Risk Management Framework | 13 |
| 7.5.1 | Functional/Operational Risk Registers | 17 |
| 7.5.2 | University Risk Register | 17 |
| 8. | Review of Policy | 21 |
| | Appendix 1 – Risk Appetite Statement (revisable schedule) | 22 |
| 6.1 | Financial Risk | 22 |
| 6.2 | Strategic Risk | 22 |
| 6.2.1 | Research and Innovation Risk | 22 |
| 6.2.2 | Teaching and Learning Risk | 23 |
| 6.2.3 | Internationalisation Risk | 23 |
| 6.2.4 | Student Experience Risk | 24 |
| 6.2.5 | Engagement Risk | 24 |
| 6.2.6 | Environment and Social Responsibility Risk | 24 |
| 6.2.7 | People and Culture Risk | 24 |
| 6.3 | Operational Risk | 24 |
| 6.3.1 | Physical & ICT Infrastructure Risk | 25 |

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| 6.3.2 | Safety, Health and Welfare Risk..... | 25 |
| 6.4 | Reputational Risk | 25 |
| 6.4.1 | Academic and Research Ethics Risk | 25 |
| 6.4.2 | Marketing and Promotional Activities Risk..... | 25 |
| 6.5 | Governance and Compliance Risk..... | 25 |
| 6.5.1 | Statutes and Regulations Risk..... | 26 |
| 6.5.2 | System of Internal Control | 26 |
| Appendix 2 – Sample Risk Incident Notification Form..... | | 28 |

1. Introduction

Under Section 7 of the TU Dublin Code of Governance, the University is committed to developing a Risk Management Policy and Framework consisting of a dynamic process designed to identify and address risks that could hinder the University in achieving its Strategic Plan. This document sets out the policy and guidance by which the University manages risk. TU Dublin recognises the importance of adopting a proactive approach to the management of risk to support both the achievement of objectives and compliance with governance requirements.

The University is committed to ensuring that risk management is seen as the concern of all academic and professional service staff and is embedded both as part of normal day to day business as well as informing strategic and operational planning and performance.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this Policy is to provide a **Risk Management Framework** that incorporates the consideration of risk at all levels across the University, and which assists management to identify, assess and rate risks. It provides guidance on the development of strategies to deal with risks so that management can provide reasonable assurance to the Audit and Risk Committee that the University's strategic objectives will be achieved in a sustainable and risk balanced manner. It establishes a Framework for management to identify potential events that may expose the University to risk, to manage this risk to keep it within the University's risk appetite and to provide reasonable assurance regarding the achievement of the University's objectives.

Specifically, the Policy sets out matters in relation to the following:

- Definitions.
- Roles and responsibilities.
- Risk Appetite Statement.
- Risk Management Framework (including Identification, Assessment and Controls).
- Risk Register (including Functional/Operational Risk Registers, University Risk Register and Escalation of Risks).
- Review of Risk Incidents.
- Risk Monitoring and Reporting.
- Review of the Policy.

Risk Management is not solely about managing risks, it is also about identifying opportunities which are uncertain but favourable events that, if they occur, would positively impact upon the University's objectives. Some of the benefits associated with Risk Management include:

- Transparent processes and good practice.
- Support for management decisions.
- Improved public accountability.
- Increased quality and efficiency in processes.
- Risk identification and prioritisation.
- Positive attitude to implementing risk controls.

3. Scope

This policy applies across the University, to academic and professional services, and to the University's owned subsidiaries.

4. Definitions

This policy uses the definitions drawn from ISO31000 Risk Management set out in the table below:

| | |
|---|---|
| Risk | Risk is effect of uncertainty on objectives. An effect is a deviation from the expected. It can be positive, negative or both, and can address, create or result in opportunities and threats. Objectives can have different aspects and categories, and can be applied at different levels. Risk is usually expressed in terms of risk sources , potential events , their consequences and their likelihood . |
| Consequence | Consequence is an outcome of an event affecting objectives. A consequence can be certain or uncertain and can have positive or negative direct or indirect effects on objectives. Consequences can be expressed qualitatively or quantitatively. Any consequence can escalate through cascading and cumulative effects. |
| Control | Control is a measure that maintains and/or modifies risk and includes, but is not limited to, any process, policy, device, practice, or other conditions and/or actions which maintain and/or modify risk. Controls may not always exert the intended or assumed modifying effect. |
| Event | Event is occurrence or change of a particular set of circumstances. An event can have one or more occurrences, and can have several causes and several consequences . An event can also be something that is expected which does not happen, or something that is not expected which does happen. An event can be a risk source . |
| Financial Risk | Risk of an event occurring that impacts negatively on the University's financial situation, income, prevention of loss, or ability to realise a financial return from its assets. These are typically risks relating to unbudgeted expenditure, income generation (student fees/research grants/funding etc.). |
| Functional/Operational Risk Register | This is a risk recording and monitoring tool for those risks at the level of President's Office, Vice President, Faculty, and Head of Function Service which acts as a repository for all key risks identified and includes details of the risk rating assigned to the risk as well as details of the mitigating controls and actions, which manage the risk. [Note: please also see the definition of University Risk Register below]. |
| Governance and Compliance Risk | Risk of governance or legal sanctions, material financial loss, or reputation loss as a result of failure to comply with legislation, regulations, governance codes, or governmental circulars, University policies or procedures, codes of conduct, and prescribed standards of best practice. |
| Inherent Risk | The level of risk before any controls are considered. |
| Inherent Risk Rating | Inherent Risk Ratings are scored using the product of the Impact of a risk (on a scale of 1 to 5), should it materialize, multiplied by the Likelihood (on a scale of 1 to 5) of such a risk event occurring. |
| Impact | This is the potential consequence of an action or event which would adversely or beneficially affect the University's ability to achieve its objectives or damage its reputation. The impact is assessed by examining the consequences of the risk materialising. |
| Likelihood | Likelihood is the chance of something happening whether defined, measured or determined objectively or subjectively, qualitatively or quantitatively, and described. |


| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Near Miss | A near miss or risk incident is an undesired event or sequence of events with potential to cause serious disruption or harm to the University but is avoided. |
| Operational Risk | Risk of an event occurring as a result of inadequate or failed internal processes, people and systems or from external events. These are typically risks relating to Data and IT systems, People/HR activities and day-to day operations. |
| Opportunity | Opportunity is the combination of circumstances expected to be favourable to objectives. |
| Risk Analysis | <p>The purpose of Risk Analysis is to comprehend the nature of risk and its characteristics including, where appropriate, the level of risk. Risk analysis involves a detailed consideration of uncertainties, risk sources, consequences, likelihood, events, scenarios, controls and their effectiveness. An event can have multiple causes and consequences and can affect multiple objectives.</p> <p>Risk analysis can be undertaken with varying degrees of detail and complexity, depending on the purpose of the analysis, the availability and reliability of information, and the resources available. Analysis techniques can be qualitative, quantitative or a combination of these, depending on the circumstances and intended use.</p> <p>Risk analysis provides an input to risk evaluation, to decisions on whether risk needs to be treated and how, and on the most appropriate risk treatment strategy and methods. The results provide insight for decisions, where choices are being made, and the options involve different types and levels of risk.</p> |
| Risk Evaluation | <p>Risk Evaluation involves comparing the results of the risk analysis with the established risk criteria to determine where additional action is required. This can lead to a decision to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — do nothing further; — consider risk treatment options; — undertake further analysis to better understand the risk; — maintain existing controls; — reconsider objectives. |
| Risk Identification | Risk Identification is to find, recognize and describe risks that might help or prevent an organization achieving its objectives. Relevant, appropriate and up-to-date information is important in identifying risks. The organization can use a range of techniques for identifying uncertainties that may affect one or more objectives. |
| Risk Management | Risk Management is the creation and protection of value. It improves performance, encourages innovation and supports the achievement of objectives. |
| Risk Treatment | <p>Risk Treatment is the selection and implementation of options for addressing risk.</p> <p>Risk treatment involves an iterative process of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — formulating and selecting risk treatment options; — planning and implementing risk treatment; — assessing the effectiveness of that treatment; — deciding whether the remaining risk is acceptable; — if not acceptable, taking further treatment. |
| Reputational Risk | Risk of losses arising as a result of bad press, negative public image and the need to improve stakeholder relationship management. |
| Residual Risk | The level of risk remaining after considering the controls and/or mitigation actions. |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Residual Risk Rating | Residual Risk Ratings are scored using the product of the Impact of a risk which has been reduced through a control action (on a scale of 1 to 5), multiplied by the Likelihood or such a risk event which has been reduced by a mitigation action (on a scale of 1 to 5). |
| Risk Appetite Statement | This is a statement of the amount and type of risk that the University is willing to pursue accept or retain in pursuit of its objectives before any action is deemed necessary to reduce it. |
| Risk Category | The type of risk identified according to its potential impact on the University. These are Financial, Strategic, Operational, Reputational, and Compliance. |
| Risk Control | An action taken to minimise the negative consequences of a risk. A control differs from a process activity as a well-designed control should either prevent a negative consequence from occurring in the first place or detect that the negative consequence has occurred and initiate corrective actions. Control wording should be very clear regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is responsible (Risk Owner & Control Owner). • What action is performed. • When is it performed. |
| Risk Description | The risk should be described as “One event (Risk)....due to (Cause).....resulting in (Impact)”. |
| Risk Incident | An unplanned event that results in a dangerous occurrence and/or near miss. |
| Risk Management | Risk Management comprises coordinated activities to direct and control an organization with regard to risk .The process that aims to help organisations understand, evaluate and take action on all their risks with a view to increasing the probability of success and reducing the likelihood of failure. |
| Risk Management Framework | The Risk Management Framework is the process of identifying, analysing, evaluating, treating, monitoring and communicating risks associated with any activity and includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk Appetite. • Risk Identification, Assessment and Control. • Risk Register. • Review of Risk Incidents. • Risk Monitoring and Reporting. |
| Risk Mitigation | A mitigation action is a specific action, project, activity, or process taken to reduce or eliminate long-term risk. Mitigating actions may be ‘one off’ in nature rather than reoccurring and may involve changes to operating procedures such as the introduction of a new control. |
| Risk Owner | This is the person responsible for identifying and managing risks associated with their functional area. |
| Risk Source | Risk source is an element which alone or in combination has the potential to give rise to risk . |
| Strategic Risk | Risk of an event occurring that impacts negatively on the ability to achieve the University’s strategic goals or objectives as set out in the Strategic Plan and the risk of not availing of opportunities when they arise. |
| University Risk Register | Risk recording and monitoring tool for those risks at a University or Strategic level. The Risk Register acts as a repository for all key risks identified and includes details of the risk rating assigned to the risk as well as details of the mitigating controls and actions, which manage the risk. |

5. Risk Management Roles and Responsibilities

This policy identifies below the roles and responsibilities in the context of Risk Management which will follow the risk management reporting structure as shown in figure 1:

Figure 1 – Risk Management Reporting Structure



Note 1 Appropriately positioned and qualified member of UET who has direct, line management responsibility for Risk Management, nominated by President to Governing Body for approval (reference Section 5.6 below).

5.1 Governing Body (GB)

Governing Body have overall responsibility for ensuring that there is an adequate Risk Management Framework in place. The Governing Body approve the Risk Management Policy and Framework and monitor its effectiveness.

Key oversight responsibilities of the Governing Body include:

- Establishing the Audit and Risk Committee.
- Placing Risk Management as a standing item on the Governing Body meeting agenda.
- Ensuring the assignment of the role of Chair of the Risk Management Committee to a member of the University Executive Team (UET) with a reporting line into the Governing Body¹ through its Audit and Risk Committee.
- On the recommendation of the Audit and Risk Committee, approving the Risk Management Policy and Framework, including the University's Risk Appetite and at least annually approve the University Risk Register together with the relevant controls.
- Requiring an external review of effectiveness of the Risk Management Policy and Framework annually.
- Confirming in the Statement of Internal Control that the Governing Body has carried out an assessment of TU Dublin's principal risks, including a description of these risks, where appropriate, and associated controls.

Whilst the Governing Body may delegate responsibilities for risk management to the Audit and Risk Committee, it shall retain overall oversight responsibility.

5.2 Audit and Risk Committee (ARC)

The role of the Audit and Risk Committee is to review and challenge the Executive on the Risk Management Framework and to advise Governing Body on the strategic processes for risk.

The Audit and Risk Committee will:

- Periodically receive reports on those risks identified as fundamental to the success or failure of the University's strategic objectives.
- Review and advise the Governing Body on the nature and extent of the assurance provided by management, external auditors, internal auditors and other third parties.

5.3 Internal Audit

The role of Internal Audit is to provide an independent and objective view to the Audit and Risk Committee in relation to risk management, the system of internal controls and the system of governance of the University. Internal Audit reviews the University Risk Register in developing the Annual Internal Audit Plan, in consultation with the Audit and Risk Committee and the President. The Annual Internal Audit Plan includes a periodic assessment of the effectiveness of the risk management framework and risk management processes. Internal Audit will report to the Governing Body, through its Audit and Risk Committee, on how all risks are being managed and on the effectiveness of the system of internal controls.

¹ TU Dublin Code of Governance Section 7.2 – appoint a CRO or empower a suitable management alternative, and provide for a direct reporting line to the Governing Body to identify, measure and manage risk and promote a risk management culture in TU Dublin

5.4 President

The President of the University has overall responsibility for the execution and implementation of strategy of the university and for ensuring that procedures and processes are in place to enable adherence to this Risk Management Policy and Framework. The key responsibilities of the President are to:

- Ensure processes and procedures are in place within the University to facilitate adherence to the Risk Management Policy and Framework and approved Risk Appetite.
- Assess and recommend an appropriately qualified member of the University Executive Team to the role of Chair of the Risk Management Committee and seek the approval of the Governing Body for this role.

5.5 University Executive Team (UET)

The UET is responsible for reviewing the University Risk Register recommended by the Risk Management Committee every semester.

The UET's responsibilities include:

- Embedding a culture of Risk Management, including horizon scanning, identification of new and emerging risks, and scenario planning, throughout the University so that risk is embedded as part of the University's decision making processes.
- Supporting the Chair of the Risk Management Committee in monitoring the assessment and management of risks that could impact on the achievement of the University's objectives.
- Ensuring that University Employees receive training towards understanding what level of risk they are empowered to take on behalf of the University.
- Ensuring risks are appropriately identified, managed and monitored in line with the Risk Management Policy and Framework.
- Taking particular note of any risks identified that should be escalated to the University Risk Register.

5.6 Chair of the Risk Management Committee

In line with Section 7.2 of the TU Dublin Code of Governance, rather than appointing a Chief Risk officer, the University has empowered a suitable management alternative as Chair of the Risk Management Committee to identify, measure and manage risk and promote a risk management culture in the University. The role of Chair of the Risk Management Committee is nominated by the President, for approval by Governing Body, to an appropriately positioned and qualified member of UET who has direct, line management responsibility for Risk Management.

In addition to Chairing the Risk Management Committee, they will also attend the Audit and Risk Committee meetings to report on risk and provide feedback from the meetings to the Risk Management Committee.

5.7 Risk Management Committee

The Risk Management Committee is chaired by the President's nominee.

Responsibilities of the Risk Management Committee are detailed in its Terms of Reference and shall include:

- Periodic review and recommendation of updates to the Risk Management Policy and Framework for review by the University Executive Team (UET), Audit and Risk Committee and approval by Governing Body.
- Reviewing and making recommendations in relation to the Risk Appetite Statement and the University Risk Register, and seeking external/expert advice as necessary to ensure that University Risk Management is in line with best practice and fit for purpose.
- Ensuring that risks, which impact the achievement of the University's strategic objectives, are identified, assessed and included in the University Risk Register.
- Compiling the University Risk Register each semester comprising the top 15 University risks which the Risk Management Committee decides most impact the achievement of the University's strategic objectives, and recommending this to the UET for review, and following feedback, then recommending it to the Audit and Risk Committee for consideration and decision by the Governing Body, where appropriate
- Receiving and reviewing Functional/Operational Risk Registers to ensure that any risks are escalated as required.
- Overseeing Risk Management training to support staff in fulfilling the requirements of the University's Risk Management Policy and Framework.

5.8 Head of Governance and Compliance

The Head of Governance and Compliance is a member of the Risk Management Committee and is responsible for Risk Management at an operational level within the University.

The key responsibilities of the Head of Governance and Compliance, which may be delegated as required, include:

- Supporting the Chair of the Risk Management Committee in creating a culture and awareness of Risk Management across the University.
- Leading a formal risk identification, assessment and scoring process for the Functional/ Operational Risk Registers every semester.
- Coordinating the ongoing development, monitoring and updating of the University Risk Register of the risks at the University or strategic level every semester.
- Ensuring the development of adequate risk management training for Risk Owners across the University.
- Directing, managing and reviewing the work of the Risk and Insurance Senior Manager.

5.9 Risk and Insurance Senior Manager

Reporting to the Head of Governance and Compliance the Risk and Insurance Senior Manager is a member of the Risk Management Committee and key responsibilities include:

- Supporting the Head of Governance and Compliance in creating a culture and awareness of Risk Management across the University.
- Supporting the Head of Governance and Compliance in the processes for the Functional/ Operational Risk Registers and the University Risk Register.
- Coordination of the provision or procurement of advice and systems to assist managers and staff with risk management, including identification and evaluation of risks and ongoing monitoring and reporting.
- Completing draft reports for review by the Head of Governance and Compliance on Risk Management for UET, Management, Audit and Risk Committee and Governing Body.
- Coordination of the provision or procurement training and communications programmes on Risk Management across the University in order to ensure all individuals with responsibility for risk management may access guidance appropriate to their responsibilities.

- Coordination of the provision or procurement of indemnities, insurances, and claims management appropriate to the University's risks and activities.
- Coordination of the review Risk Incident Notification Forms, investigating and reporting to the Risk Management Committee.
- Directing, managing and reviewing the work of the Risk Coordinator.

5.10 Risk Management and Development Coordinator

The key responsibilities of the Risk Management and Development Coordinator include:

- Supporting the Governance and Compliance team in creating a culture and awareness of Risk Management across the University.
- Supporting the Risk and Insurance Senior Manager in the processes for the Functional/ Operational Risk Registers and the University Risk Register.
- Creating processes and systems to assist managers and staff with risk management, including identification and evaluation of risks and ongoing monitoring and reporting.
- Preparing reports on Risk Management for UET, Management, Audit and Risk Committee and Governing Body.
- Developing and delivering a training and communications programme on Risk Management across the University in order to ensure all individuals with responsibility for risk management may access guidance appropriate to their responsibilities.
- Reviewing Risk Incident Notification Forms, investigating and reporting to the Risk Management Committee.

5.11 Faculty Deans, Vice Presidents and Heads of Service

The Faculty Deans, Vice Presidents and Heads of Service are responsible for the following within their areas:

- Implementing the Risk Management Policy and Framework
- The identification, assessment, management and ownership of risk
- The establishment and regular review of their Risk Register
- The identification of new and emerging risks
- Supporting the embedding of risk management and the development of a risk-aware culture

5.12 University Employees

Everyone in the University is responsible for the identification and monitoring of risk, and therefore the risk management responsibilities of University Employees shall include:

- Adherence to the requirements of Risk Management Policy and Framework
- Completion of the recommended Risk Management Training
- Ensuring cooperation with all parties in the implementation of the Risk Management Policy and Framework
- Through their line manager, escalating and reporting of risks to the Faculty Deans, Vice Presidents and Heads of Service

6. Risk Appetite Statement

Risk is an inherent part of running any organization. A Risk Appetite Statement is a statement of the amount and type of risk that the University is willing to pursue, accept or retain in pursuit of its objectives before any action is deemed necessary to reduce it.

The University has a Risk Appetite Statement which details individual types/categories of activities and the associated degree of tolerance acceptable to the University. The University may be risk-taking or risk-averse and different levels of risk appetite will apply to different activities. The University recognises that risk appetite is not static; that its appetite for risk varies according to the activity undertaken and the potential benefits and downsides of the activity.

The Risk Appetite Statement is appended as a revisable schedule which the University will review and update at least annually and present to the Audit and Risk Committee and Governing Body (Appendix 1 Risk Appetite Statement).

7. Risk Management Framework

Effective Risk Management focuses on understanding, measuring and controlling risk rather than necessarily avoiding or totally eliminating it. The Risk Management Framework is an iterative process consisting of steps when taken in sequence, enable continual improvement in the University's decision-making. It constitutes a logical and systematic method of identifying, analysing, evaluating, treating, monitoring and communicating risks associated with any activity, function or process in a way that will enable the University to minimise losses and reputational damage while maximising opportunities.

The Risk Management Policy and Framework comprises:

- Risk Identification
- Risk Assessment
- Risk Control
- Risk Registers
- Risk Monitoring and Reporting
- Review of Risk Incidents

These are described below.

7.1 Risk Identification

This is the process where risks are identified using a variety of techniques such as interviews, workshops, School /Service Line meetings and other techniques as deemed useful. The Chair of the Risk Management Committee, supported by the Risk Coordinator, shall every semester, lead a formal risk identification process through consultation with the Heads of Service and Risk Owners (in Offices of the President, Faculty Deans, Vice-Presidents).

7.2 Inherent Risk Assessment

This is the process where the identified risks are **scored** using two dimensions, the impact on the University should the risk materialise (Risk Impact) and the probability of the event occurring (Risk Likelihood). This is done in four steps by (i) scoring the Risk Impact by category, (ii) the Risk Likelihood, (iii) the Risk Rating, and (iv) defining Risk Rating Ranges and Colour Codes.

(i) Risks are scored in relation to the impact according to the table below:

| Risk Impact by Category | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Impact of Risk | Risk Category | | | | | |
| | Score | Financial: % Budget | Strategic Impact | Reputational Impact | Operational Impact | Governance & Compliance Impact |
| Severe | 5 | >20% | Failure to meet a significant Strategic Objective | National media adverse publicity for more than 3 days. Reputation seriously compromised with Stakeholders and Department | Serious interruption and impact on service delivery (downtime > week) delay which affects Stakeholders' ability to function. | Gross failures to meet University Policy, University Code or statute; Regulatory action against University; Governing Body concerns. |
| Significant | 4 | 10 – 20% | Serious compromise or potential failure in achieving Strategic Objective | National media adverse publicity for less than 3 days. A problem for Stakeholders and Department | Interruption and impact on service delivery (downtime more than a day but < week) which is a significant issue for Stakeholders. | Repeated failures to meet University Policy, University Code or single failure to meet statute law; Regulatory action against University; Audit and Risk Committee concerns highlighted to Governing Body. |
| Moderate | 3 | 5 – 10% | Notable compromise or erosion of Strategic Objective | Extensive local press, radio, TV, social media, Stakeholder concerns; Department concern. | Interruption and impact on service delivery (downtime more than an hour but < day) and Stakeholders affected. | Occasional failure to meet requirements of University Policy, University Code; Internal Audit recommendations. |
| Minor | 2 | 2 – 5% | Some minor compromise or erosion of Strategic Objective. | Short-term local media coverage; some public concern; some Stakeholder concern. | Some interruption and impact on delivery of service (downtime more than 15mins but < hour). While Stakeholders affected they can accommodate. | Single failure to meet University Policy or University Code. Minor recommendations which can easily be addressed. |
| Negligible | 1 | <2% | Some small implication on achieving objective | Rumours but no media coverage | Very minor interruption and small impact on service delivery (downtime < 15 mins) with no implication for Stakeholders. | Minor non-compliance with University Policy or University Code. |

(ii) Risks are scored in relation to the likelihood, or probability of the risks materialising, according to the table below:

| Risk Likelihood Scores | | |
|------------------------|-------|--|
| Likelihood of Risk | Score | Description |
| Almost Certain | 5 | Happens annually or more frequently, will probably happen. |
| Likely | 4 | Has happened before and may well happen again |
| Possible | 3 | Possible but has not happened in the last three years |
| Unlikely | 2 | Could happen, but has not happened in the last five years |
| Rare | 1 | Very unlikely, has not happened before |

(iii) Inherent Risk Ratings are scored using the product of the Impact multiplied by the Likelihood, according to the table below:

| Inherent Risk Rating (Impact x Likelihood) | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------|----------|----------|--------|----------------|----|
| | | Risk Likelihood | | | | | |
| | | Rare | Unlikely | Possible | Likely | Almost Certain | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Risk Impact Score | Severe | 5 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| | Significant | 4 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 |
| | Moderate | 3 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 |
| | Minor | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| | Negligible | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

(iv) Inherent Risk Rating Scoring Ranges and Colour Coding is as shown in the table below:

| Inherent Risk Rating Risk Score | Insignificant Up to 2 | Low 3 - 4 | Medium 5 - 9 | Major 10 -19 | Severe 20 - 25 |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|

7.3 Risk Control, Risk Mitigation and Residual Risk

A Risk Control is an action taken to minimise the negative impact of a risk. A control differs from a process activity as a well-designed control should either prevent a negative consequence from occurring in the first place or detect that the negative consequence has occurred and initiate corrective actions.

A mitigation action is a specific action, project, activity, or process taken to reduce or eliminate long-term risk. Mitigating actions may be ‘one off’ in nature rather than reoccurring and may involve changes to operating procedures such as the introduction of a new control.

Risk Control and Risk Mitigation wording should be very clear regarding who is responsible (Risk Owner & Control/Mitigation Owner), what action is performed, and when is it performed.

Following the scoring of the **Inherent Risk Rating**, Risk Control and/or Risk Mitigation actions may be specified to reduce the **Impact** and/or the **Likelihood** scores giving a reduced **Residual Risk Rating** following the implementation of the controls.

7.4 Reducing Subjectivity in Risk Scoring

The following methods may be used to counter the subjectivity intrinsic in the estimation of risk:

- Involvement of other relevant University Employees in the risk analysis
- Keeping a record of the rationale for the scoring
- Benchmarking with other Universities
- Periodic reviews in the light of experience
- Involvement of third party to give an independent opinion.

7.5 Risk Register

Following the completion of the process of risk identification, inherent risk assessment and rating, specification of risk controls, and scoring of residual risk ratings, a Risk Register in relation to the relevant risks is completed.

The Risk Register is used to record and monitor all key risks identified and includes details of the risk rating assigned to the risk as well as details of the controls, which reduce the risk. It shows the inherent risk rating scores, controls and residual risk rating scores following controls and control owners.

There shall be two types of Risk Registers, a **Functional/Operational Risk Register** and a **University Risk Register**, and these are described below.

An example of a Risk Register Template shown below:

| Risk Register Template | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|------------|-------|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------|-------|---------------|
| Category | Risk Description (Event: Risk of...Cause: due to...Impact: resulting in...) | Risk Owner (person who knows the most about the risk) | Inherent Risk Score (5x5) (before control is applied) | | | Risk Control and/or Risk Mitigation (process, policy, device, practice, or other actions that modify risk) | Risk Control and/or Mitigation Owner | Residual Risk Score (5x5) (after control is applied) | | | Risk Appetite |
| | | | Impact | Likelihood | Score | | | Impact | Likelihood | Score | |
| Financial | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strategic | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operational | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reputational | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Governance & Compliance | | | | | | | | | | | |

7.5.1 Functional/Operational Risk Registers

Functional/Operational Risk Registers are those Risk Registers compiled by the Faculty Deans, Vice Presidents and Heads of Service which shall include relevant details as shown in the Risk Register Template, and which shall be submitted to the Risk Coordinator every semester for review by the Risk Management Committee.

Any risk incidents or ‘near misses’ notified to the Faculty Deans, Vice Presidents and Heads of Service shall be reported in line Section on Review of Risk Incidents below.

Any risks identified by the Faculty Deans, Vice Presidents and Heads of Service shall be reported following the Residual Risk Monitoring and Reporting Table in Section below.

7.5.2 University Risk Register

The University Risk Register shall follow the Risk Register Template and identifies the top 15 University risks which the Risk Management Committee decides most impact the achievement of the University’s strategic objectives. The University Risk Register is recommended each semester by the Risk Management Committee to the UET for their review, and following feedback it is then recommended by the Risk Management Committee to the Audit and Risk Committee for consideration.

In compiling the University Risk Register the Risk Management committee shall seek inputs as follows:

- Knowledge of the key risks of each area within the specific remit of each UET member.
- Review of key risks identified in Functional/Operational Risk Registers.

- Blank paper exercise by UET, the Audit and Risk Committee and the Governing Body.
- Horizon scanning (which may include methods such as Look ahead, look across, look around – use scenarios, risk analysis, systems aping, stakeholders, visioning – for example blank paper exercise with the Audit and Risk Committee and/or with the Governing Body).
- Trends analysis or recommendations by Internal Audit.

7.6 Review of Risk Incidents

In the event of a material risk incident or significant ‘near miss’ occurring, the relevant Faculty Deans, Vice Presidents and Heads of Service shall notify the Head of Governance and Compliance, complete the Risk Incident Notification Form in Appendix 2, and return it to the Risk Coordinator. The Risk Coordinator will review the completed Risk Incident Notification Forms, investigate and report to the Risk Management Committee.

7.7 Risk Management Trends

The Chair of the Risk Management Committee reports every semester the trends on risks, the number of risk incidents and the number of risks exceeding the risk appetite.

The Residual Risk Scores by category are tabulated from the current and previous University Risk Registers and the increase or decrease in the number of the risks inserted together with the number of reported risk incidents and number of risks exceeding the University’s Risk Appetite.

A sample template for Risk Trends is shown below:

| Trend Indicators Dashboard | | | | | | | | | | Period: | | |
|--|---------------|----------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| Current University Risk Register's Date: | | | | | Previous University Risk Register's Date: | | | | | No. of Reported Risk Incidents in period | No. of Risks on Register Exceeding Risk Appetite Statement | |
| Residual Risk Rating | Insignificant | | Low | | Medium | | Major | | Severe | | | |
| Residual Risk Score | Up to 2 | | 3 - 4 | | 5 - 9 | | 10 - 19 | | 20 - 25 | | | |
| <u>Number of Risks & Trend (increase/decrease in number on Previous Risk Register)</u> | No. of Risks | Increase or decrease on Previous | No. of Risks | Increase or decrease on Previous | No. of Risks | Increase or decrease on Previous | No. of Risks | Increase or decrease on Previous | No. of Risks | Increase or decrease on Previous | | |
| Financial | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strategic | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Research & Innovation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Teaching & Learning | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Internationalisation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Student Experience | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Engagement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environment & Social Responsibility | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| People and Culture | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operational | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Physical & ICT Infrastructure | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Health & Safety | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reputational | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Academic and Research Ethics | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marketing and Promotional Activities | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Governance and Compliance | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Statutes and Regulations | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| System of Internal Control | | | | | | | | | | | | |

7.8 Risk Monitoring and Reporting

The University's Risk Management monitoring and report shall follow a cycle of once every semester.

The Head of Governance and Compliance, supported by the Risk Coordinator, shall every semester, lead a formal risk identification, risk assessment and scoring process with the Heads of Service and Risk Owners (in Offices of the President, Faculty Deans, Vice-Presidents) towards completion of the Functional/Operational Risk Registers. Such Risk Registers will include details of the Risk Controls and the responsible Risk Owners. The Head of Governance and Compliance, supported by the Risk Coordinator, shall review of the Functional/Operational Risk Registers, identify any trends identified in relation to risks and controls, and submit a report to the Risk Management Committee for its consideration.

Based on the Risk Management Committee's review and feedback, the Head of Governance and Compliance, supported by the Risk Coordinator, shall every semester submit a Draft University Risk Register of the top 15 risks to the Risk Management Committee. In addition, the Head of Governance and Compliance shall submit a Trend Indicators Dashboard indicating trends in the numbers of risks by category, the trends (increase or decrease) in the risks by category, the number of reported risk incidents by category, and those risks that exceed the Risk Appetite.

Following the consideration, review, and updating or amendment, every semester the Risk Management Committee shall recommend the University Risk Register, the Trend Indicators Dashboard, and any recommendations in relation to the effectiveness of the Risk Management Framework, to the UET for amendment or approval.

Following approval by the UET, the Chair of the Risk Management Committee shall recommend these to the Audit and Risk Committee for consideration, inputs, amendment, and/or approval.

The approved University Risk Register, the Trend Indicators Dashboard, and any recommendations received, will be forwarded by the Audit and Risk Committee to the Governing Body.

In addition to the cycle conducted each semester, any risk incidents or 'near misses' notified shall be reported in line Section 7.6.

A sample template for reporting risks identified following the Residual Risk Monitoring and Reporting is provided in the table below:

| Residual Risk Monitoring, Escalation and Reporting Table | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Residual Risk Rating | Risk Score | Level of Concern | Target Resolution & Review | Risk Management Response | Immediate Action Required |
| Severe | 20 - 25 | Unacceptable level of risk exposure which requires immediate corrective action to be taken | Reviewed every week and reported to Risk Management Committee. Chair of the Risk Management Committee updates UET and Audit & Risk Committee every meeting. | Action Plan to reduce risk to appropriate Risk Appetite level. | Notify the Head of Governance & Compliance, the Chair of the Risk Management Committee, the UET, and the Governing Body Audit and Risk Committee. |
| Major | 10 - 19 | Unacceptable level of risk exposure which requires constant active monitoring, and measures to be put in place to reduce exposure | Reviewed every month and reported to Risk Management Committee. Chair of the Risk Management Committee updates UET and Audit & Risk Committee every meeting. | Action Plan to reduce risk to appropriate Risk Appetite level. | Notify the Head of Governance & Compliance, the Chair of the Risk Management Committee, and the UET. |
| Medium | 5 - 9 | Controls must be developed and implemented to reduce exposure | Reviewed every 3 months and reported to Risk Management Committee. Chair of the Risk Management Committee updates UET and Audit & Risk Committee every meeting. | Action Plan to treat, transfer or reduce Risk. | Notify the Head of Governance & Compliance and the Chair of the Risk Management Committee. |
| Low | 3 - 4 | Tolerable level of risk exposure arising from established controls in place | Reviewed every six with reporting to Risk Management Committee | Action Plan to reduce Risk | Notify the Head of Governance & Compliance. |
| Insignificant | Up to 2 | No Concern | Reviewed annually with reporting to Risk Management Committee | Action Plan to monitor Risk | Notify the Head of Governance & Compliance. |

8. Review of Policy

This policy will be reviewed annually.

Appendix 1 – Risk Appetite Statement (revisable schedule)

The Risk Appetite Statement is a summary of the University's approaches to risks and incorporates different levels of appetite based on the nature of the Universities key activities and the relevant risk. The Statement details individual types/categories and the associated degree of tolerance acceptable to the University, and this is shown in the table at the end of this section.

The University may be risk-taking or risk-averse and different levels of risk appetite will apply to different activities. The University recognises that risk appetite is not static; that its appetite for risk varies according to the activity undertaken and the potential benefits and downsides of the activity. Therefore, the University's risk appetite varies according to its key activities aligned to both its strategic and operational objectives, as well as the associated risk levels for such activities, and these are outlined below.

6.1 Financial Risk

In order to sustain its financial position and meet its strategic goals the University has to look beyond State funding and seek to grow external commercial and non-State income opportunities. The University has a **medium risk appetite** for any risks which impact upon the achievement of financial goals and targets. In addition, the University recognises a **higher risk appetite** in respect of Strategic Investment opportunities. The University will ensure that potential benefits are fully understood before developments that may impact upon financial performance and sustainability are implemented, and that appropriate measures to mitigate risk are established and embedded.

6.2 Strategic Risk

The University engages in a wide range of activities in pursuit of its strategic objectives set out in its Strategic Intent 2030. Its role is to work with stakeholders - students, staff, communities, industry and governments - to solve some of the world's most pressing issues of today and take advantage of opportunities that arise. The University's vision is to 'Create a Better World Together'. It recognises that this requires some degree of risk and that external and internal forces, which often cannot be predicted, may have a significant impact on achieving these strategic objectives. In order to achieve these strategic goals, the University must be willing to sometimes take and accept risk and is therefore willing to take or accepts a **medium appetite** for any risks in pursuit of its overall strategic priorities. There is low willingness to accept risks which have no alignment with our Strategic Plan or which may tarnish the University's reputation, its role in the community and/or its values.

6.2.1 Research and Innovation Risk

The University has distinguished researchers and innovators who are pioneers in science and technology discovery, play active roles in informing policy and standards, and contribute to the creative life of Ireland. The University uses award winning technology transfer and business incubation activity to deliver sustainable businesses. The University wishes to enhance its reputation as a research-intensive institution that is excellent, globally collaborative, creative, interdisciplinary and entrepreneurial.

The University engages in research that serves and anticipates economic, societal and cultural needs and plays a transformative role in Irish society. Such is the nature and complexity of the major research challenges facing the world that international collaboration is essential in order to make significant and sustained advances. The University is committed to ambitious and performance driven progress in research, enterprise and innovation including knowledge exchange/transfer by:

- a) Promoting new fields of research and generating critical mass in research capacity.
- b) Developing further strategic academic and industrial collaborations and entering partnerships both nationally and internationally.
- c) Facilitating enhanced research collaboration and research opportunities.
- d) Supporting innovation and entrepreneurship and increasing the number of research students.

The University recognises that this strategy will involve having a **high- risk appetite** for investment to grow its research strengths through research grant applications, international research collaborations and developing linkages with industrial partners. Research activities are subject to ethical standards and health & safety regulations. The University has a **low risk appetite** for research conduct that is unethical, non-compliant with legislation or compromise quality and/or reputation of the University.

6.2.2 Teaching and Learning Risk

The University is committed to ensuring a high quality teaching and learning environment for all its students. The University has **low risk appetite** for poor teaching and learning outcomes or academic quality which would not achieve University standards and external accreditation requirements.

Delivery of the Teaching and Learning strategic objectives requires on-going investment in teaching and learning infrastructure across all campuses. In addition, the University recognises the need to identify workable solutions to meet the increased demands from a diverse and expanding student population and to further its work with professional bodies and industry to ensure the continued success of our graduates and their employers. The University aims to be recognised as an exemplar in equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) where people are proud to be part of a connected community and their talents, aptitude and agility will create real impact on the global stage. The University has a high risk appetite for creating a dynamic new model of education producing the most sought-after digitally-literate graduates, that will be embedded in the University, transforming the learning opportunities and experience for all. This involves pursuing an academic programme which is relevant to current and future employment and industry needs.

6.2.3 Internationalisation Risk

The University has an international outlook, and welcomes students and staff from around the world while its strong international partnerships provide opportunities for student and staff exchange programmes, major cross collaboration research projects, and employment opportunities, boasting a network of 100,000+ TU Dublin graduates who are making their careers here in Ireland and in 70 countries worldwide. The University is committed to the continued growth of its international student population. The University's strategy is to continue to develop as a global university by continuing to expand its international presence and student cohort through academic linkages, partnership arrangements and other co-operative structures while also recognising that there is an increased degree of risk in developing these international activities. The University has a **high-risk appetite** for Internationalisation where the strategy supports the University's Strategic Intent. The University has a **low risk appetite** for internationalisation that does not align with the University's Strategic Intent.

The University will be recognised as an exemplar in equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) where people are proud to be part of a connected community and their talents, aptitude and agility will create real impact on the global stage. The University has a **low risk appetite** for practices that do not support equality, diversity and inclusion.

6.2.4 Student Experience Risk

At the core of the mission and values of the University is to provide the highest quality international standard education and research experience for its students within a multi-campus environment. The University is committed to the further enhancement of this student-centric, supportive learning environment through infrastructural investment and the continual updating of the academic programmes. The University recognises that this investment in the educational continuum involves an increased degree of risk in pursuit of key strategic objectives, and in so doing, has a **high risk appetite** subject to ensuring that the potential benefits and risks are fully understood before developments are authorized and that practical and sensible measures are embedded with the system to mitigate risk.

6.2.5 Engagement Risk

The University is committed to making a positive impact on our local, regional, national and global communities through research, education and knowledge exchange by leading public debate and providing critical analysis on areas of societal importance. Through a range of initiatives, (including formal credentialing and curricular recognition) the University will continue to foster student engagement and volunteering. The University has a **high-risk appetite** for Engagement, where the strategy supports the mission and vision of the University and while acknowledging this increased level of risk it is committed to ensuring that potential benefits and risks are fully understood before developments are authorized and that sensible measures are embedded to mitigate risk.

6.2.6 Environment and Social Responsibility Risk

The University aims to make a significant, sustainable, and socially responsible contribution through its research, education, knowledge exchange, and operational activities. It recognises that this should involve an increased degree of risk and is comfortable with a **high risk appetite** subject always to ensuring that potential benefits and risks are fully understood before developments are authorised and that sensible measures to mitigate risk are established.

6.2.7 People and Culture Risk

The University relies on the skills, experience and dedication of staff to ensure the on-going delivery and quality of its education, research, engagement and operational systems and processes. The University values, supports, develops and utilises the full potential of staff to make the University a stimulating and safe place to work. The University places importance on a culture of academic freedom, equality and diversity, dignity and respect, collegiality, the development of staff and the health and safety of staff, students, and visitors. The University has a **low risk appetite** for any deviation from its standards in these areas.

6.3 Operational Risk

The University, which operates across a multi campus environment, is committed to maintaining continuity of all aspects of its operations and has a **low risk appetite** for any risk, incident or event which could impact upon the University's normal operations of teaching and learning, research and innovation.

6.3.1 Physical & ICT Infrastructure Risk

At the University's Strategic Intent is to provide the highest quality operational infrastructure for its students and staff within a multi campus environment. The University is committed to the design and investment of 200,000+ m² of new campus development space that will deliver a cutting-edge learning environment. The University recognises that this investment involves an increased degree of risk in pursuit of key strategic objectives, and in so doing, has a **high risk appetite** subject to ensuring that the potential benefits and risks are fully understood before physical and virtual developments are authorised and that practical and sensible measures are embedded with the system to mitigate risk. The University has a **low risk appetite** for risks which would impact negatively on its processes and systems in particular regarding IT infrastructure and Cyber Security.

6.3.2 Safety, Health and Welfare Risk

The safety, health and welfare of staff, students and others on University campuses is of paramount importance to the University and consequently the University has no tolerance of risk or low risk appetite for such risks. However, it is not the University's intention to avoid potentially risky activities which are part of managing a university and a strong culture of health and safety awareness and risk management is expected. This includes identifying and managing health and safety risks to the best extent possible. The University has a strong interest in protecting and preserving the environment, and hence, it has a **low risk appetite** for activities which will impact upon environmental safety.

6.4 Reputational Risk

The University has established an excellent reputation for supporting and growing its portfolio of creative and entrepreneurial endeavours, is renowned for delivering real solutions for the real world and is recognised internationally as a top performing technological university. The University has a **low risk appetite** for risks which would negatively impact on its reputation.

6.4.1 Academic and Research Ethics Risk

It is critical that the University retains and preserves this reputation. The University has a **low risk appetite** for any breaches in academic and research ethics which would impact negatively on its reputation, brand or ethical standing and could lead to loss of confidence by the local regional or international community, research community and its stakeholders.

6.4.2 Marketing and Promotional Activities Risk

The University has a **medium risk appetite** for engagement in marketing and promotional activities.

6.5 Governance and Compliance Risk

The University is committed to maintaining a culture of compliance and a robust system of governance and has a **low risk appetite** for activities which risk any breaches in statute and regulation. The University will ensure that an effective system of internal control is embedded to mitigate against any risk of non-compliance, and is willing to accept tolerable

risks with a high risk appetite towards engagement, training and reviews to achieve this.

6.5.1 Statutes and Regulations Risk

The University has a **low risk appetite** for activities which risk any breaches in statute and regulation.

6.5.2 System of Internal Control

The University’s system of internal control encompasses its policies, processes, tasks and behaviours that together facilitate its effective and efficient operation by enabling it to respond to risks to achieving its objectives; that help ensure the quality of reporting and help ensure compliance with applicable laws, regulations and internal policies. The University has a **low appetite** for risk for activities which weaken its system of internal control.

6.6 University Risk Appetite Statement

The University Risk Appetite is summarised below in tabular format.

| University Risk Appetite Statement | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Risk Appetite Range Low/Medium/Hugh | Low Risk Appetite | Medium Risk Appetite | High Risk Appetite |
| <i>Approach to Risk</i> | <i>Not prepared to tolerate risk</i> <i>Accepts as little risk as possible and takes an approach which minimises or eliminates risk</i> | <i>Prepared to tolerate some temporary risk</i> <i>A moderate and informed approach to risktaking</i> | <i>Prepared to tolerate risk</i> <i>A more aggressive approach to risk taking for increased benefit and to achieve the goals set out in the TU Dublin Strategic Intent 2030: People, Planet Partnership</i> |
| Categories | | | |
| 1 | Financial | | |
| 1.1a | Financial Goals and Targets | ↔ | |
| 1.2b | Strategic Investment opportunities | | ↔ |
| 2 | Strategic | | |
| 2.1a | Research & Innovation investment to grow its research strengths | | ↔ |
| 2.1b | Research & Innovation- Unethical research conduct | ↔ | |
| 2.2 | Teaching & Learning | ↔ | |
| 2.3a | Internationalization strategy which supports the University’s Strategic Intent | | ↔ |

| | | | | |
|------|---|---|---|---|
| 2.3b | Internationalization non alignment with University's Strategic Intent | ↔ | | |
| 2.3c | Internationalization practices not supporting equality, diversity and inclusion. | ↔ | | |
| 2.4 | Student Experience pursuit of key strategic objectives. | | | ↔ |
| 2.5 | Engagement | | | ↔ |
| 2.6 | Environment & Social Responsibility | | | ↔ |
| 2.7 | People and Culture | ↔ | | |
| 3 | Operational | | | |
| 3.1a | Physical & ICT Infrastructure Subject to benefits and risks being fully understood | | | ↔ |
| 3.1b | Physical & ICT Infrastructure - risks which would impact negatively on its processes and systems | ↔ | | |
| | IT Cyber Security | ↔ | | |
| 3.2 | Health & Safety | ↔ | | |
| 4 | Reputational | | | |
| 4.1 | Academic and Research Ethics | ↔ | | |
| 4.2 | Marketing and Promotional Activities | | ↔ | |
| 5 | Governance and Compliance | | | |
| 5.1 | Statutes and Regulations | ↔ | | |
| 5.2 | System of Internal Control | ↔ | | |

The University Risk Appetite Statement shall be reviewed during the review of the Risk Management Policy and Framework.

Appendix 2 – Sample Risk Incident Notification Form

If you discover a material risk incident, please notify your Manager and the Head of Governance & Compliance immediately.

Please complete this form and return it to the Risk Coordinator at Harry.Huston@tudublin.ie as soon as possible.

Please refer to the Risk Impact, Risk Likelihood, and Inherent Risk Rating in the **Notes** below for clarification on the Risk Rating Score of the Risk Incident.

| Initial Risk Incident Report <i>(To be completed by individual reporting the Incident and/or the relevant Manager)</i> | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Name: | Job Title: |
| Date: | Faculty/ Service Line: |
| Campus: | |
| Date of incident: | Time of incident: |
| Who did you notify? | Date and time of notification: |
| Description of Incident that occurred: | |
| Please indicate the type of activity the Incident relates to [Financial, Strategic, Reputational, Operational, or Governance & Compliance]: | |
| Please indicate the estimated potential Impact Score of the Incident relates to [Negligible (1), Minor (2), Moderate (3), Significant (4), or Severe (5)]: | |
| Please indicate the estimated potential likelihood score of such an incident re-occurring [Rare (1), Unlikely (2), Possible (3), Likely (4), or Almost Certain (5)]: | |
| Please indicate any controls that have been put in place to address this incident: | |
| Any further information: | |
| Signed By individual reporting incident: | Date: |
| Signed By Manager: | Date: |

| Note 1 - Risk Impact Scores by University Activity | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Impact | Score | Financial: % Budget | Strategic Impact | Reputational Impact | Operational Impact | Governance & Compliance Impact |
| Severe | 5 | >20% | Failure to meet a significant Strategic Objective | National media adverse publicity for more than 3 days. Reputation seriously compromised with Stakeholders and Department | Serious interruption and impact on service delivery (downtime > week) delay which affects Stakeholders' ability to function. | Gross failures to meet University Policy, University Code or statute; Regulatory action against University; Governing Body concerns. |
| Significant | 4 | 10 – 20% | Serious compromise or potential failure in achieving Strategic Objective | National media adverse publicity for less than 3 days. A problem for Stakeholders and Department | Interruption and impact on service delivery (downtime < week) which is a significant issue for Stakeholders. | Repeated failures to meet University Policy, University Code or statute; Regulatory action against University; Audit and Risk Committee concerns. |
| Moderate | 3 | 5 – 10% | Notable compromise or erosion of Strategic Objective | Extensive local press, radio, TV, social media, Stakeholder concerns; Department concern. | Interruption and impact on service delivery (downtime < day) and Stakeholders affected. | Occasional failure to meet requirements of University Policy, University Code or statute; Internal Audit concerns. |
| Minor | 2 | 2 – 5% | Some minor compromise or erosion of Strategic Objective | Short-term local media coverage; some public concern; some Stakeholder concern | Some interruption and impact on delivery of service (downtime < hour). While Stakeholders affected they can accommodate | Single failure to meet University Policy or University Code. Minor recommendations which can easily be addressed. |
| Negligible | 1 | <2% | Some small implication on achieving objective | Rumours but no media coverage | Very minor interruption and small impact on service delivery (downtime < 15 mins) with no implication for Stakeholders. | Minor non-compliance with University Policy or University Code. |

| Note 2 - Risk Likelihood Scores | | |
|--|--------------|--|
| Likelihood | Score | Description |
| Almost Certain | 5 | Happens annually or more frequently, will probably happen |
| Likely | 4 | Has happened before and may well happen again |
| Possible | 3 | Possible but has not happened in the last three years |
| Unlikely | 2 | Could happen, but has not happened in the last five years |
| Rare | 1 | Very unlikely, has not happened before |