The City of Saskatoon, like all municipal governments, faces many types of risk, including strategic, operational, financial and compliance risks. If not effectively managed, risk can impede the successful delivery of civic services, and the achievement of our goals and objectives.

We are committed to continuous improvement, and embedding risk management into our corporate culture. Intelligent risk management and monitoring the City’s risk performance is critical to preserving and protecting our reputation and resources.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Saskatoon’s (City) Risk Based Management Program was established in August 2014 in order to provide “a systematic, proactive and ongoing process to understand and manage risk, and to communicate risk information through the City, which contributes positively to the achievement of corporate objectives.” Since that time, many foundational initiatives have been undertaken to improve understanding and embed risk management into the organization’s culture.

Through the Corporate Risk Committee, the Administration has dedicated significant effort to fully understanding and analyzing each strategic risk, assessing how likely each risk is to occur, determining what the impact would be if it did occur, identifying what is currently being done to manage the risk and determining what more is required to bring that risk down to an acceptable level.

This understanding and analysis has allowed the City to continue to make progress in managing its key strategic risks. Of the 23 risks identified in the strategic risk assessment, current risk management activities have decreased the severity of 8 risks from high (i.e. high likelihood, high impact) to medium (i.e. medium likelihood, medium impact), with 2 risks residing within their target zone.

Even with this progress, additional work remains to be done. Over the coming year, the Administration will continue to focus on identifying and understanding its risks more fully, and pursuing implementation of those planned mitigation strategies that will move the organization closer to achieving its targets.
1 INTRODUCTION

The City provides the infrastructure and delivers key programs and services necessary to improve the city’s high quality of life. Many of these are essential services that citizens rely on every day, including:

› roads, bridges, pathways and public transit to move people;
› police, bylaw and fire services to keep citizens safe;
› parks, waste management and drainage systems to keep neighbourhoods clean and healthy; and
› social programs and leisure activities that make Saskatoon a great place to live, work and visit.

This diversity of activity creates an equally diverse and complex range of risks as well as a wealth of opportunities for the City. Understanding and managing the risks associated with these activities and making the most of new opportunities is challenging and critical to preserving and protecting the City’s reputation and resources.

The City recognizes that risk management is an integral part of a good governance structure and best management practice. Effectively managing risk helps support continuous improvement in the way the City is managed, as well as continued growth in public confidence in the City’s performance.

Through Council Policy No. C02-040, Corporate Governance – Risk Based Management (the Policy), the City has adopted the risk management methodology as set out in the International Standard ISO 31000 Risk management – principles and guidelines (ISO 31000). The Policy affirms the City’s strategic commitment to building a risk management culture in which risks are identified and managed effectively.

Established in August 2014, the objectives of the City’s Risk Based Management (RBM) Program are to “…embed into corporate operations and reporting a systematic, proactive and ongoing process to understand and manage risk and uncertainty, and to communicate risk information throughout the City….”

As described in the body of this report, progress continues to be made in achieving the objectives of the RBM Program, with further advances planned for 2018 and beyond.

RBM Program Vision

We know what our risks are and we are accountable to actively manage them
2 RISK BASED MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The City faces a variety of challenging natural, political, financial, environmental and cultural influences that make its operating environment uncertain. These influences may impact on the extent to which corporate objectives can be met.

The effect such uncertainty has on the City’s objectives is known as “risk.”

The City has adopted the risk management methodology as set out in ISO 31000. As shown in Figure 2.1, the ISO 31000 risk management methodology has the following three components:

- a set of **principles** for guiding and informing an effective risk management program;
- a **framework** that provides the foundation that will embed risk management throughout the organization; and
- a **process** that supports the development and implementation of activities to assess, treat, monitor and review risk.

![FIGURE 2.1: COMPONENTS OF ISO 31000 RISK MANAGEMENT METHODOLOGY](image)
2.1 PRINCIPLES

The City’s RBM Program will:

- **Create and protect value** to help the City achieve its objectives and improve its performance.

- Be an **integral part of activities and processes**, including strategic and business planning, project management and change management.

- Be **part of decision making** as every decision made has an element of risk. Effective risk management can help make informed choices, prioritize actions and select between alternative options.

- Deal explicitly with the **uncertainties** inherent in all civic activities.

- Be **systematic, structured and timely** to facilitate repeatable, consistent, comparable and reliable outcomes.

- Be **based on best available information** with inputs to the risk management process drawing on historical data, experience, feedback, observation, forecasts or expert judgment. Assumptions must be stated clearly.

- Be **tailored to the City** and consider its objectives and capabilities, the environment in which it operates and the risks it faces.

- Consider **human and cultural factors** by recognizing the perceptions and intentions of internal and external stakeholders, including staff members’ capabilities and attitudes towards risk management.

- Be **transparent and inclusive** about how risk is identified and assessed, how decisions are reached and how risks are treated. The Administration and City Council (through the Standing Policy Committee on Finance) will be regularly consulted to ensure they have an opportunity to provide input into the criteria used to evaluate the effectiveness of the risk management process.

- Be **dynamic and responsive** as the internal and external environments in which the City operates change. These environments need to be monitored to determine which risks are still relevant and to identify any new and emerging risks. The City’s risk management framework and processes need to be responsive to change.

- Facilitate the City’s **continuous improvement and enhancement** through regular reviews of, and improvements to, the risk management framework and processes.
2.2 FRAMEWORK

The success of the City’s RBM Program will depend on the framework that provides the foundation for embedding it throughout the organization at all levels.

FIGURE 2.2: ISO 31000 FRAMEWORK FOR MANAGING RISK

- Mandate and Commitment
  - Design the Framework
    - Understand the City and its context
    - Establish risk management policy
    - Embed risk management into processes
  - Implement Risk Management Program
    - Implement framework
    - Implement risk management process
- Improve the Framework
- Monitor and Review the Framework
2.3 PROCESS

The City’s RBM process can be summarized as follows:

The City manages risk by identifying it, analyzing it and then evaluating whether the risk should be modified by risk treatment in order to satisfy its risk criteria. Throughout this process, the City will communicate and consult with stakeholders and monitor and review the risk and the controls that are modifying the risk in order to ensure that no further risk treatment is required.

FIGURE 2.3: ISO 31000
RISK MANAGEMENT PROCESS
3 ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN 2017

The Corporate Risk Division continues to focus on maintaining the foundational elements of the RBM Program and engaging in corporate outreach activities, as described below. In addition, the Division has been assigned two new areas of responsibility—Corporate Business Continuity Planning and Corporate Security.

Embed into corporate operations and reporting a systematic, proactive and ongoing process to understand and manage risk and uncertainty.

- **Risk registers** for all “high,” “medium” and “low” priority strategic risks were updated to reflect 2017 accomplishments as well as the planned mitigation strategies for 2018 and beyond.

- The **Internal Audit Plan** was updated based on the priorities identified in the Strategic Risk Assessment and input from the Standing Policy Committee on Finance.

- Responsibility for a new organization-wide **Business Continuity Planning** program was assigned to the Division.

- A **Corporate Security Plan** was developed and a new position created to support implementation of organization-wide security initiatives.

- Eight **risk reviews** of new/proposed programs, existing program enhancements and corporate policies were performed, at the request of civic management and staff.

- An **operational risk assessment** of the City’s Building Permit Closure process was conducted at the request of civic management.

- Two **operational risk assessments** were initiated by the Water & Waste Stream Division (Landfill Asbestos) and the General Superannuation Pension Plan, to be completed in 2018.

Communicate risk information throughout the City.

- Risk Management has been incorporated into the **Business Planning and Budgeting** process.

- A Corporate Risk **SharePoint site** has been established to serve as a source of information and guidance.

- A series of **guidance documents** have been developed to assist the Administration in identifying, analyzing and evaluating risks.

- The Division has been involved in the development of a **key corporate initiative** regarding suspicious package response procedures.
4 STRATEGIC RISKS – AT A GLANCE

The Strategic Risk Assessment that was conducted in 2015 resulted in the identification of several strategic risks. These strategic risks were prioritized by City Council in order to guide the Internal Audit Plan, and were scored by the Corporate Risk Committee in terms of:

- **Likelihood:** the probability of the risk event occurring, measured on a scale of 1 (rare) to 4 (very likely); and

- **Impact:** the effect if the risk event does occur, measured on a scale of 1 (negligible) to 4 (critical).

Scoring of the risks was performed on both an *inherent* basis (without considering the effect of controls) and *residual* basis (after taking into account current risk mitigation activities). As outlined in Figure 4.1 below, the decrease from the inherent risk score (e.g. 10.8) to the residual risk score (e.g. 8.1) is the impact that can be attributed to current risk mitigation activities.

**FIGURE 4.1: GUIDE TO UNDERSTANDING THE STRATEGIC RISK SUMMARY**

- The priority assigned to the risk by City Council for the purposes of preparing the Internal Audit Plan
- The statement that briefly describes the risk event
- The risk matrix visually presents the risk scores with an indication of severity (red = high, yellow = medium, green = low)
- The residual risk score (after considering current risk mitigation activities) = likelihood x impact
- The inherent risk score (without considering risk mitigation activities) = likelihood x impact

**HIGH PRIORITY STRATEGIC RISKS**

The City may be unable to adequately diversify its revenue sources

Key current risk mitigation activities:
- Long-Term Financial Plan approved by City Council and updated annually
- Return on investment from civic utilities
- Service level reports presented to City Council provide options to reduce funding requirements
- Dedicated levies to fund specific infrastructure deficits
- “30 Day Challenge” engaged civic staff in identifying revenue generating/expense saving ideas

A summary of the key activities that are currently being undertaken to reduce the likelihood and/or impact of the risk event

The Administration’s target residual risk zone

The residual risk score (after considering current risk mitigation activities) = likelihood x impact

The inherent risk score (without considering risk mitigation activities) = likelihood x impact
As summarized in the following tables, many activities are currently being undertaken to reduce the likelihood and/or impact of the City’s strategic risks. The following tables are current snapshots of the risk levels with mitigation activities (residual) compared to the risk levels if these activities were not initiated (inherent).

### HIGH PRIORITY STRATEGIC RISKS

#### The City may be unable to adequately diversify its revenue sources

**Key current risk mitigation activities:**
- Long-Term Financial Plan approved by City Council and updated annually
- Return on investment from civic utilities
- Service level reports presented to City Council provide options to reduce funding requirements
- Dedicated levies to fund specific infrastructure deficits
- “30 Day Challenge” engaged civic staff in identifying revenue generating/expense saving ideas

#### The City may not be investing enough money in its transportation infrastructure to maintain an acceptable condition and level of service

**Key current risk mitigation activities:**
- Ongoing monitoring and reporting of infrastructure condition by type and class
- Asset management plans prepared
- Internal audits completed for Roadways Maintenance and Snow & Ice Management
- Increased funding levels
- Developed financial management strategies
- Winter maintenance service levels approved by City Council and monitored on an ongoing basis
- Improvements in workflow management process and resource optimization model
The City may not be prepared to quickly and effectively resume operations in the event of serious incident, accident, disaster or emergency

Key current risk mitigation activities:
- Emergency Operations Center established
- Mass notification system implemented and periodically tested
- Security assessments completed at four civic facilities
- Corporate Security Plan developed and dedicated resources assigned to implement
- Business continuity planning program established

The City’s engagement and communications initiatives and opportunities may not be effectively reaching its citizens

Key current risk mitigation activities:
- Implemented Internet publishing and electronic agenda systems
- Continue to advance Service Saskatoon customer service initiative
- Regularly utilize Citizen Advisory Panel
- Piloted citizen service satisfaction survey process, third party online citizen budget tool and other new approaches to engagement
- Launched “Engage! Saskatoon” for easier citizen access to engagement information and opportunities
- Dedicated staff assigned to engagement activities for significant civic initiatives (e.g. Growth Plan, Climate Change, Waste Utility)
MEDIUM PRIORITY STRATEGIC RISKS

The City may not be considering the total costs of asset ownership when making investment decisions

Key current risk mitigation activities:
- Asset management plans are being developed in key asset categories
- Life cycle costing methodology is being applied to all P3 projects
- Internal audit complete, recommendations are being implemented

The City’s infrastructure investments may not correspond to growth trends and forecasts for the local or regional economy

Key current risk mitigation activities:
- Growth Plan to Half a Million approved by City Council; major infrastructure investments are being aligned with the Plan’s directions and strategies
- Frequent and ongoing monitoring of market conditions, economic indicators and financial resources
- Long-term infrastructure plans developed and funding commitments secured
- Regional plans, concept plans and community plans developed

The City may not be investing enough money in its public transit infrastructure to maintain an acceptable level of service

Key current risk mitigation activities:
- Long-Term Transit Plan, fleet renewal strategy and asset management plan approved by City Council
- Infrastructure funding secured
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) planning and engagement initiatives underway
- High-frequency transit corridors implemented (8th Street, 22nd Street)
- Internal audit complete, recommendations are being implemented
The City's waste and recycling services may not be meeting customer service delivery and environmental stewardship expectations

**Key current risk mitigation activities:**
- Convenient and easy to use waste diversion programs have been launched, more being developed
- Implemented route optimization process
- Comprehensive community-wide waste study completed
- Broader education and awareness campaign launched #YXETalksTrash
- New sustainable utility business model being developed

The City may be using outdated or unsupported software and/or hardware that may fail

**Key current risk mitigation activities:**
- Current state assessment and establishment of an IT strategy are underway
- Contingency plans (manual processes, workarounds) have been established at the business unit level
- Secondary data center has been established for essential applications and services
The City’s information technology strategy may not be properly aligned with the organization’s goals and objectives

**Key current risk mitigation activities:**
- New vision, mandate and organizational structure for IT Division
- Provided training for IT staff in business analysis, project management, etc.
- Introduced new Service Desk tool to manage service requests
- Concerted efforts to ensure IT is aligned with business units, needs and outcomes

The City may not be prepared for the effects of climate change

**Key current risk mitigation activities:**
- “Environmental Implications” section in Committee and City Council report templates
- Revised roadway design standards consider severe/prolonged weather events
- Stormwater superpipe capacity improvements
- Developed predictive model with U of S regarding rainfall to identify infrastructure constraints

The City’s decision-making processes may be hampered by information systems and data sets (financial and operational) that are not integrated

**Key current risk mitigation activities:**
- Business case for core corporate financial (Enterprise Resource Planning) system awarded
- Developing enterprise strategies and programs to encompass asset management, data management and business intelligence
- Developed IT Strategic Plan
- Data management plans developed in three pilot areas (Fire, Transit and Human Resources)
The City’s existing strategies may not be attracting, hiring, managing, developing and retaining top talent to support existing and future operations

Key current risk mitigation activities:
- Succession planning framework has been developed for senior positions
- Competency frameworks have been/are being developed
- “Employee Rewards and Recognition” program under development
- “Investing in Leaders” program continues to offer a variety of opportunities for staff
- Mandatory supervisor training program implemented

The City may not be investing enough money in its parks infrastructure to maintain an acceptable condition and level of service

Key current risk mitigation activities:
- Completed Civic Service Reviews for Parks and Urban Forestry
- Completed Recreation & Parks Master Plan
- Increased funding from existing sources
- Asset management plans prepared for select assets
- Service level report presented to City Council provides options to reduce funding requirements
MEDIUM PRIORITY STRATEGIC RISKS (CONT.)

- The City may not be adequately protecting information created by or entrusted to it

**Key current risk mitigation activities:**
- Information management and governance policies have been developed
- Security reviews, inspections and audits periodically conducted
- Administrative processes/procedures govern user access privileges and information handling
- Privacy Impact Assessment process in place
- IT security threat analyses and assessments have been completed and improvements are being pursued

- The City may not be consistently considering risk management when evaluating and pursuing strategic initiatives

**Key current risk mitigation activities:**
- Risk Management Policy approved by City Council
- Continued implementation of Risk Management Program
- Strategic Risk Registers prepared and updated annually
- Consideration of risks in 2018 business planning and budgeting process
The City may not be aligning its financial resources in a way that supports its priorities, strategic goals and core services

Key current risk mitigation activities:
- Periodic strategic planning and annual business planning processes
- Multi-year business planning and budget project currently underway
- Service level reports presented to City Council provide options to reduce funding requirements

The City may not be investing enough money in its facilities to maintain an acceptable condition and level of service

Key current risk mitigation activities:
- Cyclical building condition assessments conducted and strategies to address gaps developed
- Customer service agreements prepared and regular customer service meetings conducted
- Annual review of Civic Buildings Comprehensive Maintenance Reserve
- Asbestos Management Program established and resourced
LOW PRIORITY STRATEGIC RISKS

The future growth of the City and region could be restricted by, or in conflict with, growth in surrounding areas

Key current risk mitigation activities:
- Participating in the Saskatoon North Partnership for Growth (P4G)
- Regional land use map and servicing strategy developed
- Governance and administrative structures developed for regional plan implementation
- Ongoing participation in Corman Park – Saskatoon Planning District

The City may not be investing enough money in its fleet infrastructure to maintain an acceptable condition and level of service

Key current risk mitigation activities:
- Completed Civic Service Review and implementing recommended improvements
- Reviewing fleet business model
- Customer service agreements developed with significant customer groups
- Asset management plan prepared
- Comprehensive reserve sufficiency analysis undertaken

The City may fail to identify and pursue corporate CO₂ reduction initiatives

Key current risk mitigation activities:
- Corporate greenhouse gas emission reduction target adopted
- "Environmental Implications" section in Committee and City Council report templates
- Several initiatives undertaken to date (e.g., LED fixtures for street/park lighting, solar power demonstration project, single-stream recycling at civic facilities, route optimization, water management practices, landfill gas power generation facility, etc.)
The City’s community education and awareness initiatives regarding carbon footprint may not be affecting change in people’s attitudes and behaviors

**Key current risk mitigation activities:**
- Signed the Global Covenant on Energy and Climate
- Developed community greenhouse gas emission inventory and reduction target being developed
- Waste diversion target adopted
- Conservation, recycling and waste diversion education programs are provided to citizens
- New waste diversion programs are being developed (e.g. Recovery Park, city-wide organics, waste utility)

The City’s purchases may not be in accordance with approved policy

**Key current risk mitigation activities:**
- Comprehensive review of procurement policy and procedures currently underway
- New purchasing card policies and procedures implemented
- Education/training sessions provided to key internal stakeholders
5 OBJECTIVES FOR 2018

Building on the successes achieved to date, 2018 will see additional categories of risk being subject to risk assessment as knowledge and capacity continues to be developed within the organization, as described below.

Embed into corporate operations and reporting a systematic, proactive and ongoing process to understand and manage risk and uncertainty.

- Risk Management will be considered for inclusion in the corporate report template to ensure risk is identified and addressed in all reports to City Council and Committees of Council.

- **Operational, financial and compliance risk assessments** will be conducted throughout the organization.

- **Risk Registers** will be prepared for the most significant operational, financial and compliance risks that are identified through the risk assessment process.

- A **corporate risk appetite** will be developed that will provide guidance and set the overall tone for risk taking in the organization.

- A **Business Continuity Plan** template will be developed and rolled out across the organization in a prioritized manner.

Communicate risk information throughout the City.

- Additional **education and informational material** will be developed and shared throughout the organization.
Risk is necessary for growth and improvement, and providing a wide variety of essential services and programs to citizens does involve risk.

The City of Saskatoon’s Corporate Risk Management Program assists the Administration to ensure management of risk is addressed in a positive, systematic and productive way.

Risk to the Corporation is mitigated through an ongoing commitment to continuous improvement in the way the City is managed – thereby increasing public confidence in the City’s performance.

The City may not be considering the TOTAL COSTS OF ASSET OWNERSHIP when making investment decisions.

The City may not be aligning its FINANCIAL RESOURCES in a way that supports its priorities, strategic goals and core services.

The City’s community education and awareness initiatives regarding CARBON FOOTPRINT may not be affecting change in people’s attitudes and behaviors.

The City’s ENGAGEMENT and COMMUNICATIONS initiatives and opportunities may not be effectively reaching its CITIZENS.

The City may be unable to adequately diversify its REVENUE sources.
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Risk is necessary for growth and improvement, and providing a wide variety of essential services and programs to citizens does involve risk.

The City of Saskatoon’s Corporate Risk Management Program assists the Administration to ensure management of risk is addressed in a positive, systematic and productive way.

Risk to the Corporation is mitigated through an ongoing commitment to continuous improvement in the way the City is managed – thereby increasing public confidence in the City’s performance.

The City may not be considering the TOTAL COSTS OF ASSET OWNERSHIP when making investment decisions.

The City may not be aligning its FINANCIAL RESOURCES in a way that supports its priorities, strategic goals and core services.

The City’s ENGAGEMENT and COMMUNICATIONS initiatives and opportunities may not be effectively reaching its CITIZENS.

The City’s community education and awareness initiatives regarding CARBON FOOTPRINT may not be affecting change in people’s attitudes and behaviors.

The City may not be investing enough money in its PARKS infrastructure to maintain an acceptable condition and level of service.

The City’s existing strategies may not be attracting, hiring, managing, developing and retaining TOP TALENT.

The City’s WASTE and RECYCLING services may not be meeting customer service delivery and environmental stewardship expectations.

The City may not be prepared to quickly and effectively RESUME OPERATIONS in the event of serious incident, accident, DISASTER or EMERGENCY.

The City may not be investing enough money in its PUBLIC TRANSIT infrastructure to maintain an acceptable level of service.

The City may not be preparing to quickly and effectively RESUME OPERATIONS in the event of serious incident, accident, DISASTER or EMERGENCY.

The City may not be investing enough money in its REVENUE sources.

The City may not be investing enough money in its PUBLIC TRANSIT infrastructure to maintain an acceptable condition and level of service.