Quantifying Risks & Controls Methods that Work - Methods that Don't

Aidan Collins CEO, ControlMetric, Inc.

Governance, Risk & Compliance - G23





- Introduction
- Estimating the size of risk
- Measuring the mitigation effect of controls
- Summary/wrap up

Overall problem is to find "best" set of controls to mitigate a risk



(proxy for # of controls)



• Introduction

• Estimating the size of risk

- Measuring the mitigation effect of controls
- Summary/wrap up



Response Cost Analysis

Crowdsourcing

Input Modeling



Easier

Point or Range Estimates

- Can be generated either externally (e.g. industry benchmark) or internally (e.g. planning assumption)
- Often backed by historical experience or external analysis
- For example, external benchmark for risk of "shadow payroll" fraud is 0.1% of total payroll

Response Cost Analysis

- Focus on responses to risk occurrence as an estimate of the risk impact
- Responses are categorized and cost estimates are generated for each response
- Can either be a **point or range** estimate

Crowdsourcing

- Uses the power of many opinions to generate a more reliable estimate of risk
- Can be generated either internally to the organization or, in some cases, can be extended to business partners
- Can be extended to include prediction markets

Input Modeling

- Decompose risk down to input variables impacting the likely outcome of risk
- Decide on statistical distribution for each input variable
- Model range of input variables to generate distribution of likely risk values, e.g. Monte-Carlo

For example, analyzing response costs can be useful in sizing data security risks...



...while decomposing risk to its components can work for business risks...

Overall Fraud Risk



- Historical experience of claims fraud is in the range of 3-4% of incurred losses
- Industry data suggests 10% of incurred losses represent claims fraud
- Industry data suggests
 5% total revenue is lost
 to all fraud
- Average loss per incident related to disbursements in the range \$20-125k
- No historical experience of payroll related fraud
- Industry averages are in the range of 1% of total payroll expense

11



Claims fraud risk dominates; overall fraud risk estimated at \$12M

...and Monte-Carlo-modeling of project inputs can help assess ROI risk

- Time to complete system 12 to 18 months
- Cost of new system \$4M to \$8M ٠
- Predicted agent adoption 40% to 70%
- Additional revenue per agent \$500K to \$1.5M ٠
- Margins on additional revenue 20% to 25%
- New system operating costs \$140K to \$300K ٠
- Internal productivity savings with new system \$400K to \$700K



Input factors influencing project ROI

Model these inputs to generate estimate of project ROI





- Introduction
- Estimating the size of risk
- Measuring the mitigation effect of controls
- Summary/wrap up

Goal is to find the optimal sets of controls



Generate effectiveness and cost data for each control

Coverage	 For a specific risk, how much of that risk is mitigated assuming the control is operational at all time
Operation	 This is an estimate of how often this control works over time
Flexibility	 This measures how well this individual control can deal with minor anomalies related to the risk being mitigated
Cost	 What are the estimated costs associated with this control?

Combine to generate an overall control effectiveness score for each control

15

Generate the data to be used to as input to the Rank-Order Model

Controls are scored based always on the particular risk being mitigated

"Users have more access privileges in excess of those needed for their roles"

Control scores (Coverage, Operational, Flexibility)

Ref.	Control	Cov.	Oper.	Flex.	Cost
1	Information security standards and guidelines exist. These standards and guidelines serve as the basis for security administration, management, and monitoring. This policy also defines the responsibilities of our Information Security Officer, users and management.	0.4	0.5	0.85	\$300K
2	An Information Security awareness program exists and is updated on an annual basis.	0.4	0.5	0.85	\$500K
3	Generic user accounts (e.g., Temp01) are not used to access and perform transactions within business applications.	0.65	0.85	0.9	\$50K
4	Each business user is assigned a unique account using a standard naming convention to ensure accountability for each user.	0.85	0.5	0.9	\$25K
5	All requests for new user access to App/DB/OS/Network are submitted in writing by an individual authorized to approve access.	0.8	0.4	0.8	\$25K
6	Employee terminations are communicated by HR or management, in a timely manner. Accounts are disabled/removed in a timely manner.	0.7	0.3	0.9	\$35K
7	All user access additions and modifications made in the App/DB/OS/Network are documented and maintained.	0.5	0.3	0.8	\$50K
8	Reports of current App/DB/OS/Network access privileges are periodically generated and distributed to process/data owners for review. Process/data owners validate propriety of access	0.8	0.5	0.7	\$75K
	rights Access drivileges are modified as appropriate				

Some general observations on effectiveness scores and control costs

Observations

- Scores are generated from many available sources of subjective and objective data including external benchmarks, our experience, client history and qualitative and quantitative analysis
- Automated controls tend to have higher operational scores but lower flexibility scores
- Supervisory-type controls (e.g. management review) can be provide broad coverage and increase flexibility while empowering process owners to manage risk
- People-based controls have higher ongoing costs but are relatively easy to design and implement; the operating costs of automated controls approach zero but there are non-trivial costs associated with the design and implementation of the controls

Implications

- The availability of "good" data on controls impacts the quality of the analysis; additional data gathering through "crowdsourcing" and other polling methods can make a big difference
- An over-reliance on automated controls, while cost-effective, can limit adaptability in the internal control structure
- In order to internalize effective, quantitative-driven risk management into the IT organization, some number of supervisory controls must always be in place
- Both on-going operational costs and onetime design/implementation costs should be understood to ensure that a true cost picture is presented





Rank order model produces risk-control plot



Recommend any changes or additions to implemented controls



Subset	Controls	Residual Risk	Cost	Overlap to Existing Controls	Difficulty of Implementation
A36	3,4,7,11,15	\$9,750,000	\$425,000	High	Medium
A17	1,5,6,8,9	\$8,500,000	\$420,000	High	Low
D14	3,5,8,12,20,21	\$4,750,000	\$405,000	Medium	Low
B71	1,5,8,11,21	\$4,600,000	\$460,000	Medium	Medium
C65	1,3,6,8,9,11,13,14,21,22	\$4,450,000	\$505,000	Medium	High



The final choice of controls includes a subjective review of these criteria



- Introduction
- Estimating the size of risk
- Measuring the mitigation effect of controls
- Summary/wrap up

Summary

- Managing operational risks adds layers of complexity and associated costs to business processes, yet many companies find it difficult to assess how much risk is mitigated by their choice of controls
- Quantifying risks and controls develops a rigorous, defensible view on the operational risks facing the business, and the ability of a group of controls to mitigate risk in a business or IT process
- Business and IT process owners benefit from the knowledge that selected internal controls will mitigate the appropriate level of risk based on their design



Controlietric THE SCIENCE OF INTERNAL CONTROL[™]