The power of four
An evolution in risk assessment that applies sophisticated algorithms and advanced data analytics together in a KPMG proprietary methodology to identify, connect and visualize risk in four dimensions.
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Why is Dynamic Risk Assessment different?

In today’s highly interconnected and volatile world, dominated by new technology and emerging business models, the past is no longer a reliable guide to the future. Past data is a poor fit for the future as the forces and trends that shape our future have increasingly not manifested themselves before. Moreover, risks combine. They spill over into each other—they do not occur neatly in isolation—and we no longer have the luxury of dealing with risks discretely.

Instead, we need to consider whether and how risks can potentially cluster together, as well as the potential cumulative impact of such clusters. We need to advance beyond historical risk analyses comprised of two-dimensional depictions through expected probability and severity.

This requires us to consider a third, and also a fourth dimension: velocity and contagion. This—together with the consideration of the global trends that are shaping our world—is what Dynamic Risk Assessment (DRA) does.

Management and Boards often ask:

— How do the many risks aggregate and interrelate to impact the overall summarized risk profile presented to the Executive and the Board?

— Do we have a complete understanding of our risk profile or are there emerging risks or structural breaks (macroeconomic, socio-political, and other megatrends not necessarily previously observed) that are not being addressed?

— If a risk event was to occur, how quickly would it adversely impact the business?

— How can we go beyond operational resilience to using risk to create opportunity and competitive advantage?

— Are our resources being applied as efficiently and effectively as possible to achieve a risk outcome commensurate with our risk appetite?
Traditional risk management approaches do not lend themselves to being able to answer these questions because they typically:

- Consider risks individually with linear relationships (if any) between them.
- Identify “significant” risks on an individual basis rather than reflecting the cumulative effect of interconnected risks forming a cluster with potentially a far greater likelihood and/or consequence in aggregation.
- Aggregate multitudes of operational risks, to obtain a top-level risk profile through qualitative and subjective means based on averages or worse case scenarios. The outcome thus often lacks rigor and cannot withstand scrutiny.
- Grossly underestimate risk contagion within the network, as well as velocity of impact. Notwithstanding that experience shows that failures typically result from a number of risk events occurring simultaneously or within a short space of time so that historic, single risk mitigation strategies are ineffective.
- Design mitigation strategies on a risk-by-risk basis with limited understanding of where resources should best be applied to achieve a reduction in risk across the entire risk network.

The power of considering all four dimensions of risk overcomes these limitations and enables the transformation of risk into opportunity.
The power of four

Looking beyond conventional depictions of risk, typically based solely on likelihood and severity, Dynamic Risk Assessment takes a four-dimensional view by including connectivity and velocity. This enables consideration of the contagion effect of risks—one of the most significant learnings from the Global Financial Crisis.

In these turbulent times, organizations need to approach risk assessment with fresh thinking and innovative solutions. As economic volatility becomes the norm, and the past is no longer an indicator of things to come, seemingly disparate events can become inextricably linked. This makes assessing risk exposure especially difficult because risk is unpredictable and contagious, and connected globally within complex organizational structures.

Focus needs to shift. It is increasingly important to understand and monitor emerging risks and be aware of what out of trend risks (structural breaks) could arise in this age of disruption.

Equally, as global organizations expand their reach beyond traditional geographic and sector boundaries, they not only create new opportunities, but also expose themselves to potential new risks. At the same time, organizations are being influenced by macro-economic, socio-political and other mega-trends not necessarily observed in the past.

Recognizing that past data and assumptions are severely limited in a world of developing technology, emerging markets, climate change, growing populations, and other mega-trends that interact and shape our future, KPMG’s risk professionals are well positioned through DRA to be able to help you turn risk into opportunity and increase resilience while disruption and volatility unfold.

A turning point
At KPMG we realized that a turning point has been reached where traditional, two-dimensional risk management methodologies (that focus on single points of risk with high likelihood and severity) may be limiting the value of risk management in increasingly complex and global organizations. Extending from this is the realization that the ability to understand an organization’s risk interrelationships can be significantly improved if we find a way to identify potential risk contagion.

DRA is the key with which those deeper insights can be unlocked. It is an evolution in risk assessment that applies actuarial theories, sophisticated algorithms, and advanced data analytics together in a KPMG proprietary (patent pending) methodology to identify, connect, and visualize risk in four dimensions:

— Likelihood
— Impact
— Velocity
— Connectivity

Combining the latest in applied science with insights from management, DRA modeling allows our risk professionals to see where risks can be expected to form critical clusters or trigger other risks through ‘contagion’.

By exposing the expected contagion effects between global and enterprise risks, we can objectively measure the genuinely significant threats. These may not be the risks with the highest impact individually, but rather the risks with the most significant connections and, hence, the ability to trigger several risks in a short time frame.

These fresh insights provide clients with new insights to drive more informed decision making within their organizations on how to best tackle and monitor these threats and, where possible, create opportunity.
Dynamic Risk Assessment explained

KPMG’s Dynamic Risk Assessment (DRA) marks a groundbreaking shift in risk identification that applies actuarial theories, sophisticated algorithms, mathematics, and advanced data and analytics (D&A) together in a KPMG proprietary methodology to identify, connect, and visualize risk in four dimensions.

DRA provides us with a sense of how the risk might spread, and the time horizon in which it could impact the business of a client. At the same time, DRA enables us to understand how individual risks may interact in terms of network effects—the expected contagion consequences between global and enterprise risks.

This has become critical because without understanding systemic risk in this way, our view on risk and emerging risk remains incomplete and we will continue to be surprised by downside risks. Contagion between risks is the missing link that needs introduction into risk discussions. Never before has risk been so prominent in organizations. But if risk continues to be measured only by virtue of impact and likelihood, the organization will miss the key critical dimensions that have escalated in significance in today’s operating environment. DRA rebalances our assessment of risk by analyzing business risks’ velocity and their potential interconnectedness.

DRA applies network theory to identify expected contagion between structural breaks, global risks, mega trends, and organizational risks. We model this expected contagion through working with experienced individuals from across your organization and applying the findings of published research into network theory to produce a bespoke systemic risk network for your organization, as well as a comprehensive analysis of the characteristics of your risk network.

In short, KPMG applies advanced mathematics and analytical tools to produce an understandable and personalized systemic risk network report.

This process enables the move from a two-dimensional view of independent risks to an interconnected view of the four dimensions of risk – Likelihood, Impact, Velocity and Connectivity.

Traditional, two dimensional risk map

Inter-connected view

This individually insignificant risk has hidden systemic significance: it triggers many other risks into existence, all of them more significant than itself.

Likelihood and impact of this cluster exceeds those of this single risk.

The individually most significant risk exhibits low levels of expected contagion.

Connectivity strength:
- Low
- Medium
- High
Risk interconnectedness and clusters

**Interconnectedness**

Interconnectedness assists with more holistic risk management by illuminating an additional dimension which shows the impact risks have on each other. Groups of strongly related risks are called risk “clusters”. These are relevant because organizational failures are seldom the result of a single risk event but are more typically the consequence of a number of related risks materializing at the same time.

Risk clusters are determined mathematically by analyzing a number of factors. All risks within a cluster are likely to either trigger/make another risk more severe or be triggered/made more severe by other risks in the cluster.
The domino effect
While individual risks may not be regarded as significant due to their assessed likelihood and impact, it may change when the risks are considered in combination considering clusters. Risks in a cluster can be subject to the “domino” effect and this effect can be mathematically quantified such that the collective impact and likelihood of the cluster as a whole can be understood. By understanding the overall impact and likelihood of connected risks, appropriate resources can be allocated.

The illustration below depicts how the labor, security and leadership skills/culture risks (bottom right) are individually rated to have an impact which is not considered to be “High”. However, due to the cumulative impact of these risks collectively, this cluster of risks has an impact which is between “High” and “Very High”. Their collective likelihood has increased slightly as well.

In this way DRA is superior to traditional aggregation techniques which, in order to determine the rating of a number of risks together, will often take either the average of the risk ratings of a group of risks, or alternatively, the highest rated risk. Using either of these methods in the scenario below would have reported a much lower risk outcome than what DRA does using established science.
An added advantage of understanding interconnectedness is that it enables management to understand which risks have the strongest connections and, hence, where resources should be allocated for maximum benefit.

By understanding the connections between risks, the most central and contagious risks in the network can be identified. We can identify the risks which “must go right” (green arrow) for the other risks to not be triggered, as well as the risks that “can’t go wrong” (red arrow) which should be avoided at any cost.

In the current environment, it is important to ensure that any capital allocated will have the maximum impact possible.

In a capital conscious environment, it is these risks which “must go right” (green arrow) which should be allocated the most resources.

This differs to traditional risk management thinking whereby the risks outside of appetite are typically allocated the most resources.

While the traditional approach may reduce the risk to a rating within appetite, only one risk is typically mitigated, which has little impact on the risk network a whole.

We quite often find that the points of vulnerability (the risks which must go right) are within appetite and hence are not being closely managed or monitored. Allocating additional resources to these risks rather than to those outside of appetite can equate to a cost saving. This is because treating this one very connected risk has flow on implications to the whole network thereby creating an opportunity to bring numerous risks back within appetite.
The DRA process

We apply network theory to depict the expected contagion between structural breaks, megatrends, risks and opportunities that are idiosyncratic to your business. This is modelled by accessing the collective experiences of senior, experienced individuals within your organization. Typically, the end-to-end DRA process takes six to eight weeks, with the key steps outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Landscape articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DRA Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KPMG Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Follow Up Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>KPMG Deliver Dynamic Risk Assessment Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The KPMG advantage**

DRA is truly a unique approach to risk management that only we, KPMG, can offer.

We can help you apply our DRA diagnostics to a single problem, one business unit, or the company as a whole.

Our goal is to help you take advantage of risk rather than simply reacting to it – to cut through the complexity and leverage the insights that DRA can provide to drive targeted action.

In a word, the advantage we and DRA offer our clients is confidence. Confidence in your insights. Confidence in your decisions. Confidence in your business results.