

From: Lorna Gunn
Sent: July 24, 2009 2:34 PM
To: Sharon Shepherd; Ron Mattiussi
Cc: David Graham; Jan Johnston
Subject: BC Gaming - Responsible Gaming Initiative/Funding

Dear Mayor Shepherd,

As requested I did some research and spoke with Greg Walker at BCLC regarding program funding recently announced. Mr. Walker indicated that this funding comes out of community discussions held throughout the province in 2006 whereby communities were asking the Province how they were addressing the impacts of problem gambling. The Province's response has been to create a \$25,000 matching fund that communities can apply for with ideas that they have generated such as holding community forums, speaker panels etc. (see attached notes). Some communities are partnering with organizations such as United Way and asking 3rd parties to deliver a program.

The application form (attached) seems relatively simple....and at the same timequite vague. From speaking with Mr. Walker, they are open to any and all ideas. Again, it is matching funding. Hope this is helpful.

There are two attachments – first is the original community forum that had 9 participants and no representation from the City that I could see. The second attachment is information that I have taken from the website plus notes from my own conversation with Greg Walker.

Thanks,

Lorna Gunn, Grants Manager
Strategic Initiatives

TEL 250 469-8936
FAX 250 862-3312

City of Kelowna 1435 Water Street, Kelowna, BC V1Y 1J4 kelowna.ca

1. Open House and Question Session

Moderator's Report

BCLC invited a number of stakeholder leaders from the area; several were unable to attend due to schedule conflicts.

The meeting began with an Open House during which participants reviewed information materials from BCLC and shared an informal meal. Discussion then opened with a presentation by Paul W. Smith, who described the gaming industry province-wide and its operations in Kelowna including information on the economic impact of gaming. He outlined the regulatory environment within which gaming operates and concluded with an overview of BCLC programs and policies.

Key issues raised in the question period were as follows (responses by Paul W. Smith are in parentheses).

- **On the regulatory side, is BCLC the only one allowed to run lotteries? For example, I understand a quilting group wanted to raffle but was shut down.** (*Charity gaming is regulated via the Gaming Policy Enforcement Branch, e.g. hospital lotteries, etc. Any lottery operated otherwise would be violating the Criminal Code.*)
- **How many applications do you have for new casinos?** (*As an agent of the Crown, the Province has designated BCLC as the authority to conduct and manage lottery schemes within British Columbia. Under current gaming legislation, BCLC is responsible to conduct and manage lottery gaming, casino gaming, and electronic and commercial bingo gaming. BCLC is responsible for making decisions about bingo and casino properties and works with its service providers and host municipalities whenever a decision is made regarding upgrading and relocating a facility.*)
- **What's planned for Big White?** (*There is nothing planned. We don't want to over-saturate the market and undermine our current service providers. There is a casino and a community gaming centre in Kelowna and we wouldn't want to undermine either.*)
- **Do you have jurisdiction on Indian Reserves?** (*There is an agreement that there is no independent native participation in gaming. We have a couple of casinos where we have entered into service provider relationships with native bands; but they don't have the authority to suddenly decide to put in a gaming facility. There is an active attempt by the Osoyoos Indian Band to build a community gaming centre but we're not sure if it will go ahead. An Indian band would have to follow the same process as everyone else. Neither a band nor a municipality can decide to build a casino. That only happens under our authority, and then we seek approval of municipality to proceed.*)
- **Is there some income from horse racing that goes into BC Lotteries funds?** (*The only piece of revenue that comes to the Lottery Corporation is from the slot machines at one track. There is no money going from racetracks to BCLC otherwise.*)

Community Engagement Meeting Report

Date	December 7, 2006
Location	Ramada Lodge Hotel, 2170 Harvey Avenue, Kelowna BC

BCLC Lead and Presenter	Paul W. Smith	BCLC Reps	Greg Walker Scott MacFarlane
Moderator	John Barr	On-site Reporter	Stephanie Tan Bozic
Participating Stakeholders	James Baker, Mayor Lake County District Ki-Low-Na Friendship Society Kelowna & District Safety Council Central Okanagan Foundation School District 23 R.C.M.P. (3) Kelowna residents		
Number of participants	9		

Meeting Context

The Kelowna meeting was the third of a series of community engagement meetings sponsored by BCLC. Its purpose was to elicit the input of community leaders on gaming-related issues and their suggestions concerning the principles which BCLC should follow in managing the gaming industry in the province. Participants were invited on the basis of their demonstrated interest in gaming issues and their leadership roles in various community organizations and local government. BCLC endeavored to gain the participation of a broad cross section of opinion.

To promote informed discussion, an information background report was provided to all participants preceding the meeting. To ensure transparency and the full participation of all attendees, the meeting was moderated by a third-party moderator, John Barr, and the proceedings documented by an independent meeting reporter, Stephanie Tan Bozic. This report is compiled from that documentation.

- **Many think (all) the proceeds from Lottery earnings go to meaningful [government services] like health. To have a line item of money [\$4.6 million last year] going from government to facilitate horse racing...seems curious.** *(The decision on which groups to support is made by government – BCLC isn't involved. Other groups are welcome to make their case to government if they wish.)*
- **What does that \$4.6 million actually buy?** *(It goes to support race purses. It helps to sustain the horse racing industry, all its employment, facilities, etc. The horse racing industry itself is much bigger than just the staging of the races themselves.)*
- **Aren't there other businesses that could make those arguments?** *(I'm sure there are and that's their right if they choose to. I'm just accounting for where the money goes. Those allocation decisions on where the money goes are made by the provincial government. BCLC doesn't have any say on that.)*
- **How are the actual pay-outs of prizes decided? Are they adjusted? How are they structured?** *(It depends on the game. There's a prize structure for each game - it reflects standards across the gaming industry. Whether it is blackjack or some other game, the odds and pay-outs are the same around the industry.)*
- **Can you dial into slot machines and control the payouts?** *(Yes we can. The payout is set according to industry standards and is based on the need to stimulate participation. For example, slots pay out 92%; Lotteries pay out much less. That doesn't mean I'm encouraging you to suddenly stop using one or the other!)*
- **How do you arrive at what each retailer of Lottery products gets?** *(All retailers get a standard commission across the board. It's generally 5% commission plus retailer incentives on any particular products.)*
- **The revenues that go to city, do they go to the City's general revenue?** *(Each city makes its own decision where to spend the money. Richmond, for example, is spending its funds on the Olympics skating oval.)*
- **Say Westside incorporates and becomes a municipality. Would it be entitled to any of [Kelowna's] revenues? Do all municipalities share with neighbors?** *(Revenues go only to the host city. For example the Richmond facility's revenues go to Richmond, and not Vancouver. In a couple of circumstances, through the approval process for a casino there was negotiation [of some revenue sharing] between host and neighboring municipality on the basis that customers might flow across the boundaries. Such agreements are negotiated by municipalities amongst themselves, and not with the involvement of BCLC.)*

- **Do you have any thought [of BCLC revenues] going towards health? Hospitals?** (*\$147 million of BCLC revenue is already dedicated to the health spending account in addition to half a billion going to general revenues. Health care accounts for a significant part of provincial spending.*)
- **Who does GPEB report to? Since it's in the same Ministry that BCLC is in, isn't that like the fox guarding the henhouse?** (*There haven't been issues challenging the regulatory framework being within the same ministry.*)
- **You say your social impact study found that expanded gambling hasn't increased the prevalence? Communities like Kelowna have seniors and many of them gamble, so it would seem that some segments of our community are spending money on gambling that they didn't spend before.** (*GPEB set up the parameters of the social impact study so I can't comment on the specifics. We shouldn't equate the popularity of gambling with problem gambling. For many people, including seniors, gambling is a form of entertainment and social activity in a safe and secure environment, no different that someone else's choice to go see a movie, etc. I understand that there are people who are against gambling in any form, but if you put that aside, most people who gamble do not develop problems and will say that it is okay.*)
- **A question about the process of allocation of net revenue. How is it decided how much goes to charities, health and so on?** (*BCLC doesn't have anything to do with that decision. It's a legislative and government decision, therefore political - the government prioritizes and decides on allocations.*)
- **Is the allocation of revenue reviewed annually?** (*I'm not sure whether it is annual. Let me give you an example of a change in funding. The new SportsFunder lottery, for example, is a fund specifically for amateur sport in the province. All its revenues are now going to support amateur sport. That was seen as a government policy change. Obviously it's of huge interest to the sport community.*)
- **E-gaming: how do you stop people from outside of the province?** (*I'm not an IT person, but my information is that we can identify where you are playing from. The system works quite well. A registered BC player can take his laptop to Alberta and when he tries to log in, he will be blocked. Legally, we can't operate outside the province.*)
- **Where is BCLC headed? How many casinos are there in BC and what's the density?** (*We have been enjoying a fair degree of growth, two major casinos under construction as we speak - New Westminster, Burnaby. Most of our effort will be focused on a couple of facilities seeking growth opportunities. Most of our growth is the conversion of our existing bingo halls to community gaming centre.*)

2. Principles of Operation

The Moderator framed the discussion by reviewing BCLC’s suggested Principles of Operation and asked participants to comment on them.

Principle 1: BC Lottery Corporation should operate or manage legalized gaming in a way that is socially responsible.

Areas of Support

- Participants generally agreed that this Principle is a good one, but in its present form it may be too “motherhood” to constitute a clear and firm guide to conduct.
- There was general agreement that a vital part of social responsibility is the idea that BCLC should exercise restraint in promoting gambling and in maximizing its revenues to avoid undermining the percentage of people (however small) who are potential problem gamblers.
- A few respondents felt that BCLC should not advertise at all, to avoid encouraging problem gambling. The majority felt that it is legitimate for BCLC to be a significant advertiser, given market realities and the fact that consumers need to know about its product offerings.
- Participants felt that BCLC was acting in a socially responsible manner through its present program of offering gambling addicts free and almost immediate treatment and providing response training to casino employees. It was stated that BCLC’s program of voluntary assistance to problem gamblers is a much more enlightened and available service than society is providing to other kinds of addicts (e.g. substance abusers). One participant said, “I think you do an outstanding job with people with addictions.”

Areas of Concern

- Given that gambling is a government monopoly and given that it is a form of entertainment in competition with activities like movies, electronic games, sports and dining out, is it fair that BCLC advertising attracts customers away from those other choices?
- When does advertising cross the line between legitimate promotion of BCLC offerings, and enticement of people who are vulnerable to excessive gambling? While one participant felt that the BCLC should not advertise its products at all, this was not generally supported.
- Some participants felt that the amount of money BCLC earns from gambling (nearly one billion a year) and the amount it spends on advertising (about \$30 million annually) is disproportionate to the amount government spends on gambling addiction and problem gambling (about \$4 million annually).

BCLC – Community Engagement Meeting Report

- A number of participants stated that more well-researched information should be provided to the public about the extent and causes of problem gambling. A stated need is for objective data on the extent of the problem, and trends. One participant asked, “on the basis of available information, how are we to know whether the \$4 million figure for problem gambling is accurate, or how it compares with other jurisdictions?”
- Participants were divided on the question of whether BCLC should be taking a more interventionist approach with problem gamblers; the majority were not prepared to support compulsory intervention (e.g. forcing people identified as compulsive gamblers to take counseling, or banning people thought to be compulsive gamblers). It was generally agreed that the concept of compulsory intervention presents many problems. How do you identify a problem gambler? What are the implications of a more interventionist approach for the protection of privacy? What is the risk that more intervening will simply drive the problem gambler to other venues or forms of gambling?
- Participants were also troubled by a lack of a rationale for taking a more interventionist approach to suspected problem gamblers than society now takes to substance abusers or other people who exhibit compulsive behaviors that are potentially dangerous to them or their families. (It was pointed out by BCLC staff that only 0.4% of gamblers have a severe problem controlling their behavior.)
- There was a concern that, in considering more intervention with compulsive gamblers, we need to keep sight of the principle that legal gambling is age-controlled, voluntary, and that people must be urged to take responsibility for their decisions; there is a limit to how far society should go in trying to manage people’s behavior.

Principle 2: BC Lottery Corporation should ensure that legalized gaming is economically competitive and sustainable

Areas of Support

- Several participants indicated that they had not previously thought of gaming as a competitive business (while government has a monopoly of gaming, gaming itself is in competition with other forms of entertainment.)
- Several participants indicated that the importance of gaming revenue as a source of revenue to the provincial or municipal government, or to charities, was greater than they previously realized.

Areas of Concern

- There is a linkage between the Principle of social responsibility and the Principle of competitiveness and sustainability. Given that gambling is a government monopoly and given that it is a form of entertainment in competition with activities like movies, electronic games,

BCLC – Community Engagement Meeting Report

sports and dining out, is it fair that BCLC advertising attracts customers away from those other choices?

- When does advertising cross the line between legitimate promotion of BCLC offerings, and enticement of people who are vulnerable to excessive gambling? While one participant felt that the BCLC should not advertise its products at all, this was not generally supported.
- If gambling revenues go down, government will simply increase taxes to make up the difference. So why should maintenance of government gambling revenues concern us?
- If this Principle is valid, does that mean BCLC should move into online gaming or video lottery terminals in order to compete efficiently? (Participants were advised by BCLC staff that, as a matter of policy, government has no intention of authorizing VLTs.)
- One participant argued that unlimited revenue growth is not necessarily a good goal for BCLC. Competing with offshore gambling sites may be a good thing because it keeps gaming money in the BC economy, but maximizing BCLC revenue by competing domestically may not be in the best interest of communities.
- The goal of remaining competitive must be balanced with other goals like social responsibility (e.g., spending more money to raise awareness of problem gambling; with exercising restraint in increasing revenues to avoid enticing more people into gambling than would become involved otherwise.)
- A few participants stated they didn't really know whether BCLC's competitive behavior (e.g. Advertising) is "over the top" or not because there wasn't enough hard evidence to know whether advertising gaming is socially responsible.
- Is BCLC's restraint on competitive behavior better than, as good as, or worse than other industries whose products risk increasing addiction (e.g. alcohol producers)? More details on what BCLC does and what other industries do are needed.
- Why not provide a larger number of smaller prizes? (Answer: this is driven by the marketplace. It's a trade-off between the public attractiveness of big prizes and the odds of winning any prize. At present, "scratch" tickets pay off one in four; bigger lotteries, especially the national ones, have to have larger prizes to compensate for the longer odds brought on by the number of people buying tickets. The industry's experience, generally, is that a lot of small prizes do not generate the same level of public expectation.

Principle 3: BC Lottery Corporation should be accountable to government and stakeholders.

The Moderator framed this discussion by pointing out some things that “accountability” does mean or could mean. For example, it clearly does mean “reports to government.” It could also mean “transparent,” “open” or “reports fully”. It probably does not mean “makes all decisions by local vote of stakeholders.”

Areas of Support

- There was very broad support for this Principle but participants felt that it needed sharper definition. As a public agency, BCLC is obviously accountable to government and in a democracy the government, in turn, is accountable to the people. What else does it mean? Participants suggested:
 - “Transparent”
 - Open in its dealings with community groups.
- Participants were supportive of community engagement meetings like this one and felt that this meeting set a good precedent for accountability.
- Several participants said that their first-hand experience with BCLC had been positive, that the organization and GPEB provide a good deal of information to the public, including the process of accessing community grants.

Areas of Concern

- Several questions were asked about media allegations of illegal activity in the Ontario Lotteries retail system. (BCLC staff presented information about this, and about measures that are in force to ensure the integrity of gaming in BC. The number of verified complaints about the operation of the BC system is extremely small.)
- In a certain sense BCLC can’t be “accountable” to everyone or it would become paralyzed. Being accountable fully to public authorities is the most important aspect of accountability. Few of BCLC’s private-sector competitors (e.g. Entertainment industry giants) are as publicly accountable as BCLC.
- There was some support for the idea that major stakeholders of BCLC (the example given was police) should be represented on its Board of Directors.
- There could still be improvements in the access to information for community groups, especially as far as information on how to access funds, eligibility, etc.

Principle 4: Legalized gaming should be regulated in a way that ensures it is fair and efficient.

.Areas of Support

- Participants indicated that most people feel the BC “system” is honest.

Areas of Concern

- This Principle requires more definition of what is meant by “fair” and “efficient.” For example, when it comes to the odds of winning, what is “fair”? (Participants engaged the BCLC staff in a discussion of the trade-offs between higher and lower pay-out ratios and the relative attractiveness of various products to the public.)
- How do we determine what is “fair” when it comes to local communities’ share of gaming revenues?
- Several participants queried the fairness of lotteries in which a large prize may have already been drawn while sale of lottery tickets is still ongoing – should something be done to tell subsequent ticket buyers that the main prize has been won?
- As in previous public engagement meetings in other cities, participants said they were not entirely clear about the respective jurisdictions of BCLC and the Gaming Enforcement Policy Branch.

**APPENDIX:
Participants’ Feedback (from Exit Surveys)**

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don’t Know
How would you rate this meeting as a forum for discussing role BCLC plays in your community?	5	4			
	Yes	No	Don’t Know		
Did it give you an opportunity to provide input on the principles BCLC should follow to be in line with local values?	9				
How would you rate:	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don’t Know
Information provided about gaming in my community	5	4			
Information about BCLC’s role in my community	3	6			
Presenters at the meeting	8	1			
Value for your time	5	3	1		
Overall rating	4	5			
Respondents: 9	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don’t know
BCLC understands the needs of my community	1	8			
BCLC makes a solid contribution to my community	3	6			

BC Gaming - Community Initiative

Hello,

This year's BC Partnership for Responsible Gambling Forum brought together participants from all corners of the province including sectors of government, local communities and service providers of the gaming industry.

As a valued member of the Partnership, we would like to update you of the new initiative BCLC has launched.

The Responsible Gambling Community Initiative (RGCI) is a partnership between BCLC and municipalities to initiate responsible gambling pilot projects responding to community interest in this important subject.

All municipal governments interested in developing pilot projects in their communities are encouraged to submit a proposal for this funding that will only be available through BCLC until March 31, 2010.

Click on the link below to learn more about the RGCI today.

<http://www.bclc.com/cm/wherethemoneygoes/communityengagement.htm>

Sincerely,

Greg Walker
Manager, Public Affairs
Corporate Affairs, BCLC

10760 Shellbridge Way, Richmond, BC V6X 3H1

T 604 276 6410 C 604 220 4144 F 604 276 6485

gwalker@bclc.com

INFORMATION FROM WEBSITE

Interested in applying for the **Responsible Gambling Community Initiative (RGCI)**? View the [application form](#) to learn more about the RGCI and apply. BCLC will respond to your submission within three working weeks.

BCLC has been holding a series of invitation-only meetings with community leaders who are interested in the contributions and impacts of gaming in their communities.

These meetings are designed to stimulate discussion about the role BCLC plays with respect to local government, economic development, health and social services, public safety and benefits in the community.

Presentations and summary reports are being produced for each meeting that takes place and are posted to this webpage. To open a report, please use the links below.

LORNA'S DISCUSSION WITH GREG WALKER – BCLC

This initiative came out of community dialogues facilitated by BCLC in 2006 (separate report attached). BCLC were asked "how are you addressing the impacts of gambling".....and their response was to create a funding program whereby communities can apply.....come up with their own ideas on educating the community on impacts of gambling. It is a \$25,000 matching fund.

I called Greg to get some idea as to what other communities were doing. Examples he gave were:

Prince George – have asked their United Way to hold a community forum on problem gambling with speakers well versed on the issue.

Another City (can't remember which one) partnered with the School District and students created a play called "Know the Score" that was performed in the schools and throughout the community.

City of Coquitlam organized events and created a "Responsible Gambling Week".

APPLICATION FORM:

In its engagement with communities since 2006, BCLC has been asked by community leaders what they can do about responsible gambling concerns.

The Responsible Gambling Community Initiative (RGCI) has been created to provide an answer to that question.

RGCI is a partnership between BCLC and communities in British Columbia to identify and address responsible gambling issues at the community level.

Under the terms of this initiative, BCLC **will match funds** put forward by a community to launch a gaming-related initiative.

This offer is open until March 31, 2010.

A community initiative could involve working with BCLC to achieve an agreed result, or it could involve an independent project for which the community requests funds (matching the amount the community provides for the initiative).

To apply for the RGCI, please complete the application form below. BCLC will be in contact with you within three working weeks.

Community Name:	<input type="text"/>
First Name:	<input type="text"/>
Last Name:	<input type="text"/>
Title/Position:	<input type="text"/>
Telephone:	<input type="text"/>
Cell Phone:	<input type="text"/>
Fax:	<input type="text"/>
Address:	<input type="text"/>
City:	<input type="text"/>
Postal Code:	<input type="text"/>
Website:	<input type="text"/>

**What will be the purpose of the initiative you wish to undertake within your community?
(75 words or less)**

What is the scope of work for this initiative? (100 words or less)

▲
▼

What are the measurable goals for this initiative? (200 words or less)

▲
▼

What will be the indicators of success of this project? (200 words or less)

▲
▼

Why will this project make a difference in your community? (200 words or less)

▲
▼

What level of funding is your community prepared to provide (to be matched by BCLC)?

Submit

CITY OF KELOWNA

SECURITY RISK ANALYSIS SESSION AGENDA & GUIDLINES

Date of Session: August 7, 2009

Location of Session: Veendam Room, City Hall

Facilitator: Lance Kayfish

PARTICIPANTS

Stu Evans	Ian Wilson
John Hemmett	Martin Johansen
Rob Mayne	Darryl Astofooroff
Stephen Fleming	George King

WORKING DOCUMENTS FOR SESSION:

1. **Security Risk / Issue Analysis Worksheet** (to be completed by participants at beginning of the session)
2. **Risk Register** (to be completed in facilitated session on projected screen)
3. **Measurement Tool** (used to complete the Risk Level section of the Register)
4. **Treatment – Action Plan** (to be used by participants following session)

A. Purpose of the Risk Analysis

The purpose of the *Security Risk Analysis Session* is to **identify corporate security risks** by building an inventory of issues and current treatments. Then begin prioritizing security issues for mitigation action and identify potential further actions. The end goal being to identify and analyze key strategic security risks that do, or have the potential too, significantly impact a specific unit, project or the entire City and develop an appropriate action plan.

B. Deliverable #1 for Security Risk Analysis Session

The deliverable for this session will be a Security Risk / Issue list and ***Risk Register for Corporate Security Issues***. Those that want to complete a *Risk Treatment Action Plan* for issues identified in the session are encouraged to do so. Risk management will provide advice and assistance if required.

C. Deliverable #2 for Security Risk Analysis Session

The City of Kelowna has been given a significant grant from the province to audit camera use by the City and to increase use of CCTV for security and public safety. Following from the discussion about corporate security issues globally the group will brainstorm ideas regarding questions to be addressed within an audit of current CCTV camera use that will be used to define a scope of work for a third-party review. Also, the group will provide input on ideas for the best use of further CCTV camera resources to benefit the corporation and community.

**RISK ANALYSIS
Measurement Tool**

LIKELIHOOD MEASURE: The probability of the risk event occurring.

Score	Likelihood	Description
1	Improbable, Rare	May occur in exceptional circumstances
2	Unlikely	Could occur if circumstances change
3	Possible	Might occur under current circumstances
4	Likely	Will probably occur in most circumstances
5	Almost Certain	Is expected to occur unless circumstances change

CONSEQUENCE MEASURE: Degree of severity of the consequence should the risk occur

Consequence Levels	People, Damages & Liability	Operational Effects	Reputation (Internal & External)
Insignificant 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very limited # of employees or public affected • Very limited loss • Very limited damage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negligible effects • Very minor disruption • Very minor overruns/loss of FTE • Very minor loss of data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No/minor impact on trust (internal) • No/minor external or media attention
Minor 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited # of employees or public affected • Minor Injuries or damage • Limited loss of assets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Normal administrative difficulty • Minor disruptions or losses in services, data or FTE. • Minor cost overruns / implications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor setback in trust (internal) • Some unfavorable external/media attention
Moderate 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate # of employees, or public affected • Loss of large physical asset (replaceable) • Serious injuries or moderate damage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay in accomplishing program/project • Moderate disruption of essential services, data or FTE • Some loss of service, data or FTE. • Moderate cost overruns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some loss of trust (internal) • Negative media attention • Negative audit or student outcome rating.
Major 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major number of employees, or public affected • Loss of major asset • Serious injury or major damage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program/project redesign required (fundamental rework) • Major disruption of essential services, data or FTE • Major cost overruns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major loss of trust (internal) • Public outcry for removal of official • Strong criticism in audit
Catastrophic (Significant or Extreme) 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant # of employees, or public affected • Significant or extreme funding decrease • Significant or extreme damage • Death or significant disability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program/project irrevocably finished (objective will not be met) • Essential services disrupted for extended periods • Total loss of service, data or FTE • Extreme cost overruns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public call for change in Administration/Council • Internal vote of non-confidence • Very negative public ratings.

Security Risk Treatment - Action Plan Template

Unit: _____

Initiator: _____

Date: _____

Risk Level: _____

Treatment - Action Plan

Description of Risk:

Potential Impacts:

Current Risk Mitigation (list):

Action Plan

Proposed Actions (list):	By whom:	By when:

Resources Required (\$): _____

Plan Approved: Comments: _____

Resources Approved: Comments: _____

Review Date: _____

Unit Leader: _____ Date: _____