
Special Forum Workshop Report in this issue:-

1 of 2 - FORUM Report - the tale of two workshops - the morning

Having registered for our SIG workshop due Wednesday afternoon, I called in at another presentation from two of our members

Appendix 1

attached

NB. The SIG had a table reserved in the restaurant for lunch, ten or so of our members had an all to infrequent chance to get together. Also, I met Marya Vasilyeva who had come all the way from Ukraine to visit the Forum - welcome to our Group, Marya.

2 of 2 - and then there was the afternoon

"Snap, crackle and pop" was the catchy title of this rather apt, and even melodramatic acting out of stress and

Appendix 2

attached

And now for the football - the something different feature

Watching "Final Score" the other Saturday afternoon (20th September), my attention was drawn to a difference of opinion between two of

Appendix 3

attached

Thought for the month:

"A memorandum is written not to inform the reader but to protect the writer"
Dean Acheson. 1893 - 1971. American lawyer. (Somethings don't change. Ed)

Our next issue will be out late **October** or early **November**. But we still need **your** contributions on any subject related to our sphere of research. So please keep those letters coming in.

Bruce Widdowson

Secretary

e-mail bruce.widdowson@btinternet.com Tel. 0115 986 3254

Appendices

1 of 2 - FORUM Report - the tale of two workshops - the morning

Having registered for our SIG Workshop due Wednesday afternoon, I called in at another presentation from two of our members that was running before our SIG lunch at the venue - David Parrott MIRM and Bernadette Welsh MIRM of the Unilever team presented "The three horses of product innovation". This was a well ran and well attended workshop in the "presentation with Q & A" format that dealt

with: getting “creative” minds to engage in efficient RM; practical ways to overcome behaviour bias and linking critical risks with key decision points.

Your editor regarded this as being largely a “people type” workshop that warranted a visit. I suppose the people aspect of the first *horse* is initially one of tact, creativity mustn't be dampened by bringing in the risk (threat) factors at the very start, but before costs and exposures gather pace – timing being of the essence and fits in with the “decision gates” concept. The “practical ways to overcome behaviour bias” *horse* has implications for operational risk as well as the project side and the final, “linking critical risks with key decision points” *horse* also has implications for strategic risk. All showing that risk, including people exposures is multi dimensional.

I will only comment within this *NEWSLETTER* on points that are relevant to the current topic, but will retain other information gleaned for reference later in our research. The two items for this month are:

(a) The right people were brought in early, but initially communication was not through workshops, which were not convened until well into the project, probably around half way or a little later – this was in support of the *Delphi* concept we have looked at recently, but with a modification for meeting up later on ([the best of both worlds, with much of the filtering of data out of the way before the more costly meeting](#). Ed)

(b) When negotiating with people in Europe, Latin America and elsewhere, an audio visual link is set up to assist in communication. This would appear to run contrary to the option of anonymity that was available if required with *Delphi* – we will come back to this point later within this issue.

2 of 2 – and then there was the afternoon

“Snap, crackle and pop”, was the catchy title of this rather apt, and even melodramatic acting out of stress and risk in a mock boardroom situation at the *Big Rock Bank*. The production was devised and directed by Pauline Bird MIRM with back up on the day from Andrew Mills FIRM and out thanks to them and the whole support team who helped set up this most creative workshop.

Each delegate was issued with an explanatory leaflet (in view of the time aspect, this was for taking away and reading later) explaining that one of the key variables in crisis management is the behaviour of individuals who are actually dealing with the emergency (examples of extreme behaviour and analyses of actual incidents where quoted within the leaflet). It was further pointed out that there is no “one size fits all” – risk attitude and behaviour is as individual as a fingerprint, and in fact may vary day to day. Risk communications within organisations vary and there are many drivers of individual's risk perceptions.

Delegates were then split into groups to constitute members of a mock board meeting and were handed summary sheets which provided information about the *Big Rock Bank* under the categories of: history; current effects of the credit crunch; staff conduct which involved a long tale of woes and media reports (actual and potential). Each delegate was to assume a given role (CEO; CFO and similar) the summary sheet had a different last section accordingly that listed the shortcomings and past behaviour of the character that the delegate was playing.

The mock board meeting then took place (duplicated by the second group) with a proper agenda leading up to trying to rescue the organisation by a rights issue. The actual stress on and performance of individual delegates was very interesting to experience and observe - there will be throwbacks to this in future issues as aspects become relevant.

Some of you will smile when I advise that your editor and one of his cohorts had to be spoken to by the Chairman for disturbing the meeting with raucous laughter when enacting some of the unknown shortcomings of the Chief Financial Officer's *extramural* activities. [Well, training doesn't have to be taxing. Ed.](#)

And now for the football

Watching "Final Score" the other Saturday afternoon (20th September) my attention was drawn to a difference of opinion between two of the experts, the issue arose out of the result, a goalless draw, between Liverpool and Stoke City ([for readers not familiar with the English Premier Division, Liverpool are one of the top teams and Stoke City are near the bottom of the current table having been promoted from a lower division last year - Liverpool should have won comfortably on their home ground](#)).

It was reported that Liverpool had, as predicted, scored a goal in the opening minutes of the game, but it had been dis-allowed by the referee. One expert said that it had altered the course of the game, whereas another (Garth Crooks) said that Liverpool had all the rest of the match to do something about it.

By way of contrast, in another similar game, Bolton ([a lower team](#)) against Arsenal ([a top team](#)) Bolton, playing at home, scored first, but Arsenal recovered and put on a blistering display of football scoring two goals in as many minutes and going on the win 1-3 against the home side. As Garth Crooks rightly said, "Bolton got them angry" (by scoring first). The anger was correctly directed into skilful play and they banged three back in payment.

The point(s) of all this for our SIG

Anger in the workplace will be looked at further in a later issue, but for today we will consider the position of Liverpool, who were in different circumstances to Arsenal in the other match. Arsenal had a goal scored against them which no doubt spurred on the Bolton home crowd as well as the home team - in spite of this, Arsenal responded magnificently as described above. The Liverpool game was different - like Bolton they scored a goal in the early stages of the game in front of the home crowd - then they suffered *injustice* (or *perceived injustice if the referee was correct*) after the goal had been disallowed. A sense of *injustice* can cause anger to overflow and could be argued to be another form of temporary autism - in a team, we see the scenario of group temporary autism - further, in front of a home crowd this could be fuelled by mass anger and even a degree of hysteria. Again, this is all part of the more advanced "People exposures" that we will have to examine in the future.

The second point to emerge from this is the perspective of the two experts: one said it altered the course of the game, the other shrugged his shoulders and said they had almost the whole length of the game left to do something about it. I would put the case, that they were both right as *truth* can also be multi-dimensional, depending

largely on perspective – still that's another story. The matter for the subject matter in this issue, is that the earlier mentioned use of a video link up to speed commercial communication can be good *and* the use of the anonymous *Delphi* option can be good too.

Remember, “there is no “one size fits all” – risk attitude and behaviour is as individual as a fingerprint”, ([nice one, Pauline](#)). It is the responsibility of the manager/decision maker involved to select the tools that are felt to be best for the job.