| | Risk Score Report - As of June 30, 20 |)23 | | | | R | isk Stat | tus |
|------------------|--|----------|---|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Organizations t | hrive by taking risks, but falter when risks are not managed effectively | . Risks | Inherent | | one or | very high | | 1-50 |
| 1 | present in the work we do at CaISTRS, which is why we implement inte igate these inherent risks. However, the possibility of residual risk, aft | | | nout any acti in place to re | | high | 3: | 1-40 |
| | en to mitigate risk, does exist. | or an | - | d or impact. | | medi | um 2: | 1-30 |
| This Risk Score | Report identifies the inherent risks and residual risks in each of the ri | sk | Residua Risk rem | I Risk naining after | | low | 1: | 1-20 |
| categories at Ca | gories at CalSTRS and any corresponding changes since the last reporting perember 31, 2022. | | implementing actions and controls to remove or mana | | s and | very l | ow 1- | 10 |
| | | | risk. | | | | | |
| Strategic | Goal 1: Trusted stewards (G1: TS) | Stra | itegic | A, B, C, D, | | Risk | Avoid | |
| | Goal 2: Leading innovation and managing change (G2: LI) | | | A, B, C, D, | <u>с, г</u> | | Reduce | |
| Goals | Goal 3: Sustainable organization (G3: S0) | Obje | ctives | A, B, C, D | | Responses | Share Accept | |
| | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | Inherent | Inherent | Residual | Residual |
| 1 | Pension Funding - Investments | | | | Risk | Period | Risk | Period |
| | | | | | Score | Change | Score | Change |
| Fund perform | nance objectives not achieved as set in the Investment Policy | and Ma | anageme | ent Plan. | 23 | J -2 | 18 | J -3 |
| The overall inh | herent risk score for the category decreased by two points to 23 | 3, which | is in alig | gnment with | the mediu | m-risk range (d | range ban | d) of the heat |

map. In addition, the overall residual risk score decreased by 3 points to 18, which is in alignment with the low-risk range (yellow band) of the heat map. These decreases reflect a recent reassessment of both inherent and residual scores in terms of the impact of the headquarters expansion and pension solution project resources on investment operations now that the Pillars project has been successfully completed. Based on the reassessment, it was determined that these projects do not directly impact investment returns and the scores were updated to reflect this consideration. From a mitigation standpoint, the CalSTRS team is in the process of implementing a tool to enhance monitoring and oversight of portfolio performance. Staff is also working to develop an implementation strategy for an enhanced Regulatory Oversight Program within the Investments Branch.

In November 2022, the Investments Branch presented the annual Investment Cost Report and the Collaborative Model Savings Report to the board. The Cost Report was based on 2021 calendar year information and found that CalSTRS continues to manage the portfolio at a lesser comparable cost than peers.

| Sub-Risk | Weight | Sub-Risk Statement | Strategic Goal | Strategic Objective | Risk Response | | | | |
|----------|--------|--|-------------------|------------------------|------------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| A | 35% | The fund will not achieve the actuarially expected return over the long term (30 years/absolute return), which may prevent CalSTRS from reaching full funding by 2046. | G1: TS | A, B, C | Reduce | 20 | No Change | 16 | No Change |
| В | 45% | CalSTRS will not be able to implement strategies and tools necessary to manage risk associated with a more complex and volatile investment environment, which may hinder Investments Branch ability to capitalize on value added investment opportunities. | G1: TS | A, B, C, D | Reduce | 32 | J -4 | 24 | J -8 |
| С | 20% | The fund will not add value above the total fund benchmarks return over the long term (Relative return), which may create stakeholder uncertainty in CalSTRS ability to effectively manage risk and implement investment strategies. | G1: TS | A, B, C | Reduce | 12 | No Change | 9 | No Change |
| | | | | | | Inherent | Inherent | Residual | Residual |

| 2 | Pension Funding - Actuarial | Risk Score | Period Change | Residual Risk Score | Period Change |
|-----------------|---|---------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| Actuarial metho | odologies and assumptions vary from experience. | 22 | No Change | 20 | No Change |

The overall residual risk score for this category remains at 20 and in alignment with the low-risk range (yellow band) of the heat map. In May 2023, staff presented the June 30, 2022 actuarial valuation to the board and despite the negative investment return in fiscal year 2021-22, the funded status improved slightly and the funding plan is still on track to reach full funding by 2046. Staff is currently preparing the next Review of Funding Levels and Risk report which will take an in depth look at the risks and challenges to funding the system. Work has also begun on the next experience study, which will examine the economic and demographic actuarial assumptions to ensure they remain reasonable and appropriate. The experience study will be presented to the board in January 2024. The board adopted a new asset allocation as part of the ALM process in May 2023 and, based on the capital market assumptions adopted earlier, it is anticipated that no change will be recommended to the current 7% assumed investment return in the experience study.

| Sub-Risk | Weight | Sub-Risk Statement | Strategic Goal | Strategic Objective | Risk Response | | | | |
|----------|--------|--|-------------------|------------------------|------------------|----|-----------|----|-----------|
| А | 80% | Over the long-term actual experience significantly differs negatively from actuarial assumptions, which could result in the inability to achieve full funding by 2046. | G1: TS | А | Reduce | 24 | No Change | 24 | No Change |
| В | 10% | There is a risk that actuarial assumptions negatively differ from actuarial experience, caused by incorrect information underlying the actuarial assumptions, which could result in the inability to achieve full funding. | G1: TS | Α | Reduce | 18 | No Change | 9 | No Change |
| С | 10% | Inappropriate measures of actuarial obligations and costs, caused by invalid actuarial methodologies, could result in the inability to achieve full funding by 2046. | G1: TS | А | Reduce | 9 | No Change | 6 | No Change |

| | Risk Score Report - As of June 30, 202 | 23 | | | R | isk Stat | us |
|-----------------|---|---------------|---|----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Organizations t | hrive by taking risks, but falter when risks are not managed effectively. F | Risks | nt Risk | | very h | nigh 41 | -50 |
| 1 | resent in the work we do at CalSTRS, which is why we implement internatigate these inherent risks. However, the possibility of residual risk, after | ai control | ithout any act s in place to i | | high | 31- | -40 |
| | en to mitigate risk, does exist. | likeliho | ood or impact | • | medi | ım 21- | -30 |
| This Risk Score | Report identifies the inherent risks and residual risks in each of the risk | | i al Risk maining aftei | • | low | 11- | -20 |
| | gories at CalSTRS and any corresponding changes since the last reporting periember 31, 2022. | | implementing actions and controls to remove or manage | | | ow 1-1 | .0 |
| | | risk. | | | | | |
| Stratagia | Goal 1: Trusted stewards (G1: TS) | Stratogia | A, B, C, D, | | Diele | Avoid | |
| Strategic | Goal 2: Leading innovation and managing change (G2: LI) | Strategic | A, B, C, D, | E, F | Risk | Reduce | |
| Goals | Goal 3: Sustainable organization (G3: S0) | Objectives | A, B, C, D | | Responses | Share Accept | |
| | | | | Inherent | Inherent | Residual | Residual |
| 3 | Pension Funding - Contribution Rate | | | Risk | Period | Risk | Period |
| | | | | Score | Change | Score | Change |
| Insufficient c | ontribution rates to amortize unfunded actuarial obligation. | | | 20 | No Change | 15 | No Change |

The overall residual risk score for this category remains at 15 and in alignment with the low-risk range (yellow band) of the heat map. In May 2023, staff presented the June 30, 2022 actuarial valuation to the board and it was determined that current contribution levels were sufficient to keep the funding plan on track to reach full funding by 2046. As a result the board elected to maintain the same contribution rates for fiscal year 2023-24 as were in effect for fiscal year 2022-23 for both the state and employers. Several factors could put pressure on CalSTRS' ability to collect sufficient contributions to reach full funding: investment volatility is the most significant pressure and despite the large increase in the number of active teachers CalSTRS experienced in fiscal year 2021-22, continued declines in enrollment in K-12 public schools could impact the ongoing appropriateness of CalSTRS 3.5% payroll growth assumption. These pressures will be examined further in the Review of Funding Levels and Risk report in November 2023 as well as in the experience study that will be presented to the board in January 2024.

| Sub-Risk | Weight | Sub-Risk Statement | Strategic Goal | Strategic Objective | Risk Response | | | | |
|----------|--------|---|-------------------|------------------------|------------------|----|-----------|----|-----------|
| Α | 70% | The board's limited authority to change contribution rates per AB 1469 could result in insufficient contributions to reach full funding by 2046. | G1: TS | А | Reduce | 24 | No Change | 20 | No Change |
| В | 30% | Failure of the board to exercise their authority to adequately fund the Defined Benefit Program to its fullest extent could result in insufficient contributions to reach full funding by 2046. | G1: TS | A, D | Reduce | 12 | No Change | 6 | No Change |

| 4 | Pension Administration | Inherent Risk Score | Inherent Period Change | Residual Risk Score | Residual Period Change |
|---|---|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| - | accurate delivery of benefits and services due to inadequate or failure of processes, stems, staff actions or data. | 35 | No Change | 25 | No Change |

The overall residual risk score for this category remains at 25 and in alignment with the medium-risk range (orange band) of the heat map. Staff continue to assess potential impacts of the Pension Solution Project delays in relation to extending the maintenance timeframe of the current legacy system, START. Technology Services remains proactive in the identification and monitoring of potential challenges in retaining or recruiting resources with the necessary technical skills to extend the lifespan of the legacy system. Staff continue to monitor and track the workload of resources needed to support legislated enhancements related to AB1667 and SB868 during the current moratorium on START enhancements.

| Sub-Risk | Weight | Sub-Risk Statement | Strategic Goal | Strategic Objective | Risk Response | | | | |
|----------|--------|---|-------------------|------------------------|------------------|----|-----------|----|-----------|
| А | 30% | CalSTRS is unable to ensure accurate and timely benefits due to the aged pension administration system's (START) failure to pay benefits timely. | G2: LI | A, C | Reduce | 45 | No Change | 32 | No Change |
| В | 30% | During the transition period, the loss of mainframe knowledgeable staff may result in the inability to continuously maintain START and properly service members until the new pension administration system is fully operational. | G2: LI | А | Reduce | 45 | No Change | 32 | No Change |
| С | 20% | Inability to deliver timely benefits and services due to incomplete, inaccurate and late employer reporting. | G2: LI | A | Reduce | 21 | No Change | 15 | No Change |
| D | 20% | Inaccurate benefit payments caused by current system limitations, manual processes and unknown system defects. | G2: LI | А | Reduce | 24 | No Change | 16 | No Change |

| | Risk Score Report - As of June 30, 2023 | 3 | | | R | isk Stat | us |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| Organizations tl | nrive by taking risks, but falter when risks are not managed effectively. Ris | ks Risk with | t Risk hout any acti | ions or | very h | nigh 41 | -50 |
| 1 | resent in the work we do at CaISTRS, which is why we implement internal gate these inherent risks. However, the possibility of residual risk, after all | controls | in place to r | educe | high | 31 | -40 |
| | en to mitigate risk, does exist. | likelihoo Residua | d or impact. | | mediu | ım 21 | -30 |
| This Risk Score | Report identifies the inherent risks and residual risks in each of the risk | Risk ren | naining after | | low | 11 | -20 |
| December 31, 2 | alSTRS and any corresponding changes since the last reporting period, 2022. | controls | enting action to remove o | | very lo | ow 1-1 | _0 |
| | Goal 1: Trusted stewards (G1: TS) | risk. | A, B, C, D, | E | | Avoid | |
| Strategic | | trategic | A, B, C, D, | E, F | Risk | Reduce | |
| Goals | Goal 3: Sustainable organization (G3: S0) | ojectives | A, B, C, D | | Responses | Share Accept | |
| 5 | Financial Reporting | | | Inherent Risk Score | Inherent Period Change | Residual Risk Score | Residual Period Change |
| | ancial information and/or weaknesses in internal controls may r ce with accounting standards and jeopardize an unmodified audi | _ | nificant | 20 | No Change | 8 | No Change |
| staff's ongoing | sidual risk score for this category remains at 8 and in alignment with goonfidence in the effectiveness of CalSTRS internal controls over the material nature implemented in the last year. | _ | _ | • | · | - | |
| Sub-Risk Weight | Sub-Risk Statement Strate | | | | | | |
| A 100% | | al Objective | e Response | | | | |
| | Information received from subsidiary systems is recorded incorrectly in the general ledger, which could result in the financial statements being materially misstated and the external auditors issuing a modified opinion. | | Response Reduce | 20 | No Change | 8 | No Change |
| 6 | Information received from subsidiary systems is recorded incorrectly in the general ledger, which could result in the financial statements being materially G2: | | | 20 Inherent Risk Score | No Change Inherent Period Change | 8 Residual Risk Score | No Change Residual Period Change |
| | Information received from subsidiary systems is recorded incorrectly in the general ledger, which could result in the financial statements being materially misstated and the external auditors issuing a modified opinion. | LI A, C | Reduce | Inherent Risk | Inherent Period | Residual Risk | Residual Period |
| Loss of information breaches. The overall residual by a third-part remains a control CalSTRS systematical control con | Information received from subsidiary systems is recorded incorrectly in the general ledger, which could result in the financial statements being materially misstated and the external auditors issuing a modified opinion. Information Security | ed or unintended ith the highly version efficient to reduce the scheduled to the scheduled | entional risk range (olatile cybe uce the resi forts to con dent Cybers to be prese | Inherent Risk Score 49 (red band) of security latest this risk security Assecurity Assec | Inherent Period Change No Change of the heat mandscape. A receive of the incider | Residual Risk Score 38 D. Security recent cyberse at. Information and an experience of the cyberse of the cybe | Residual Period Change No Change emains the ecurity incident on Security oring of august 2023 |

| Sub-Risk | Weight | Sub-Risk Statement | Strategic Goal | Strategic Objective | Risk Response | | | | |
|----------|--------|---|-------------------|------------------------|------------------|----|-----------|----|-----------|
| Α | 88% | A highly volatile cyber-risk landscape and a limited number of staff could result in an information security breach or incident at CalSTRS. | G3: S0 | D | Reduce | 50 | No Change | 40 | No Change |
| В | 4% | The absence of proper Information Security Program management and oversight could result in an information security breach or incident at CalSTRS. | G3: S0 | D | Reduce | 36 | No Change | 24 | No Change |
| С | 4% | A lack of employee security awareness could result in an information security breach or incident at CalSTRS. | G3: S0 | D | Reduce | 40 | No Change | 24 | No Change |
| D | 4% | A highly volatile cyber-risk landscape and insufficient resources could result in increased cyber-fraud risk as it relates to a security breach or incident at CalSTRS. | G3: S0 | D | Reduce | 40 | No Change | 27 | No Change |

| | Risk Score Report - As of June 30, 20 |)23 | | | | R | isk Stat | us |
|------------------------------------|---|----------|---------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Organizations t | nrive by taking risks, but falter when risks are not managed effectively | /. Risks | Inheren | t Risk hout any acti | ione or | very h | nigh 41 | -50 |
| | resent in the work we do at CalSTRS, which is why we implement inte gate these inherent risks. However, the possibility of residual risk, aft | | controls | in place to r | educe | high | 31 | -40 |
| | en to mitigate risk, does exist. | | Residua | od or impact. | | medi | ım 21 | -30 |
| This Risk Score | Report identifies the inherent risks and residual risks in each of the ri | isk | | naining after | | low | 11 | -20 |
| categories at Ca December 31, 2 | aISTRS and any corresponding changes since the last reporting period 2022. | , | controls | enting action to remove o | | very l | ow 1-1 | LO |
| Strategic Goals | Goal 1: Trusted stewards (G1: TS) Goal 2: Leading innovation and managing change (G2: LI) Goal 3: Sustainable organization (G3: S0) | | risk. Itegic ctives | A, B, C, D, A, B, C, D, A, B, C, D | | Risk Responses | Avoid Reduce Share Accept | |
| 7 | Operational | | | | Inherent Risk Score | Inherent Period Change | Residual Risk Score | Residual Period Change |
| | hieve business objectives due to lack of compliance with inte o technology systems, or loss of critical staff knowledge. | ernal co | ontrols, l | ack of | 32 | 1 | 19 | No Change |
| The overall inl | nerent risk score for the category increased by one point to 32. | This inc | crease is | a result of | the combin | ation of two su | ıb-risks rela | ted to |

The overall inherent risk score for the category increased by one point to 32. This increase is a result of the combination of two sub-risks related to disruptions to business operations as both shared identical mitigation strategies, and the removal of one sub-risk due to the organization's successful operationalization of the Pillars Project which was established to support the implementation of CalSTRS Collaborative Model. In addition, two sub-risks reflect lowered residual scores as a result of an organizational increase in staffing retention rates. Furthermore, an in-depth reevaluation of the remaining sub-risks resulted in their reweighting, with particular emphasis placed on the combined sub-risk, ultimately contributing to the slight increase in the inherent risk score. The overall residual risk score did not change this period and remains in alignment with the low-risk range (yellow band) of the heat map.

| • | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|--------|---|-------------------|------------------------|------------------|----|-----------|----|-------------|
| Sub-Risk | Weight | Sub-Risk Statement | Strategic Goal | Strategic Objective | Risk Response | | | | |
| A | 30% | In the event of a disaster, and/or full or partial disruption to the CalSTRS datacenter, CalSTRS may not be able to provide mission critical business processes to our members due to inaccessibility to technology systems. | G3: S0 | A, D | Reduce | 36 | No Change | 24 | No Change |
| В | 15% | There is a risk that the transition to a blended working model may result in disruptions to operational, enterprise initiatives, and business goals due to a potential adverse shift in CalSTRS' culture caused by changes to how we communicate and collaborate. | G2: LI G3: S0 | D A, D | Reduce | 36 | No Change | 15 | No Change |
| С | 15% | CalSTRS lacks the ability to meet critical business functions due to recruitment challenges. | G3: S0 | А | Reduce | 28 | No Change | 15 | J -3 |
| D | 10% | CalSTRS is unable to meet critical business functions or maintain service levels due to potential loss of subject matter experts and lack of CalSTRS knowledge transfer. | G3: S0 | А | Reduce | 32 | No Change | 21 | J -3 |
| E | 15% | Staff and leadership turnover could result in loss of long-term business stability and sustainability. | G3: S0 | А | Reduce | 24 | No Change | 18 | No Change |
| F | 5% | CalSTRS may fail to identify risks caused by staff not being fully engaged for various reasons including competing priorities, which could result in CalSTRS being unprepared for future risks. | G1: TS | E | Reduce | 36 | No Change | 15 | No Change |
| G | 5% | CalSTRS may not establish or maintain the proper health and safety strategies, measures, training, etc., resulting in compromised employee health and safety. | G3: S0 | А | Reduce | 32 | No Change | 21 | No Change |
| н | 5% | CalSTRS is unable to complete the Headquarters Expansion Project within the established scope, schedule and budget due to delays with construction (i.e. inspections, approvals or materials) and the additional costs/timeframes associated with those delays. | G3: S0 | С | Reduce | 24 | No Change | 15 | No Change |

| Risk Score Report - As of June 30, 2023 | | | | | | Risk Status | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------|---------------------|--|
| Organizations thrive by taking risks, but falter when risks are not managed effectively. Risks Risk without any actions or | | | | | very h | nigh 41 | 41-50 | | |
| are inherently p | | controls in place to reduce | | | high | 31 | -40 | | |
| actions are take | actions are taken to mitigate risk, does exist. | | | likelihood or impact. Residual Risk | | | um 21 | 21-30 | |
| This Risk Score Report identifies the inherent risks and residual risks in each of the risk Risk | | | | naining after | | low | 11 | 11-20 | |
| categories at CalSTRS and any corresponding changes since the last reporting period, December 31, 2022. | | | implementing actions and controls to remove or manage | | very l | ow 1-1 | 1-10 | | |
| | Goal 1: Trusted stewards (G1: TS) | | risk. | ARCD | F | | Avoid | | |
| Strategic | Goal 2: Leading innovation and managing change (G2: LI) | Stra | A, B, C, D, E A, B, C, D, E, F A, B, C, D | | Risk | Reduce | | | |
| Goals | Goal 3: Sustainable organization (G3: S0) | Obje | | | | Responses | | | |
| | | | | _ | | | Accept | | |
| 8 | Reputational | | | | Inherent Risk | Inherent Period | Residual | Residual Period | |
| | dence in CalSTRS as a respected fiduciary of public funds. The rent risk score for this category increased by one point to 32 | 0: 55 | | | Score 32 | Change 1 | Score 22 | Change No Change | |

The overall inherent risk score for this category increased by one point to 32. Staff removed one sub-risk due to the effectiveness of the organization's mitigations in ensuring candidate qualifications and education are assessed and validated prior to final offer of employment. In addition, the weighting associated with this sub-risk was reallocated to sub-risk B regarding the risks to reputation as a result of transformational efforts. The overall residual risk score did not change this period and remains in alignment with the medium-risk range (orange band) of the heat map.

| Sub-Risk | Weight | Sub-Risk Statement | Strategic Goal | Strategic Objective | Risk Response | | | | |
|----------|--------|--|-------------------|------------------------|------------------|----|-----------|----|-----------|
| Α | 25% | A board or staff member engages in unethical behavior resulting in reputational damage. | G3: S0 | D, E | Avoid | 28 | No Change | 24 | No Change |
| В | 30% | CalSTRS is unable to implement transformational efforts, which could impact stakeholders, members, staff and public confidence. | G2: LI | Α | Reduce | 40 | No Change | 24 | No Change |
| С | 20% | Investments may be perceived as conducting business in an imprudent and unethical manner due to a lack of transparency in CalSTRS ESG focused investment efforts, resulting in a loss of public trust. | G1: TS G2: LI | A, B, D A | Reduce | 30 | No Change | 24 | No Change |
| D | 15% | There is a risk that CalSTRS may need to correct inaccurate reporting of business and financial information which may result in a loss of public trust and harm to our reputation. | G1: TS G2: LI | A, B, D | Reduce | 30 | No Change | 16 | No Change |
| E | 10% | CalSTRS is unable to meet member service expectations due to resource constraints resulting from competing priorities. | G2: LI | А | Reduce | 21 | No Change | 12 | No Change |

Risk Score Report - As of June 30, 2023 **Risk Status Inherent Risk** very high 41-50 Organizations thrive by taking risks, but falter when risks are not managed effectively. Risks Risk without any actions or are inherently present in the work we do at CalSTRS, which is why we implement internal 31-40 high controls in place to reduce controls, to mitigate these inherent risks. However, the possibility of residual risk, after all likelihood or impact. actions are taken to mitigate risk, does exist. 21-30 medium **Residual Risk** 11-20 low This Risk Score Report identifies the inherent risks and residual risks in each of the risk Risk remaining after implementing actions and categories at CalSTRS and any corresponding changes since the last reporting period, 1-10 very low December 31, 2022. controls to remove or manage risk. Goal 1: Trusted stewards (G1: TS) A, B, C, D, E Avoid **Strategic** Strategic Risk A, B, C, D, E, F Goal 2: Leading innovation and managing change (G2: LI) Reduce Goal 3: Sustainable organization (G3: S0) A, B, C, D Share **Objectives** Responses Goals Accept Inherent Inherent Residual Residual 9 **Transformational Change** Period Risk Period Risk Change Change Score Score 33 CalSTRS is unable to accomplish major transformational change initiatives. 39 No Change No Change

The overall residual risk score remains at 33, which is also in alignment with the high-risk range (red band) of the heat map. The highest rated residual sub-risk for this category remains sub-risk A, which relates to potential delays in the successful implementation of the new pension administration system. The Pension Solution project team continues to monitor the efforts of the project by identifying critical path activities and associated metrics to track effectiveness. Staff will reevaluate risk scoring once a vendor contract and updated schedule are approved by the board. Note: Pension Solution will provide an update to the board in September 2023.

| Sub-Risk | Weight | Sub-Risk Statement | Strategic Goal | Strategic Objective | Risk Response | | | | |
|----------|--------|---|-------------------|------------------------|------------------|----|-----------|----|-----------|
| А | 40% | CalSTRS is unable to successfully implement a new pension administration system and transform the associated data and business processes within the established scope, schedule and budget due to ongoing delays. | G2: LI | А | Reduce | 45 | No Change | 41 | No Change |
| В | 15% | There is a risk that the vendor's staffing issues and limited pension industry experience may result in schedule delays or cost increases to the Pension Solution project. | G2: LI | А | Reduce | 36 | No Change | 32 | No Change |
| С | 15% | Loss of CalSTRS subject matter experts and challenges associated with replacing them may result in the inability to successfully implement Pension Solution. | G2: LI | А | Reduce | 36 | No Change | 21 | No Change |
| D | 20% | The procured vendor does not follow the agreed upon project-related processes to provide the results and functionality necessary to meet CalSTRS' business needs. | G2: LI | А | Reduce | 41 | No Change | 36 | No Change |
| E | 5% | Lack of cohesive project governance and communication practices within business areas could result in uninformed decision-making on transformational efforts. | G2: LI | А | Reduce | 24 | No Change | 21 | No Change |
| F | 5% | Inability of the Pension Solution Project to achieve desired results due to lack of readiness to the transformed business processes. | G2: LI | A, C, F | Reduce | 28 | No Change | 15 | No Change |

| | | Inherent | Inherent | Residual | Residual |
|------------|---|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| 10 Third I | Parties | Risk | Period | Risk | Period |
| | | Score | Change | Score | Change |
| | ks associated with third parties, resulting in operational age, compliance violations or failure to reach strategic | 32 | No Change | 21 | No Change |

The overall residual risk score remains at 21 and in alignment with the medium risk range (orange band) of the heat map. Staff does not expect a decrease in residual risk until the Third-Party Risk Management Program matures further to ensure a consistent, systematic method of governing and controlling third-party risk. The Office of General Counsel continues to collaborate with both Enterprise Risk Management and Enterprise Compliance Services to develop a governance process and standards to help strengthen controls for third party risk identification and mitigation for contract managers. Staff continue working collaboratively across the organization to create a governing policy and has begun work to establish third party risk classification tiers to categorize vendors and ultimately determine the level of monitoring and review required. As a result of a recent cybersecurity incident by a third-party service provider, the program development team reevaluated the planned controls to ensure measures are in place to mitigate or prevent these types of events from happening in the future.

| Sub-Risk | Weight | Sub-Risk Statement | Strategic Goal | | Risk Response | | | | |
|----------|--------|---|-------------------|--------|------------------|----|-----------|----|-----------|
| A | 94% | An absence of third-party risk management program governance could result in duplication of efforts or assurance gaps which could result in operational disruption, financial loss, reputational damage, compliance violations or failure to reach strategic goals. | G1: TS G2: LI | E E | Reduce | 32 | No Change | 21 | No Change |
| В | 6% | There is a risk that CalSTRS does not perform adequate due diligence of third parties prior to awarding a contract which could result in failure to identify risks involved in outsourcing a specific service(s). | G1: TS G2: LI | E E | Reduce | 24 | No Change | 18 | No Change |