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**Purpose of report**

1. This report provides JARAP with information about the corporate risk register, highlighting high priority, newly registered and risks of note.

**Recommendation**

1. The panel is asked to discuss the contents of this report and note the current state of risk arrangements.

**Summary**

1. The force Strategic Organisational Risk Board (SORB) oversees and directs the strategic risks facing the force. This board last met on 23rd April 2015 and was chaired by DCC Edens. At this board the OPCC was unrepresented, the JARAP was represented by Leon Dundas.
2. The OPCC risks are overseen by its Chief Executive and presented to the Senior Management Team within the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

**Risk**

1. The corporate risk register identifies the key strategic risks. In the main these risks represent long-term issues and typically remain on the register for long periods.

1. All risks are scored on an ascending scale of 1 - 4 in terms of impact and likelihood. Multiplication of these two figures leads to a risk priority rating, which is expressed as a ‘RAG’ rating.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority Rating** | **‘RAG’ Rating** | **Review** |
|  9 - 16 | High | Monthly |
| 5 - 8 | Medium | 3 Monthly |
| 1 - 4 | Low | 3 Monthly |

**Risk status**

1. *Controlled* – this risk is in the ideal state. Circumstances or time may change this state.

*Controls Tasked* – when additional controls have been identified. These additional controls will have an owner tasked to complete them and a target completion date. Within the Orchid risk register the term ‘Awaiting Control’ is used to describe this status.

*Overdue Control* – when the completion date for additional controls has passed.

*Managed* – when no further controls have been identified at that time to reduce the risk further, however, the risk is not acceptably controlled.

*Awaiting Review* – a managed risk which requires a review. It may also be a new risk prior to first review or a risk transferred to a new ‘Responsible Officer’.

**Strategic risks**

1. On the corporate risk register there are 37 police strategic risks and 8 OPCC strategic risks.

The overall risk rating grid for the corporate risk register is shown below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Corporate Risk****Rating Grid** | **Likelihood** |
| Very High | High | Medium | Low |
| **Impact** | Very High | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| High | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 |
| Medium | 2 | 2 | 10 | 12 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

The 1 new risk, 3 high priority risks and 4 risks of note are outlined within Appendix A. The full corporate risk register is attached as Appendix B.

**Implications**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Financial* | **STR1844 – Failure to transition to the ESN.** Costs incurred by the infrastructure upgrade and purchase of new equipment. In addition, costs associated to the possible extension of the Airwave contract. **STR1329 – Transforming services risk.** This revolves around providing services with the reduced budget. **STR1823 – Forensic and healthcare services, financial risk to force.** The provision of service associated to novating to NHS England; the new contract exceeds the existing contract and the contribution by Leicestershire Police is not yet clear. **STR127 – Unauthorised use/misuse of IT systems, loss of information.** There can be financial penalties levied by the Information Commissioner for breaches of the Data Protection Act and Privacy and Electronic Communications Regulations. A new protective monitoring system has now been installed. |
|  |  |
| *Equality impact assessment*  | **STR430 – Disability related harassment risk.** The police reputation for providing a fair and equitable service may be damaged. |
| *Risks and impact* | As per the tables above.  |
| *Link to Police and* *Crime Plan*  | As per report. |

**Appendices**

Appendix A: Strategic Risks

Appendix B: Corporate Risk Register

Appendix C: Risk Matrix

**Persons to contact**

Simon Edens – Deputy Chief Constable – (0116) 248 2005

Email: Simon.Edens@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk

Paul Stock – Chief Executive – (0116) 229 8981

Email: Paul.Stock@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk

Laura Saunders – Risk and Business Continuity Advisor – (0116) 248 2127

Email: Laura.Saunders@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk

**Appendix A – Strategic Risks**

1. High priority risks

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1844** | **Failure to transition to the Emergency Services Network (ESN).** |
| Responsible Officer  | Tom Reynolds Communications System Manager | Impact/Likelihood | Very High/High |
| Date Recorded | 15/08/14 | Current Rating | High (12) |
| Category | Information Systems/Technology | Previous Rating | High (12) |
| Information | Leicestershire Police use Airwave for radio voice communications; however, the contract is due to expire in 2017. The government are driving the procurement process as every emergency service will move to mobile communications and connect to the ESN.  |
| Impact | This risk is concerned with the impact of not transitioning to the ESN within the timescales, however, there are a number of associated risks:- Financial; upgrading our infrastructure to ensure connectivity, possibility of extending our contract with Airwave, purchase of new handsets. Operational; abstractions caused by equipment being fitted to cars and training in the use of new equipment.  |
| Existing Controls | * Regional Airwave user group.
* Monitoring of Airwave performance.
* National project team.
* COT oversight.
* Local impact assessment of transition plan.
* Creation of ESMCP Project Board.
* Close contact with national police project team.
* ICCS infrastructure upgrade.
* Appointment of a project manager locally.
 |
| Update | **17/04/15 – Tom Reynolds:-** The ICCS infrastructure upgrade has been successfully completed. Locally, the project team have been identified and are now in post. Monthly conference calls are now being held with the national police team to keep updated with developments. The infrastructure suppliers have indicated the national infrastructure may not be enabled before April 2017 - it is unclear how this may impact upon the overall transition plan. **Current status: managed.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1329** | **Transforming services - fit for 2017.** |
| Responsible Officer  | Rob NixonHead of the Change Team | Impact/Likelihood | Very High/High |
| Date Recorded | 23/02/12 | Current Rating | High (12) |
| Category | Operational/Performance | Previous Rating | High (12) |
| Information | There is a budget deficit of £20 million until 2017 against previously anticipated funding. There has already been considerable work around efficiency savings, however, further savings are required.  |
| Impact | These savings have the potential to have a substantial effect on service delivery for the force. The force will need to transform its services and its culture to deliver in the future. |
| Existing Controls | * Governance through the Change Board and Change Team.
* Force restructure: BCU’s, directorates and services.
* One year plan (2014/15).
* Stakeholder engagement plan.
* External support – KPMG and objective based budgeting.
* HMIC inspection.
* Baker Tilly inspection.
* JARAP meetings.
* SAB meetings.
 |
| Update | **27/04/15 – Rob Nixon:-** The outline target operating model has been developed. This has now fallen into 5 key work streams. The outline is being worked up into a more detailed target operating model ‘‘Blue Print 2020''. The next critical date is June 2015 when the Change Team will present how the 2016/17 funding gap will be closed.**Current status: managed.** |
| **STR1679** | **Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime.** |
| Responsible Officer  | Caroline Barker Crime Registrar | Impact/Likelihood | High/High |
| Date Recorded | 12/06/13 | Current Rating | High (9) |
| Category | Operational/Performance | Previous Rating | High (9) |
| Information | The Service Improvement Unit have carried out a number of audits under the heading "Missed Opportunities" which have identified issues with the accuracy of our crime recording, both on initial contact and in relation to classification of crime. In addition, the Home Office have introduced a requirement for police forces to record crime within 24 hours, previously 72 hours. |
| Impact | Operational: crimes not being recorded.Reputational: loss of confidence in published figures and in the police as a whole. |
| Existing Controls | * Audit of ‘STORM’ incidents within CMD – staff check to ensure compliance.
* Audit schedule – conducted by the Service Improvement Unit.
* Task and finish groups – part of Get it Right 1st Time.
* Communication plan – part of Get it Right 1st Time.
* Get it Right 1st Time Gold Group.
* HMIC inspection.
* Introduction of the Investigative Management Unit.
 |
| Additional Controls | * Get it Right 1st Time delivery plan.
 |
| Update | **08/05/15 – Caroline Barker:-** Force processes are being reviewed to comply with the new crime recording requirement. The Home Office advised that the process must have been being developed by April 2015, not fully implemented. There are resource, cost and process implications to the change in the time allowed to record crime. A plan has been generated to address the changes and identify potential solutions.**Current status: controls tasked.** |

2. New risk

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1890** | **Making best use of the DNT to reduce demand upon other teams.** |
| Responsible Officer  | Mark NewcombeStrategic Partnerships Lead | Impact/Likelihood | Medium/Medium |
| Date Recorded | 29/04/15 | Current Rating | Low (4) |
| Category | Operational/Performance | Previous Rating | New |
| Information | Following the implementation of the Edison model, the neighbourhood teams have been replaced by Dedicated Neighbourhood Teams. The staffing levels have also changed as a consequence. The Dedicated Neighbourhood Teams are staffed by fewer officers than the previous neighbourhood teams, however, the remit of their role has altered substantially. They no longer carry crime queues or are subject to the same abstractions so while the number of officers may have reduced the capacity and amount of time to focus on neighbourhood issues has increased. |
| Impact | The risk is associated to ensuring best use of these resources and additional capacity in order to drive down demand upon other interdependent teams across the organisation. |
| Existing Controls | * Neighbourhood activity analysis.
* Use of KINECT consultation and engagement recording system.
* Tactical plans.
* Tasking via TABS system.
* Superintendent meetings with NPA commanders.
* Monitoring levels of abstraction.
 |
| Additional Controls | * Quarterly narrative based performance framework.
* Quarterly development plan.
 |
| Update | **29/04/15 – Mark Newcombe:-**Work is being undertaken to align the approach across the Dedicated Neighbourhood Teams in terms of community engagement and problem solving plans. All officers will be subject to a narrative based performance framework to capture good work and a development plan will be used to model and embed this across all teams.**Current status: controls tasked.** |

3. Risks of note due to decrease in rating

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR127** | **Unauthorised use/misuse of IT systems, loss of information.** |
| Responsible Officer | Simon HurstHead of Professional Standards Department | Impact/Likelihood | Medium/High |
| Date Recorded | 22/09/08 | Current Rating | Medium (6) |
| Category | Information Systems/Technology | Previous Rating | High (9) |
| Information | Reputational and operational risk together with the probable impact on public, government and partners’ confidence as a result of unauthorised loss or misuse of data, loss of data from data storage devices or other misuse of force IT systems. |
| Impact | Legal implications/loss of confidence/operational compromise. |
| Existing Controls |

|  |
| --- |
| * National vetting procedure adhered to – (please refer to STR473).
* Systems auditing – conducted across most IT systems.
* Identified systems owners – responsible for security.
* Effective internal investigation/sanctions.
* System passwords/encryption.
* HR manages with IT the potential for misuse from staff put at risk.
* Force Information Officer in post.
* Comprehensive suite of policies and procedures.
* Communication strategy.
* Learning the Lessons group.
* Protective monitoring system.
* Op Fox meetings.
* Information Commissioners inspection.
 |

 |
| Update | **21/04/15 – Jim Holyoak (outgoing Head of Professional Standards Department):-** We have recently been visited by the Information Commissioners Office, who have undertaken an audit by speaking to our staff and scrutinising our procedures. We are awaiting the findings and recommendations. There has been several recent IT misuse cases dealt with through the appropriate channels. Whilst the likelihood remains high, the impact is reduced due through early detection and intervention of such cases. **Current status: controlled.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1475** | **Limited ability to collate ASB incidents onto SENTINEL.** |
| Responsible Officer  | Mark NewcombeStrategic Partnerships Lead | Impact/Likelihood | Medium/Medium |
| Date Recorded | 11/05/12 | Current Rating | Low (4) |
| Category | Operational/Performance | Previous Rating | Medium (6) |
| Information | The Sentinel multi-agency ASB Case Management system was launched for Leicestershire Police in October 2011. The aspiration was that 100% of recorded ASB would be entered onto SENTINEL. The Police currently lack a STORM to SENTINEL interface, which means we are not able achieve 100% recording on the system. |
| Impact | There is an operational and reputational risk associated to information being stored in multiple systems if the inter-relationship between some incidents is not identified.  |
| Existing Controls | * Additional funding secured for development.
* Process mapping.
* Change management controls.
* Upgrade roll out.
* ACPO lead.
* Monitoring process.
* Revised improvement programme.
 |
| Additional Controls | * System versioning and change requests.
 |
| Update | **18/03/15 – Mark Newcombe:-** The lack of STORM and SENTINEL interface still exists, which we know means the 100% target remains aspirational. The impact of this was previously high, however, over time other monitoring processes have been introduced to manage this so the impact of the lack of interface is not as high as it was previously deemed.**Current status: controls tasked.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR11** | **Potential for industrial action affecting our service.** |
| Responsible Officer  | Alison NaylorHR Director | Impact/Likelihood | Medium/High |
| Date Recorded | 09/10/07 | Current Rating | Low (4) |
| Category | Operational/Performance | Previous Rating | Medium (6) |
| Information | Identification of any emerging issues that may result in industrial action being taken by members of staff across the force, partnership agencies and other organisations. |
| Impact | Industrial action taken by members of staff could impact upon the force being able to deliver front line and support services, particularly if action is undertaken by those in specialist roles or a role that supports the most critical functions. |
| Existing Controls | * Horizon scanning.
* Liaison with senior management.
* Additional articles on latest news.
* Manager advice issued.
* Review protocols.
* Engaged legal advice.
* Business continuity measures.
* Liaison with the trade unions and staff associations.
* Restriction of information.
 |
| Update | **16/03/15 – Alison Naylor:-** The strike activity planned in December 2014 did not go ahead, with an agreement reached between the two sides in relation to pay. The likelihood has therefore been reduced and the overall risk rating has reduced to low.**Current status: controlled.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **OPCC1700** | **Failure to maintain relationships with key partners.** |
| Responsible Officer  | Matthew ClarkePartnership Coordinator | Impact/Likelihood | Medium/Medium |
| Date Recorded | 19/07/13 | Current Rating | Low (4) |
| Category | Contracts and Partnerships | Previous Rating | Medium (6) |
| Information | Failure to maintain effective working relationships across statutory, voluntary and third sector partners and ensure partnership working in criminal justice sector is both efficient and effective, maximising value for money for local taxpayers. |
| Impact | Failure to maintain these relationships could have a detrimental effect on existing partnership arrangements and the development of new arrangements. |
| Existing Controls | * OPCC revised structure implemented.
* Police and Crime Panel – proactive work and oversight arrangements.
* PCC has met with CSP chairs and will continue to do so as appropriate.
* Weekly meetings between OPCC SMT and Chief Officer Team.
* Police and Crime Plan – developed in consultation with partners via steering group.
* Strategic Partnership Board and sub-groups.
* Continuity of auditors (internal and external).
* PCC and Chief Constable have met with all local planning authorities.
* ‘Working Together’ Partnership Summit held on 9th December 2014.
* Ongoing engagement at a national level through forums.
* Annual review of internal control framework.
* Assurance mapping for regional collaboration developed.
* Performance framework – reviewed with partners to reflect their contribution.
* JARAP meetings.
* CEO invited to the national MoJ Reference Group looking at probation reforms.
* Leicestershire OPCC selected as pilot for youth commission work.
 |
| Additional Controls | * Embed new SPB/SPB executive governance arrangements.
 |
| Update | **07/05/15 – Helen King (Chief Finance Officer):-**The existing controls reflect the actions that have now been completed and put into place, strengthening the relationship with key partners and reducing the likelihood of this risk. Changes to the Strategic Partnership Board and associated reporting structures are reflected as an additional control at this time until they are fully complete and embedded. **Current status: controls tasked.** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix B** | **Corporate Risk Register** | **11th May 2015** |
| **Reference** | **Owner** | **Title** | **Impact**  | **Likelihood** | **Status** | **Recorded**  | **Last****review** | **Priority** | **Previous rating** |
| STR1329 | Rob NixonHead of the Change Team | Transforming services - fit for 2017. | Very High | High | Managed | February 2012 | 27/04/15 | 12 | 12 |
| STR1844 | Tom Reynolds Communications System Manager | Failure to transition to the ESN. | Very High | High | Managed | August 2014 | 17/04/15 | 12 | 12 |
| STR1679 | Caroline BarkerCrime Registrar | Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime. | High | High | Controls Tasked | June 2013 | 07/05/15 | 9 | 9 |
| STR1823 | Chris Cockerill Operations Lead Criminal Justice | Forensic and healthcare services – financial risk to force. | Medium  | Very High | Controls Tasked | July 2014 | 13/03/15 | 8 | 8 |
| STR473 | Ross DimmockAnti-Corruption Lead | Organisational risk of not complying with the ACPO national vetting policy. | Medium | Very High | Controls Tasked | March 2010 | 13/03/15 | 8 | 8 |
| STR127 | Simon HurstHead of Professional Standards  | Unauthorised use/misuse of IT systems, loss of information. | Medium | High | Controls Tasked | September 2008 | 06/05/15 | 6 | 9 |
| STR1764 | Tim Glover Head of IT | Accreditation for the use of the PSN. | High | Medium | Controlled | January 2014 | 16/03/15 | 6 | 6 |
| STR420 | Peter Coogan Head of Health and Safety | Management system for energy use. | High | Medium | Controlled | February 2010 | 01/04/15 | 6 | 6 |
| STR1608 | Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services | Governance of partnership working arrangements. | High | Medium | Controls Tasked | January 2013 | 21/02/15 | 6 | 6 |
| STR1519 | Paul Hooseman Information Manager | RMADS management for information security. | High | Medium | Controls Tasked | June 2012 | 08/03/15 | 6 | 6 |
| STR1801 | Alison NaylorHR Director | Ability to meet mandatory training requirements. | Medium | High | Controlled | June 2014 | 01/04/15 | 6 | 6 |
| STR11 | Alison NaylorHR Director | Potential for industrial action affecting our service. | Medium | Medium | Controlled | October 2007 | 16/03/15 | 4 | 6 |
| OPCC1700 | Matthew ClarkePartnership Coordinator | Failure to maintain relationships with key partners. | Medium | Medium | Controls Tasked | July 2013 | 07/04/15 | 4 | 6 |
| STR1475 | Mark NewcombeStrategic Partnerships Lead | Limited ability to collate ASB incidents onto SENTINEL. | Medium | Medium | Controls Tasked | May 2012 | 18/03/15 | 4 | 6 |
| OPCC1690 | Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer  | Failure to consult and engage sufficiently with the public. | Medium | Medium | Controls Tasked | July 2013 | 07/04/15 | 4 | 4 |
| STR1521 | Simon HurstHead of Professional Standards  | Criminal behaviour/impropriety by staff. | Medium | Medium | Controls Tasked | July 2012 | 24/03/15 | 4 | 4 |
| STR1648 | David SandallHead of Crime and Intelligence | Failure to manage the licensing and holding of firearms within the force area. | Very High | Low | Controls Tasked | March 2013 | 01/04/15 | 4 | 4 |
| STR508 | Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services | Failure to meet requirements of the Police and Crime Plan. | Medium | Medium | Controlled | April 2010 | 21/02/15 | 4 | 4 |
| STR1875 | Alison CoultonSenior HR Business Partner | Increased number of subject to vetting contracts issued. | Medium | Medium | Controlled | December 2014 | 21/04/15 | 4 | 4 |
| STR1706 | Alison NaylorHR Director | Loss/absence/churn of key personnel. | Medium | Medium | Controlled | August 2013 | 01/04/15 | 4 | 4 |
| STR533 | Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services | The fair and effective use of stop and search to promote confidence. | Medium | Medium | Controls Tasked | June 2010 | 21/02/15 | 4 | 4 |
| STR1890 | Mark NewcombeStrategic Partnerships Lead | Making the best use of the DNT to reduce demand upon other teams. | Medium | Medium | Controls Tasked | April 2015 | 29/04/15 | 4 | New |
| OPCC1694 | Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer | Lack of resource and capacity available to OPCC. | High | Low | Controls Tasked | July 2013 | 07/04/15 | 3 | 3 |
| OPCC1698 | Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer | Failure to provide governance to all East Midlands police collaboration projects. | High | Low | Controls Tasked | July 2013 | 07/04/15 | 3 | 3 |
| STR564 | Jonathan BrownHead of Serious Crime | Management of MFH enquiries. | High | Low | Controlled | August 2010 | 08/04/15 | 3 | 3 |
| STR1571 | Jonathan BrownHead of Serious Crime | Genie/DASH not being used correctly resulting in incorrect risk assessments. | High | Low | Managed | September 2012 | 08/04/15 | 3 | 3 |
| STR458 | Jonathan BrownHead of Serious Crime | Failure to protect vulnerable persons. | High | Low | Controlled | March 2010 | 08/04/15 | 3 | 3 |
| STR310 | David SandallHead of Crime and Intelligence | Failure to recognise and respond to critical incidents and ‘learn lessons’. | High | Low | Controlled | November 2009 | 01/04/15 | 3 | 3 |
| STR459 | Mark NewcombeStrategic Partnerships Lead | Failure to respond to ASB. | High | Low | Controlled | March 2010 | 17/03/15 | 3 | 3 |
| STR520 | Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services | Governance of collaborative arrangements. | High | Low | Controlled | May 2010 | 21/02/15 | 3 | 3 |
| STR253 | Tim Glover Head of IT | High risk of virus introduction and data loss.  | High | Low | Controls Tasked | July 2009 | 27/03/15 | 3 | 3 |
| OPCC1695 | Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer | Failure to deliver Police and Crime Plan during period of reducing funding. | Medium | Low | Controls Tasked | July 2013 | 07/04/15 | 2 | 4 |
| STR325 | Tim Glover Head of IT | IT strategy at risk if each department requirement is not captured. | Medium | Low | Managed | November 2009 | 03/03/15 | 2 | 4 |
| STR1765 | Chris HawardHead of EMOpSS | Regional operational support command structure. | Medium | Low | Controlled | February 2014 | 29/04/15 | 2 | 2 |
| STR1818 | Paul Hooseman Information Manager | Government Security Classification (GSC) implementation. | Medium  | Low | Controls Tasked | June 2014 | 08/03/15 | 2 | 2 |
| STR430 | Lynne WoodwardHead of Equalities | Inquiry into disability related harassment. | Medium | Low | Managed | March 2010 | 23/02/15 | 2 | 2 |
| STR380 | Alex Stacey-MidgleySenior HR Business Partner | Current JES unlikely to meet Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) criteria. | Medium | Low | Controls Tasked | January 2010 | 15/04/15 | 2 | 2 |
| STR1709 | Stephen PotterLeicestershire EMOpSS Lead | EMA policing provision - failure to sign PSA. | Low | Medium | Managed | August 2013 | 26/02/15 | 2 | 2 |
| STR1623 | Andy LeeDirector of Intelligence  | Preparing for new communities, travelling and foreign national offending.  | Medium | Low | Controlled | February 2013 | 21/04/15 | 2 | 2 |
| STR1163 | Stephen PotterLeicestershire EMOpSS Lead | Risk to the force to deal with spontaneous or pre-planned widespread protest. | Medium | Low | Controls Tasked | September 2011 | 26/02/15 | 2 | 2 |
| STR1861 | Fiona Linton Information Security Manager | Risk to redacted information. | Medium | Low | Controls Tasked | September 2014 | 16/03/15 | 2 | 2 |
| STR1871 | Kerry McLernonHead of Contact Management | Failure of IVR to effectively handles contact as expected. | Medium | Low | Controlled | October 2014 | 07/05/15 | 2 | 2 |
| OPCC1864 | Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer | Impact of changes in legislation on the PCC. | Medium | Low | Controls Tasked | October 2014 | 07/04/15 | 2 | 2 |
| OPCC1699 | Sue HaslettHead of Commissioning | Failure to produce and maintain a commissioning framework. | Medium | Low | Managed | July 2013 | 07/04/15 | 2 | 2 |
| OPCC1696 | Helen KingChief Finance Officer | Poor data quality leads to inefficient decision making and use of resources. | Low | Low | Controlled | July 2013 | 07/04/15 | 1 | 1 |

|  |
| --- |
| Risk of Note |
| New Risk |

Appendix C

**Risk Scoring Matrix**

|  |
| --- |
| **Impact** |
|  | **Score** | **Performance/****Service Delivery** | **Finance/ Efficiency £** | **Confidence/Reputation** | **Health and Safety** | **Environment** | **Strategic Direction** |
| **Very High****Very High** | **4** | Major disruption to service delivery.Major impact on performance indicators noticeable by stakeholders. | Force>1,000,000Business area>150,000 | Major stakeholder/investigations/longer lasting community concerns.Major reputational damage; adverse national media coverage > 7 days. | Death or a life changing injury. | Very high negative environmental impact (high amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected). | Major impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective. |
| **High****High** | **3** | Serious disruption to service delivery.Serious impact on performance indicators noticeable by stakeholders. | Force251,000-1,000,000Business area41,000-150,000 | Serious stakeholder/investigations/prolonged specific section of community concerns.Serious reputational damage; adverse national media coverage < 7 days. | An injury requiring over 24 hours hospitalisation and/or more than 3 days off work or a major injury as defined by the RIDDOR regulations. | High negative environmental impact (medium amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected). | Serious impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective. |
| **Medium****Medium** | **2** | Significant disruption to service delivery.Noticeable impact on performance indicators. | Force51,000-250,000Business area11,000-40,000 | Significant investigations/specific section of community concerns.Significant reputational damage; adverse local media coverage. | An injury requiring hospital/professional medical attention and/or between one day and three days off work with full recovery. | Medium negative environmental impact (low amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected). | Significant impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective. |
| **Low** | **1** | Minor disruption to service delivery.Minor impact on performance indicators. |  Force<50,000Business area<10,000  | Complaints from individuals.Minor impact on a specific section of the community. | An injury involving no treatment or minor first aid with no time off work. | Low negative environmental impact (limited amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected). | Minor impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Likelihood** |  | **Overall Risk Rating:****Impact x Likelihood** |
|  Score |
| **Very High** | **4** |  >75% chance of occurrence Almost certain to occur |
| **High** | **3** |  51-75% chance of occurrence More likely to occur than not |  **9 - 16 = High** |
| **Medium** | **2** |  25-50% chance of occurrence Fairly likely to occur |  **5 - 8 = Medium** |
| **Low** | **1** |  <25% chance of occurrence Unlikely to occur |  |  **1 - 4 = Low** |
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