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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 30th July 2015 and was chaired by DCC Bannister. At this board the OPCC and JARAP were unrepresented.
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 40 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 | 0 |
| High | 0 | 1 | 7 | 10 |
| Medium | 3 | 3 | 10 | 10 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

There are 3 high priority risks and 5 new risks. They are outlined within Appendix A. The full corporate risk register is attached as Appendix B.

There are no risks of note.

**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.** This revolves around providing services with the reduced budget. **STR1823 – Forensic and healthcare services, novating to NHS England.** The provision of these services (which is expected to exclude sexual assault referral centres) novating to NHS England; the contribution by Leicestershire Police is not yet clear. **STR1921 – Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC) funding.**The cost of SARC services is not separated from the overall forensic and healthcare provision at present. Any shortfall in costs may have to be met by Leicestershire Police. |
| *Equality impact assessment*  | **STR430 – Disability related harassment.** 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**

Roger Bannister – Deputy Chief Constable – (0116) 248 2005

Email: Roger.Bannister@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.
* Emergency Services Mobile Communications Programme (ESMCP) Project Board.
* COT oversight.
* ICCS infrastructure upgrade.
* Appointment of a project manager locally.
* Monthly conference calls with national police team.
* Purchase of repair credits for Airwave radios.
 |
| Update | **09/11/15 – Tom Reynolds:-** Regular updates are still being received from the national project team. We have met with Capita regarding their readiness to engage in ESN migration and discussed issues specific to our ICCS solution and this confirmed that we are in a positive position. **Current status: managed.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1329** | **Transforming services - fit for 2017.** |
| Responsible Officer  | Andy ElliottHead of Change  | 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 | **09/11/15 – Andy Elliott:-** Blue Print 2020 has been launched with partners, the public and the media. Part of the partnership launch was discussion about the specific areas of policing we want to consult with the public about as we look at ways of working in the future with a reduced budget. A meeting is scheduled in December with Leicestershire, Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire to review the work being undertaken by the Strategic Alliance Team.**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 First Time.
* Communication plan – part of Get it Right First Time.
* Get it Right First Time Gold Group.
* HMIC inspection.
* Introduction of the Investigative Management Unit.
 |
| Additional Controls | * Get it Right First Time delivery plan.
 |
| Update | **13/10/15 – Caroline Barker:-** Work continues with the Get it Right First Time delivery plan to achieve full implementation of the new crime recording requirement. Progress of this delivery plan continues to be monitored via the regular Get it Right First Time meetings.**Current status: controls tasked.** |

1. New risks

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1921** | **SARC funding shortfall as a consequence of the novation to NHS England.** |
| Responsible Officer  | Jonathan BrownHead of Serious Crime | Impact/Likelihood | Medium/High |
| Date Recorded | 21/09/15 | Current Rating | Medium (6) |
| Category | Finance | Previous Rating | New Risk |
| Information | The Department of Health are in the process of taking responsibility for healthcare provision within the police arena. This includes custody and until recently, it was thought it also included Sexual Assault Referral Centres (SARC). However, it now appears that because of their forensic/investigative element SARCs will remain the responsibility of each force. NHS England currently holds the funding for the delivery of SARC provision and have signed an agreement to fund a new single SARC for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland. Early discussions with NHS England suggest that even if the Police continue to manage the SARC the funding agreement will continue or the cost of running SARC services will be included in the force budget. |
| Impact | The cost to provide forensic medical services to both custody and SARC is currently outsourced to G4S. It is believed that this amount will be top-sliced from the force budget when the responsibility for the general provision novates to NHS England in April 2016. When the operating cost of SARC has been separated there may be a shortfall that Leicestershire Police must meet. |
| Existing Controls | * Ongoing dialogue.
 |
| Update | **21/09/15 – Jonathan Brown:-**The service currently provided by G4S is all encompassing and there is a combined staffing rota. In its current form it is difficult to separate the cost for providing the service to the SARC only and because of this, unless agreement on the amount can be reached, the force could have to cover any potential shortfall. We and NHS England are engaging in discussions with the national lead to gain clarity with this matter.**Current status: managed.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1917** | **Failure to comply with the ‘Building the Picture’ HMIC recommendations.** |
| Responsible Officer  | Paul HoosemanInformation Manager | Impact/Likelihood | High/Medium |
| Date Recorded | 20/08/15 | Current Rating | Medium (6) |
| Category | Operational/Performance | Previous Rating | New Risk |
| Information | Between 2013 and 2014 HMIC completed an assessment and inspection focussing on several key areas. This included adhering to the principles of the Authorised Professional Practise (APP) on information management and records management to ensure compliance to the Code of Practice on the Management of Police Information Act 2005. Arising from this and the subsequent report 'Building the Picture' there are 6 specific recommendations for all police forces with a timescale of completion and compliance of November 2015. |
| Impact | This risk is associated to failing to comply with the recommendations and the reputational, legal and operational implications as a result. |
| Existing Controls | * Programme support.
* Governance.
 |
| Additional Controls | * Programme of work.
 |
| Update | **10/11/15 – Paul Hooseman:-**The recommendations have been captured within an action plan and work continues to meet the recommendations within the designated timescales. Progress is being monitored and tracked via the monthly Information Management Group. The formal response from the force to HMIC is being developed and will be sent to them by the end of November.**Current status: controls tasked.**  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1916** | **Failure to comply with the ICO recommendations around records management.** |
| Responsible Officer  | Paul HoosemanInformation Manager | Impact/Likelihood | High/Medium |
| Date Recorded | 20/08/15 | Current Rating | Medium (6) |
| Category | Operational/Performance | Previous Rating | New Risk |
| Information | The Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) conducted a consensual audit of Leicestershire Police in February 2015. The audit focussed on the processing of personal data in 3 key areas; records management, security of personal data, subject access requests. They concluded that there was reasonable assurance (the second highest attainment). However, there were 58 recommendations made, primarily around enhancing existing processes to facilitate compliance with the Data Protection Act. These 58 recommendations relate to two key areas, information asset owners and records management. Actions need to be completed or work in progress within 6 months (by November 2015). |
| Impact | If the recommendations are not addressed the ICO may choose to take enforcement action. Further failure to comply is a criminal offence, which may result in a financial penalty. This risk is associated to failing to address the issues identified with records management in a timely and effective manner. |
| Existing Controls | * Programme support.
* Governance.
 |
| Additional Controls | * Programme of work.
 |
| Update | **10/11/15 – Paul Hooseman:-**The recommendations have been overlaid onto an existing programme of work to address the recommendations from the HMIC thematic inspection of information management ‘Building the Picture’. This has been captured within an action plan and work continues to meet the recommendations within the designated timescales. Progress is being monitored and tracked via the monthly Information Management Group.**Current status: controls tasked.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1915** | **Failure to comply with the ICO recommendations around asset owners.** |
| Responsible Officer  | Paul HoosemanInformation Manager | Impact/Likelihood | High/Medium |
| Date Recorded | 20/08/15 | Current Rating | Medium (6) |
| Category | Operational/Performance | Previous Rating | New Risk |
| Information | The Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) conducted a consensual audit of Leicestershire Police in February 2015. The audit focussed on the processing of personal data in 3 key areas; records management, security of personal data, subject access requests. They concluded that there was reasonable assurance (the second highest attainment). However, there were 58 recommendations made, primarily around enhancing existing processes to facilitate compliance with the Data Protection Act. These 58 recommendations relate to two key areas, information asset owners and records management. Actions need to be completed or work in progress within 6 months (by November 2015). |
| Impact | If the recommendations are not addressed the ICO may choose to take enforcement action. Further failure to comply is a criminal offence, which may result in a financial penalty. This risk is associated to failing to address the issues identified with information asset owners in a timely and effective manner. |
| Existing Controls | * Programme support.
* Governance.
 |
| Additional Controls | * Programme of work.
 |
| Update | **10/11/15 – Paul Hooseman:-**The recommendations have been overlaid onto an existing programme of work to address the recommendations from the HMIC thematic inspection of information management ‘Building the Picture’. This has been captured within an action plan and work continues to meet the recommendations within the designated timescales. Progress is being monitored and tracked via the monthly Information Management Group.**Current status: controls tasked.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1922** | **Inability to adequately audit Niche.** |
| Responsible Officer  | Chris CockerillOperations Lead, Criminal Justice | Impact/Likelihood | Medium/Very High |
| Date Recorded | 01/10/15 | Current Rating | Medium (8) |
| Category | Information Security | Previous Rating | New Risk |
| Information | Niche is the main IT system used by Leicestershire Police to record custody, crime, intelligence, and case preparation. It is a shared system, hosted by Lincolnshire Police. The Anti-Corruption Unit (ACU) monitors the access of individuals and the footprint activity within specific areas of such a system. Although they are still able to undertake this monitoring within Niche, it is difficult and time consuming and there are concerns that incidents of misuse may not be fully detected. In addition, the ACU are not privy to ACL’d (cloaked) crime reports unless the user selects them. This means they do not automatically have an overview of all crime reports regardless of status as they did with the previous system. |
| Impact | This causes a reputational and operational risk together with the probable impact on public, government and partners’ confidence.  |
| Existing Controls | * Engagement with regional Anti-Corruption Units.
* Regional Niche meetings.
* Leicestershire Niche project team.
* Details of ACL'd occurrences available from IT.
 |
| Additional Controls | * Direct contact with Niche.
 |
| Update | **29/10/15 – Chris Cockerill:-**An audit function is provided within Niche, however, it is an incredibly laborious process to decipher the information and without seemingly meaningless data appearing in the audit. Our ACU is engaging with regional counterparts to identify the specific requirements which can then be taken forward to Niche for a solution. **Current status: controls tasked.** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix B** | **Corporate Risk Register** | **12th November 2015** |
| **Reference** | **Owner** | **Title** | **Impact**  | **Likelihood** | **Status** | **Recorded**  | **Last****review** | **Priority** | **Previous rating** |
| STR1329 | Andy ElliottHead of Change  | Transforming services - fit for 2017. | Very High | High | Managed | February 2012 | 09/11/15 | 12 | 12 |
| STR1844 | Tom Reynolds Communications System Manager | Failure to transition to the ESN. | Very High | High | Managed | August 2014 | 09/11/15 | 12 | 12 |
| STR1679 | Caroline BarkerCrime Registrar | Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime. | High | High | Controls Tasked | June 2013 | 13/10/15 | 9 | 9 |
| STR1823 | Chris Cockerill Operations Lead Criminal Justice | Forensic and healthcare services – financial risk to force. | Medium  | Very High | Controls Tasked | July 2014 | 04/09/15 | 8 | 8 |
| STR473 | Ross DimmockAnti-Corruption Unit | Organisational risk of not complying with the ACPO national vetting policy. | Medium | Very High | Controls Tasked | March 2010 | 13/10/15 | 8 | 8 |
| STR1922 | Chris Cockerill Operations Lead Criminal Justice | Inability to adequately audit Niche. | Medium | Very High | Controls Tasked | October 2015 | 09/11/15 | 8 | New |
| STR1915 | Paul Hooseman Information Manager | Failure to comply with the ICO recommendations - asset owners. | High | Medium | Controls Tasked | August 2015 | 10/11/15 | 6 | New |
| STR1916 | Paul Hooseman Information Manager | Failure to comply with the ICO recommendations - records management. | High | Medium | Controls Tasked | August 2015 | 10/11/15 | 6 | New |
| STR1917 | Paul Hooseman Information Manager | Failure to comply with the ‘Building the Picture’ HMIC recommendations. | High | Medium | Controls Tasked | August 2015 | 10/11/15 | 6 | New |
| STR1921 | Jonathan BrownHead of Serious Crime | SARC funding shortfall as a consequence of the novation to NHS England. | Medium | High | Controls Tasked | September 2015 | 21/09/15 | 6 | New |
| STR1904 | Neil CastleHead of Crime and Intel | Safe keeping of property within force safes. | High  | Medium | Controls Tasked | June 2015 | 08/10/15 | 6 | 6 |
| STR1910 | Kerry McLernonHead of Contact Management | Lack of resilience and foreseeable attrition in RTI-PNC compromises service. | Medium | High | Managed | August 2015 | 09/09/15 | 6 | 6 |
| STR420 | Peter Coogan Head of Health and Safety | Management system for energy use. | High | Medium | Controlled | February 2010 | 13/10/15 | 6 | 6 |
| STR1608 | Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services | Governance of partnership working arrangements. | High | Medium | Controls Tasked | January 2013 | 12/10/15 | 6 | 6 |
| STR1519 | Paul Hooseman Information Manager | RMADS management for information security. | High | Medium | Controls Tasked | June 2012 | 27/09/15 | 6 | 6 |
| STR1801 | Alison NaylorHR Director | Ability to meet mandatory training requirements. | Medium | High | Controlled | June 2014 | 08/10/15 | 6 | 6 |
| STR11 | Alison NaylorHR Director | Potential for industrial action affecting our service. | Medium | Medium | Controlled | October 2007 | 08/10/15 | 4 | 4 |
| OPCC1700 | Matthew ClarkePartnership Coordinator | Failure to maintain relationships with key partners. | Medium | Medium | Controls Tasked | July 2013 | 07/09/15 | 4 | 4 |
| OPCC1690 | Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer  | Failure to consult and engage sufficiently with the public. | Medium | Medium | Controls Tasked | July 2013 | 07/09/15 | 4 | 4 |
| STR1521 | Simon HurstAnti-Corruption Lead | Criminal behaviour/impropriety by staff. | Medium | Medium | Controls Tasked | July 2012 | 14/09/15 | 4 | 4 |
| STR508 | Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services | Failure to meet requirements of the Police and Crime Plan. | Medium | Medium | Controlled | April 2010 | 12/10/15 | 4 | 4 |
| STR1875 | Alison CoultonSenior HR Business Partner | Increased number of subject to vetting contracts issued. | Medium | Medium | Controlled | December 2014 | 09/11/15 | 4 | 4 |
| STR1706 | Alison NaylorHR Director | Loss/absence/churn of key personnel. | Medium | Medium | Controlled | August 2013 | 08/10/15 | 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 | 12/10/15 | 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 | 12/11/15 | 4 | 4 |
| STR1818 | Paul Hooseman Information Manager | Government Security Classification (GSC) implementation. | Medium  | Medium | Controls Tasked | June 2014 | 02/10/15 | 4 | 2 |
| STR1648 | David SandallHead of Crime and Intelligence | Failure to manage the licensing and holding of firearms within the force area. | High | Low | Controls Tasked | March 2013 | 29/10/15 | 3 | 3 |
| OPCC1694 | Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer | Lack of resource and capacity available to OPCC. | High | Low | Controls Tasked | July 2013 | 07/09/15 | 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 | 07/09/15 | 3 | 3 |
| STR1764 | Tim Glover Head of IT | Accreditation for the use of the PSN. | High | Low | Controlled | January 2014 | 23/09/15 | 3 | 3 |
| STR564 | Jonathan BrownHead of Serious Crime | Management of MFH enquiries. | High | Low | Controlled | August 2010 | 21/10/15 | 3 | 3 |
| STR1571 | Jonathan BrownHead of Serious Crime | Genie/DASH not being used correctly resulting in incorrect risk assessments. | High | Low | Managed | September 2012 | 21/10/15 | 3 | 3 |
| STR458 | Jonathan BrownHead of Serious Crime | Failure to protect vulnerable persons. | High | Low | Controlled | March 2010 | 21/10/15 | 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 | 15/09/15 | 3 | 3 |
| STR520 | Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services | Governance of collaborative arrangements. | High | Low | Controlled | May 2010 | 12/10/15 | 3 | 3 |
| STR253 | Tim Glover Head of IT | High risk of virus introduction and data loss.  | High | Low | Controls Tasked | July 2009 | 01/09/15 | 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 | 07/09/15 | 2 | 2 |
| STR325 | Tim Glover Head of IT | IT strategy at risk if each department requirement is not captured. | Medium | Low | Managed | November 2009 | 03/09/15 | 2 | 2 |
| STR1765 | Chris HawardHead of EMOpSS | Regional operational support command structure. | Medium | Low | Controlled | February 2014 | 24/08/15 | 2 | 2 |
| STR459 | Mark NewcombeStrategic Partnerships Lead | Failure to respond to ASB. | Medium | Low | Controlled | March 2010 | 12/11/15 | 2 | 3 |
| STR430 | Lynne WoodwardHead of Equalities | Inquiry into disability related harassment. | Medium | Low | Managed | March 2010 | 01/10/15 | 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 | 24/08/15 | 2 | 2 |
| STR1623 | Andy LeeDirector of Intelligence  | Preparing for new communities, travelling and foreign national offending.  | Medium | Low | Controlled | February 2013 | 06/11/15 | 2 | 2 |
| STR1861 | Fiona Linton Information Security Manager | Risk to redacted information. | Medium | Low | Controls Tasked | September 2014 | 13/10/15 | 2 | 2 |
| OPCC1864 | Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer | Impact of changes in legislation on the PCC. | Medium | Low | Controls Tasked | October 2014 | 07/09/15 | 2 | 2 |
| OPCC1699 | Sue HaslettHead of Commissioning | Failure to produce and maintain a commissioning framework. | Medium | Low | Managed | July 2013 | 07/09/15 | 2 | 2 |
| OPCC1696 | Helen KingChief Finance Officer | Poor data quality leads to inefficient decision making and use of resources. | Low | Low | Controlled | July 2013 | 07/09/15 | 1 | 1 |
| STR1475 | Mark NewcombeStrategic Partnerships Lead | Limited ability to collate ASB incidents onto SENTINEL. | Low | Low | Controls Tasked | May 2012 | 12/11/15 | 1 | 1 |

|  |
| --- |
| 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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