POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR LEICESTERSHIRE JOINT AUDIT, RISK & ASSURANCE PANEL	PAPER MARKED **B**

Report of	**OFFICES OF CHIEF CONSTABLE AND POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER**
Subject	**RISK REGISTER**
Date	**FRIDAY 19th DECEMBER 2014 – 1.00 P.M.**
Author	**LAURA SAUNDERS – RISK AND BUSINESS CONTINUITY ADVISOR**

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

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

Summary

3. The force Strategic Organisational Risk Board (SORB) oversees and directs the strategic risks facing the force. This board last met on 9th October 2014 and was chaired by DCC Edens. At this board the OPCC was represented by Stuart Fraser, the JARAP was unrepresented.

4. 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

5. 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.

6. 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

7. *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.

   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

8. On the corporate risk register there are 42 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	2	9	11
	Medium	2	0	8	13
	Low	0	0	1	1

   The 4 high priority risks, 3 risks of note and 3 new risks 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 is novating to NHS England in 2015. The cost of a new contract is likely to exceed the amount forecast for the existing contract.

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.

STR473 – Organisational risk of not complying with the ACPO National Vetting Policy. The staffing resilience has been increased to meet the requirement.

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

Person (s) 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 2994
Email: Laura.Saunders@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk

Appendix A – Strategic Risks

1. High priority risks

STR1844	Failure to transition to the 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 Emergency Services Network (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.		
Additional Controls	- ICS infrastructure upgrade. - Appointment of a project manager locally.		
Update	**25/11/14 - Tom Reynolds:-** We are currently upgrading some of our infrastructure to the next generation ICCS in readiness, as the current ICCS has no upgrade capability to work with the ESN solution. The impact assessment of the transition plan has identified the need for the early appointment of a local project manager. To address this, a member of the IT department has been temporarily appointed into this role. **Current status: controls tasked.**		

STR1329	Transforming services - fit for 2017.		
Responsible Officer	Rachel Swann Head 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 Programme/Board and Change Team. - Workforce modernisation: ongoing and voluntary redundancy scheme. - Force restructure: BCU's, directorates and services. - One year plan (2014/15) agreement: agreed July 2013. 2014/15 progress reporting: to the Change Board. - External support - KPMG, continuous Improvement and objective based budgeting. - Project Edison. - HMIC inspection.		
Update	**13/11/14 - Andrew Elliot, Op Edison Programme Manager:-** The Edison full business case has been signed off by the Change Board. All the Edison projects are being managed as a programme of work. A timeline for implementation is in place and the implementation phase has commenced. Monthly meetings take place with the Change Board to authorise decisions and mitigate and manage risks and issues.		

	Current status: managed.

STR127	Unauthorised use/misuse of IT systems, loss of information.		
Responsible Officer	Jim Holyoak Head of Professional Standards Department	Impact/Likelihood	High/High
Date Recorded	22/09/08	Current Rating	High (9)
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 to manage with IT the potential for misuse from staff put at risk. • Force Information Officer in post and aware. • Comprehensive suite of policies and procedures. • Communication strategy – for key messages with Corp Comms.		
Additional Controls	• Protective monitoring system.		
Update	26/11/14 - Jim Holyoak:- Positive action continues to be taken where breaches are reported. The protective monitoring system has been installed following the IT Windows 7 roll out. In January 2015 the software suppliers will be providing training to Professional Standards Department staff to ensure this system can be fully operational. This will address one aspect of the HMIC inspection recommendations in that it provides pro-active intelligence gathering capability. Current status: controls tasked.		

STR1679	Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime.		
Responsible Officer	Stuart Prior Head of Crime and Intelligence	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. HMIC have announced plans to carry out visits to examine crime data within forces during 2013/14.		
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 (previously Op Enigma). • Communication plan – as part of Get it Right 1st Time. • Get it Right 1st Time – Gold Group. • HMIC inspection.		
Additional Controls	• Get it Right 1st Time delivery plan.		
Update	01/12/14 - Stu Prior:- HMIC have published their report on the forces Crime Data Integrity which identified good leadership and ethical crime recording. It highlighted issues with some processes related to the use of CATS and the recording of crimes contained within CATS records. Measures are already in place to address this in the short term. In the longer term CATS records will be recorded on NICHE when the force moves to this system for crime recording which will support compliance. Current status: controls tasked.		

2. Risks of note

Risk decrease from medium to low:

OPCC1690	Failure to consult and engage sufficiently with the public.		
Responsible Officer	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Impact/Likelihood	Medium/Medium
Date Recorded	19/07/13	Current Rating	Low (4)
Category	Politics/Legal	Previous Rating	Medium (6)
Information	Under S96 of the Police Act 1996 the PCC is responsible for ensuring that appropriate levels of consultation takes place so that representative views of all communities are collected in a form that can inform future strategies and decision making. Furthermore there is a legal duty to consult on the level of precept before this is set every year.		
Impact	The legal implications of not carrying out this activity. In addition, lack of consultation and engagement could lead to a lack of understanding and awareness of the PCC's role.		
Existing Controls	• Communication and Engagement Plan 2014/17. • Inherited relationships remain effective. • Increased proactive use of website and other media. • Facilitate the PCC's public presence and impact. • Actively foster positive relations with the media/press. • PCC actively meeting with community and stakeholders. • Secure the appropriate capability and capacity to support the engagement process. • Apply a proportionality mechanism for dealing with public enquiries.		
Additional Controls	• Improve stability of resources. • Develop a proactive consultation and engagement strategy. • Develop a proactive public communications strategy. • Report to SAB on scope and effectiveness of consultation.		
Update	**10/11/14 - Stuart Fraser, Policy and Research Officer:-** A proactive consultation and engagement strategy has been developed with associated plan to ensure delivery of the strategy and thereafter. The scope and effectiveness of consultation will be reported to SAB to provide assurance to the PCC that the representative views of all communities within our diverse population are being collected. **Current status: controls tasked.**		

Risk decrease from medium to low:

STR564	Management of MFH enquiries.		
Responsible Officer	David Sandall Head of Serious Crime	Impact/Likelihood	High/Low
Date Recorded	10/08/10	Current Rating	Low (3)
Category	Stakeholders/Reputation	Previous Rating	Medium (6)
Information	There is a risk to force reputation if officers fail to comply with the Missing From Home Policy resulting in loss of life/serious injury to a vulnerable person or reputational damage in the event of poor investigation.		
Impact	Operational risk of failing to contribute to the safeguarding of vulnerable people. Reputational risk resulting in a lack of confidence in the police.		
Existing Controls	• Search training. • Existing force policy. • Missing from home or care 'top tips'. • MFH teams for both city and county BCU. • MFH centralised team with links to CSE/social workers and online offending team.		
Update	**10/09/14 - David Sandall:-** There were concerns that the recording of the new 'absent' category would not be completed to the required standard or safeguarding risks not identified. This was due to a delay in the upgrade to the missing from home IT system 'Compact' to ensure 'absent' reports are recorded in the same way as other missing reports. These concerns have been overcome with the implementation of Compact version 5 and work is underway to improve the recording of the absent category in terms of safeguarding effectiveness.		

	Current status: controlled.

Risk decrease from medium to low:

STR1571	Genie/DASH not being used correctly for risk assessments.		
Responsible Officer	David Sandall Head of Serious Crime	Impact/Likelihood	High/Low
Date Recorded	26/09/12	Current Rating	Low (3)
Category	Operational/Performance	Previous Rating	Medium (6)
Information	Domestic Violence audits have identified inconsistent use of Genie (also noted on misper/harassment audits) and incorrectly filled out DASH forms leading to threat/risk being incorrectly calculated and the subsequent Police response being inadequate; potentially resulting in severe consequences including risk to the public and loss of reputation.		
Impact	The impact of not completing Genie effects the decision making of the officers and the effective use of utilising the National Decision Model.		
Existing Controls	• DV action plan. • Specific action plan created for this specific risk. • Control strategy plan. • PDG update briefing on DV. • DV Support Team.		
Update	**10/09/14 - David Sandall:-** There remains a risk that a DASH risk assessment or a GENIE check is not completed but this would be an individual failing, as the organisational procedures and processes are clear and have been reinforced through communications and briefings. There is a national DV action plan in place and the DV support team focus on repeat incidents and crimes. The new Domestic Violence Protection Notice (DVPN) process ensures if a criminal justice sanction cannot be applied then the DVPN notice ensures further opportunities are there to assist and manage the risk, preventing offences and escalation between the relevant parties. **Current status: managed.**		

3.   New risks

STR1861	Risk of disclosing redacted information.		
Responsible Officer	Fiona Linton Information Security Officer	Impact/Likelihood	Medium/Low
Date Recorded	25/09/14	Current Rating	Low (2)
Category	Contracts/Partnerships	Previous Rating	New Risk
Information	Risk associated with redaction of information not fully embedded into a document and forwarded to partner agencies and subsequent disclosure of information. An issue around the inconsistent application of redaction was identified with the preparation of case files. Work is being undertaken to ascertain the other departments that use redaction and the process used.		
Impact	When redaction is not correctly applied, for instance within case files there is the risk of sharing protected information. This has legal implications, safeguarding issues for victims/witnesses and a reputational risk due to a lack of confidence in the police.		
Existing Controls	• Review of processes currently undertaken within case file preparation. • Live case file audit. • CPS checks with Magistrate Court files. • ADOBE PRO installed to all Prosecution Team computers. • Training presentation. • Local management support. • Compliance regime by managers.		
Additional Controls	• Review of departments that use the redaction process. • Contact with the CPS.		
Update	**01/12/14 - Fiona Linton:-** The initial issues identified have been resolved. An action plan has been generated and work has been undertaken to ensure redaction is properly applied in future case files. A review continues to ascertain which departments use redaction and the processes they apply to ensure consistency in our approach.		

	Current status: controls tasked.

STR1871	Failure of IVR to effectively handle contact as expected.		
Responsible Officer	Kerry McLernon Head of Contact Management	Impact/Likelihood	Medium/Low
Date Recorded	08/12/14	Current Rating	Low (2)
Category	Information Systems/Technology	Previous Rating	New Risk
Information	The Intelligent Voice Recognition (IVR) solution for internal and external non-emergency contact into the organisation is due to be implemented by the end of 2014. There are no specific concerns in terms of the stability of the system but testing has presented some issues with functionality with a success rate of approximately 80%. It is also unclear how the system will respond to an increase in call traffic when it is fully live, with concerns that unnecessary delays to the non-emergency number may cause users to telephone 999 creating delays for callers reporting an emergency.		
Impact	Delays could inhibit our ability to effectively receive emergency calls and have implications operationally in the timely dispatch of officers to deal with such incidents. This combined with the delays could have a negative reputational effect on the force and be reflected in lowered confidence and satisfaction rates.		
Existing Controls	- System testing. - System improvements. - Failsafe option. - IVR project meeting. - Provider support. - BC plans. - Communications. - CMD change group. - Contact Management/Local Policing Board. - Business case. - COT overview. - Fall back system.		
Update	**07/11/14 - Alistair Roe, Contact Management:-** Testing has been undertaken both internally and externally and feedback obtained with further work being undertaken with the company to make improvements to the system. At the present time the risk is controlled, however, when the system is fully live further issues or concerns may be identified. **Current status: controlled.**		

OPCC1864	Impact of changes in legislation on PCC and his responsibilities.		
Responsible Officer	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Impact/Likelihood	Medium/Low
Date Recorded	03/10/14	Current Rating	Low (2)
Category	Politics/Legal	Previous Rating	New Risk
Information	The potential impact of future national legislative and policy changes. For example the local and General Election in May 2015.		
Impact	It has been debated as to whether there should be any changes to complaints arrangements which would potentially impact on the PCC's administrative support arrangements.		
Existing Controls	- New OPCC structure includes policy resource. - National and regional PCC horizon scanning. - Appointment of PCC policy advisor.		
Additional Controls	- Recruit to Head of Policy and Strategy. - Implement local PCC horizon scanning and policy responses.		
Update	**10/11/14 - Stuart Fraser, Policy and Research Officer:-** A Policy Advisor is now in post with recruitment underway to appoint somebody as the Head of Policy and Strategy. Scanning of horizon e-briefings is in place to ensure the PCC is sighted about potential implications and is able to generate a response as necessary. **Current status: Controls tasked.**		

Appendix B		Corporate Risk Register						1st December 2014	
Reference	Owner	Title	Impact	Likelihood	Status	Recorded	Last review	Priority	Previous rating
STR1329	Rachel Swann Head of the Change Team	Transforming services - fit for 2017.	Very High	High	Managed	February 2012	13/11/14	12	12
STR1844	Tom Reynolds Communications System Manager	Failure to transition to the ESN.	Very High	High	Controls Tasked	August 2014	25/11/14	12	12
STR1679	Stuart Prior Head of Crime and Intelligence	Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime.	High	High	Controls Tasked	June 2013	01/12/14	9	9
STR127	Jim Holyoak Head of Professional Standards	Unauthorised use/misuse of IT systems, loss of information.	High	High	Controls Tasked	September 2008	26/11/14	9	9
STR1823	Chris Cockerill Operations Lead Criminal Justice	Forensic and healthcare services – financial risk to force.	Medium	Very High	Controls Tasked	July 2014	13/11/14	8	8
STR473	Simon Hurst Anti-Corruption Lead	Organisational risk of not complying with the ACPO national vetting policy.	Medium	Very High	Controls Tasked	March 2010	26/11/14	8	8
STR1796	Adam Streets Operational Superintendent	Absence of accurate mental health statistical representation.	High	Medium	Controlled	May 2014	02/09/14	6	6
STR1764	Tim Glover Head of IT	Accreditation for the use of the PSN.	High	Medium	Controlled	January 2014	12/11/14	6	6
STR420	Peter Coogan Head of Health and Safety	Energy use - environmental and financial risk.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	February 2010	25/09/14	6	6
STR1608	Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services	Governance of partnership working arrangements.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	January 2013	13/10/14	6	6
STR1475	Martyn Ball Strategic Partnerships Lead	Limited ability to collate ASB incidents onto Sentinel.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	May 2012	13/11/14	6	6
STR1768	Fiona Linton Information Security Manager	Microsoft XP reaching 'end of life'.	High	Medium	Managed	February 2014	10/11/14	6	6
STR1519	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	RMADS management for information security.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	June 2012	02/09/14	6	6
OPCC1700	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Failure to maintain relationships with key partners.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	17/10/14	6	6
STR2	Tim Glover Head of IT	Impact of Loss of IT and/or communications infrastructure.	High	Medium	Managed	September 2007	21/11/14	6	6
OPCC1690	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Failure to consult and engage sufficiently with the public.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	10/11/14	4	6
STR1521	Jim Holyoak Head of Professional Standards	Criminal behaviour/impropriety by staff.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2012	26/11/14	4	4
STR1801	Alison Naylor Head of HR	Ability to meet mandatory training requirements.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	June 2014	24/09/14	4	4

STR1648	Stuart Prior Head of Crime and Intelligence	Failure to manage the licensing and holding of firearms within the force area.	Very High	Low	Controls Tasked	March 2013	26/11/14	4	4
STR508	Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services	Failure to meet requirements of the Police and Crime Plan.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	April 2010	13/10/14	4	4
STR325	Tim Glover Head of IT	IT strategy at risk if each department requirement is not captured.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	November 2009	25/09/14	4	4
STR1706	Alison Naylor Head of HR	Loss/absence/churn of key personnel.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	August 2013	24/09/14	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	14/10/14	4	4
OPCC1695	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Failure to deliver Police and Crime Plan during period of reducing funding.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	17/10/14	4	4
OPCC1694	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Lack of resource and capacity available to OPCC.	High	Low	Controls Tasked	July 2013	17/10/14	3	4
OPCC1698	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Failure to provide governance to all East Midlands police collaboration projects.	High	Low	Controlled	July 2013	17/10/14	3	3
STR564	David Sandall Head of Serious Crime	Management of MFH enquiries.	High	Low	Controlled	August 2010	10/09/14	3	6
STR1571	David Sandall Head of Serious Crime	Genie/DASH not being used correctly resulting in incorrect risk assessments.	High	Low	Managed	September 2012	10/09/14	3	6
STR458	David Sandall Head of Serious Crime	Failure to protect vulnerable persons.	High	Low	Controlled	March 2010	10/09/14	3	3
STR310	Stuart Prior Head of Crime and Intelligence	Failure to recognise and respond to critical incidents and 'learn lessons'.	High	Low	Controlled	November 2009	03/11/14	3	3
STR459	Martyn Ball Strategic Partnerships Lead	Failure to respond to ASB.	High	Low	Managed	March 2010	13/11/14	3	3
STR520	Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services	Governance of collaborative arrangements.	High	Low	Managed	May 2010	24/09/14	3	3
STR253	Tim Glover Head of IT	High risk of virus introduction and data loss.	High	Low	Controls Tasked	July 2009	12/11/14	3	3
STR11	Alison Naylor Head of HR	Potential for industrial action affecting our service.	High	Low	Controlled	October 2007	04/09/14	3	3
STR537	Martyn Ball Strategic Partnerships Lead	Risk of reduced service delivery if public confidence reduces.	High	Low	Managed	June 2010	13/11/14	3	3
STR1765	Chris Haward Head of EMOpSS	Regional operational support command structure.	Medium	Low	Controlled	February 2014	13/10/14	2	4
STR1818	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	Government Security Classification (GSC) implementation.	Medium	Low	Controls Tasked	June 2014	01/12/14	2	4
STR1680	Luke Russell Contact Management	Shortage of accredited CMD inspectors to cover the 24/7 requirement.	Medium	Low	Controlled	April 2013	13/11/14	2	3
STR430	Lynne Woodward Head of Equality and Human	Inquiry into disability related harassment.	Medium	Low	Managed	March 2010	19/11/14	2	2

STR380	Alex Stacey-Midgley Senior HR Business Partner	Current JES unlikely to meet Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) criteria.	Medium	Low	Controls Tasked	January 2010	24/11/14	2	2
STR1709	Stephen Potter Leicestershire EMOpSS lead	EMA policing provision - failure to sign PSA.	Low	Medium	Managed	August 2013	28/11/14	2	2
STR1705	Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services	OPCC stage 2 transfers.	Medium	Low	Controls Tasked	August 2013	24/09/14	2	2
STR1623	Matt Hewson Head of Force Intelligence Bureau	Preparing for new and emerging communities.	Medium	Low	Controlled	February 2013	24/09/14	2	2
STR1163	Stephen Potter Leicestershire EMOpSS lead	Risk to the force to deal with spontaneous or pre-planned widespread protest.	Medium	Low	Controls Tasked	September 2011	28/11/14	2	2
STR1335	Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services	Shift pattern review.	Medium	Low	Controlled	February 2012	24/09/14	2	2
STR1861	Fiona Linton Information Security Manager	Risk to redacted information.	Medium	Low	Controls Tasked	September 2014	30/11/14	2	New
STR1871	Kerry McLernon Head of Contact Management	Failure of IVR to effectively handles contact as expected.	Medium	Low	Controlled	October 2014	24/10/14	2	New
OPCC1864	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Impact of changes in legislation on the PCC.	Medium	Low	Controls Tasked	October 2014	10/11/14	2	New
OPCC1699	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Failure to produce and maintain a commissioning framework.	Medium	Low	Managed	July 2013	17/10/14	2	2
OPCC1696	Helen King Chief Finance Officer	Poor data quality leads to inefficient decision making and use of resources.	Low	Low	Controls Tasked	July 2013	21/11/14	1	1

Risk of Note
New Risk

Risk Scoring Matrix

Impact							
	Score	Performance/ Service Delivery	Finance/ Efficiency £	Confidence/Reputation	Health and Safety	Environment	Strategic Direction
Very High	4	Major disruption to service delivery. Major impact on performance indicators noticeable by stakeholders.	Force >1,000,000 Business 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	3	Serious disruption to service delivery. Serious impact on performance indicators noticeable by stakeholders.	Force 251,000-1,000,000 Business area 41,000-150,000	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	2	Significant disruption to service delivery. Noticeable impact on performance indicators.	Force 51,000-250,000 Business area 11,000-40,000	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 <50,000 Business 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			
	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
Medium	2	25-50% chance of occurrence	Fairly likely to occur
Low	1	<25% chance of occurrence	Unlikely to occur

Overall Risk Rating: Impact x Likelihood
9 - 16 = High
5 - 8 = Medium
1 - 4 = Low

This page is intentionally blank.