

# POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR LEICESTERSHIRE JOINT AUDIT, RISK & ASSURANCE PANEL

PAPER MARKED

E

Report of	OFFICES OF CHIEF CONSTABLE AND POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER
Subject	RISK REGISTER
Date	WEDNESDAY 21 MAY 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 11<sup>th</sup> February 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 40 police strategic risks and 7 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	1	2	2
	High	0	3	8	11
	Medium	1	1	8	7
	Low	0	0	2	1

The 4 high priority risks and 4 risks of note are outlined within Appendix A. There are no new risks to report. The full corporate risk register is attached as Appendix B.

## **Implications**

<i>Financial</i>	<p>STR1329 – Transforming services risk. This revolves around providing services with the reduced budget.</p> <p>STR430 – Disability related harassment risk. There may be financial penalties levied if a non-statutory approach is not agreed and a section 23 enforcement notice is served.</p> <p>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 protective monitoring system is currently being explored.</p> <p>STR473 – Organisational risk of not complying with the ACPO National Vetting Policy. Additional staff may be required to fulfil the requirements.</p>
<i>Legal</i>	<p>STR430 – Disability related harassment risk. The force may face legal action if a non-statutory approach is not agreed.</p>
<i>Equality impact assessment</i>	<p>STR430 – Disability related harassment risk. The police reputation for providing a fair and equitable service may be damaged.</p>
<i>Risks and impact</i>	<p>As per the tables above.</p>
<i>Link to Police and Crime Plan</i>	<p>As per report.</p>

## **Appendices**

Appendix A: Strategic Risks  
Appendix B: Corporate Risk Register  
Appendix C: Risk Matrix

## **Persons to contact**

DCC Simon Edens – (0116) 248 2005  
Email: [Simon.Edens@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk](mailto:Simon.Edens@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk)

Paul Stock – Chief Executive – (0116) 229 8981  
Email: [Paul.Stock@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Stock@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk)

Laura Saunders – (0116) 248 2994  
Email: [Laura.Saunders@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk](mailto:Laura.Saunders@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk)

## Appendix A – Strategic Risks

High priority risks (4)

<b>STR1329</b>		<b>Transforming services - fit for 2017.</b>	
Responsible Officer	Rachel Swann	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance through the Change Programme/Board and Change Team.</li> <li>• Workforce modernisation: ongoing and voluntary redundancy scheme.</li> <li>• Force restructure: BCU's, directorates and services.</li> <li>• One year plan (2014/15) agreement: agreed July 2013 with OPCC, SRO's and work owners.</li> <li>• 2014/15 progress reporting: to the Change Board.</li> <li>• External support – continuous improvement, objective based budgeting and increase to Change Team agreed by PCC (03/02/14).</li> <li>• External support – KPMG.</li> <li>• Project Edison.</li> </ul>		
Update	15/04/14 Rachel Swann. KPMG commenced work within the force in February. Their scoping work is being completed under Project Edison. The expected turnaround of business cases is within 24 weeks. Current status: managed.		

<b>STR127</b>		<b>Unauthorised use/misuse of IT systems, loss of information.</b>	
Responsible Officer	Jim Holyoak	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National vetting procedure adhered to – (please refer to STR473).</li> <li>• Systems auditing – conducted across most IT systems.</li> <li>• Identified systems owners – responsible for security.</li> <li>• Effective internal investigation/sanctions.</li> <li>• System passwords/encryption.</li> <li>• HR to manage with IT the potential for misuse from staff put at risk.</li> <li>• Force Information Officer in post and aware.</li> <li>• Comprehensive suite of policies and procedures.</li> <li>• Communication strategy – for key messages with Corp Comms.</li> </ul>		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protective monitoring system – work underway to identify and install a system that best meets the requirements of the organisation.</li> </ul>		
Update	23/04/14 Jim Holyoak. It is nationally recognised that a protective monitoring system is required. Work is currently being undertaken to identify a protective monitoring system that is the best fit for our requirements. The lead for this is Simon Hurst – the target date for achievement is 02/06/14.		

	Current status: controls tasked.		
<b>STR1679</b>	<b>Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime.</b>		
Responsible Officer	Stuart Prior	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Audit of 'STORM' incidents within CMD – staff check to ensure compliance.</li> <li>• Audit schedule – conducted by the Service Improvement Unit.</li> <li>• Task and finish groups – part of Get it Right 1<sup>st</sup> Time (previously Op Enigma).</li> <li>• Communication plan – as part of Get it Right 1<sup>st</sup> Time.</li> <li>• Get it Right 1<sup>st</sup> Time – Gold Group.</li> </ul>		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Get it Right 1<sup>st</sup> Time delivery plan. The lead for this work is Caroline Barker and the target date for achievement is 30/05/14.</li> </ul>		
Update	09/04/14 Caroline Barker. The Get it Right 1 <sup>st</sup> time meetings (previously Op Enigma) continue to be held and the group review the associated delivery plan. The force are preparing for when the HMIC visit as part of their crime data integrity inspection. Current status: controls tasked.		

<b>STR1764</b>	<b>Accreditation for the use of the PSN.</b>		
Responsible Officer	Tim Glover	Impact/Likelihood	High/High
Date Recorded	28/01/14	Current Rating	High (9)
Category	Information Systems/Technology	Previous Rating	Low (3)
Information	Accreditation of the connection to the Public Sector Network may depend on replacement of Windows XP.		
Impact	Microsoft support for XP finishes in April 2014. Windows 7 is being rolled out but this will not be completed until towards the end of 2014. CIS and possibly DMS may be affected by this lack of support for XP.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project board chaired by C/Supt of Corporate Services.</li> <li>• Deployment mechanism in advanced stage of development.</li> <li>• Additional resources being recruited to accelerate rollout.</li> <li>• Risk documented in report by Information Security Officer.</li> <li>• Report identifying options to accelerate rollout prepared for DCC.</li> </ul>		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the appropriate levels of encryption.</li> <li>• Review the appropriate level of penetration testing.</li> <li>• Award premier contract to Microsoft to extend MS patching of XP.</li> <li>• Negotiate CJX contract with Vodafone. Home Office have recommended forces negotiate individual contracts with Vodafone for connectivity to national police systems via the CJX.</li> </ul>		
Update	07/04/14 Tim Glover. Following briefings from the national project team it has been identified that the scope of work to achieve accreditation to PSN for local and national connectivity may be much greater than expected. This includes the issue about XP (which is now mitigated), but also additional expectation around encryption and penetration testing (which is not). The		

	risk is being managed regionally, DCC Fish being regional lead and Dan Cooper as project manager. Current status: controlled.
--	--

Risks of note (4)

Risk increase from low to high:

<b>STR1764</b>		<b>Accreditation for the use of the PSN.</b>	
Responsible Officer	Tim Glover	Impact/Likelihood	High/High
Date Recorded	28/01/14	Current Rating	High (9)
Category	Information Systems/Technology	Previous Rating	Low (3)
For full details of this risk please refer to page 5.			

Risk decrease from high to low:

<b>STR1479</b>		<b>New version of DMS for HR regionalisation.</b>	
Responsible Officer	Carol Hever	Impact/Likelihood	Medium/Low
Date Recorded	21/05/12	Current Rating	Low (2)
Category	Operational/Performance	Previous Rating	High (9)
Information	HR Services are to be delivered collaboratively, with Leicestershire Police providing the Service with Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire. The HR/accident reporting systems links into DMS. The timeline is for Leicestershire and Derbyshire to migrate on 18th February 2014, with a system shutdown of 8 days. There is due to be a further 7 day shutdown in April 2014 when Nottinghamshire migrate across. There is concern around the robustness of the system, the standardised working practices which will need to be adopted and the resource implications of the implementation of a new system.		
Impact	This risk is principally concerned with the impact of the shutdown period as well as the transition to a new system. There is potential for insufficient back up/alternatives in place to manage force performance/resources and business during that time, if problems are encountered during the shutdown and transition.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local IT lead.</li> <li>• DMS Steering Group.</li> <li>• Business continuity plan.</li> <li>• Dedicated project manager.</li> <li>• Governance of the project.</li> <li>• Project board.</li> <li>• Lessons learnt.</li> <li>• Action plan for project.</li> </ul>		
Update	25/04/14 Carol Hever. The steering group has been closed with a final post implementation meeting held on 03/04/14. The system is now fully operative and remains stable. We have been experiencing some Java error messages; however, minor faults such as these were anticipated and are being managed by the IT Help Desk. The risk rating has been reviewed and reduced to low risk following successful implementation of the new system. The risk remains open whilst the system continues to be closely monitored and minor faults addressed. Current status: controlled.		

Risk decrease from medium to low:

<b>STR1660</b>		<b>Partnership funding withdrawal for ICSB analysts.</b>	
Responsible Officer	Matt Hewson	Impact/Likelihood	High/Medium
Date Recorded	08/05/13	Current Rating	Low (2)
Category	Contracts and Partnerships	Previous Rating	Medium (6)
Information	Leicestershire Police have four ICSB analysts who provide a partnership analytical function in support of the Joint Action Groups (JAG) within both City and County. Two of the analysts are co-located with the Leicester City Community Safety Team at Beaumont Leys Anti-Social Behaviour Unit (LASBU) and two analysts are based at Loughborough Police Station. Due to a shortfall in funding the OPCC has agreed to fund 4 analyst posts for 12 months – until June 2014. This is a medium term solution with a requirement that the partners take over the funding, post June 2014.		
Impact	The lack of funding may lead to the loss of the analyst posts. This would be detrimental to partnership working as it would remove the analytical products from the JAG forums. They are primarily concerned with ASB and removal of their role may lead to adverse comment levelled at the Leicestershire Police and partners about their approach to identifying and addressing ASB.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interim funding of posts until June 2014.</li> <li>• Briefing to ACPO.</li> </ul>		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing negotiation with partners.</li> </ul>		
Update	01/05/14 Mark Newcombe. At the Multi-Agency ASB Strategy Group meeting on the 19 <sup>th</sup> March 2014 it was formally agreed that funding support for the ICSB analysts should cease with the Chair agreeing to co-ordinate work to redefine the data requirement and secure such data via other means. The FIB 2014 change plan has realigned resources to establish an additional analyst post; part of this post will be to absorb this residual work. Current status: controlled.		

Risk decrease from medium to low:

<b>OPCC1698</b>		<b>Failure to provide governance to East Midlands police collaborations.</b>	
Responsible Officer	Paul Stock	Impact/Likelihood	High/Low
Date Recorded	19/07/13	Current Rating	Low (3)
Category	Governance	Previous Rating	Medium (6)
Information	Failure to provide governance to all East Midlands Police collaboration projects.		
Impact	Failure to provide sufficient and appropriate governance could impact upon the success and effectiveness of the delivery of the collaborative projects.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed business cases.</li> <li>• Detailed monitoring reports.</li> <li>• Regional meetings framework.</li> <li>• DCC oversight.</li> <li>• East Midlands PCCs' board.</li> <li>• Regional CEO board.</li> <li>• Regional CFOs' meeting.</li> <li>• Governance framework.</li> </ul>		
Update	23/04/14 Stuart Fraser. Further controls have been established and are in place. These include detailed business cases to support informed decision		

	<p>making, which highlights risks and mitigations. In addition, detailed monitoring reports are in place for all key collaboration projects. As a result the likelihood has been revised with an overall decrease in risk rating. Current status: controlled.</p>
--	---



Appendix B		Corporate Risk Register				1 <sup>st</sup> May 2014		
Reference	Owner	Title	Impact	Likelihood	Priority	Status	Recorded	Previous rating
STR1329	Rachel Swann	Transforming services - fit for 2017.	V High	High	12	Managed	February 2012	12
STR1764	Tim Glover	Accreditation for the use of the PSN.	High	High	9	Controlled	January 2014	3
STR1679	Stuart Prior	Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime.	High	High	9	Controls Tasked	June 2013	9
STR127	Jim Holyoak	Unauthorised use/misuse of IT systems, loss of information.	High	High	9	Controls Tasked	September 2008	9
STR1521	Jim Holyoak	Criminal behaviour/impropriety by staff.	Very High	Medium	8	Controls Tasked	July 2012	8
STR430	Lynne Woodward	Inquiry into disability related harassment.	Very High	Medium	8	Managed	March 2010	8
STR473	Simon Hurst	Organisational risk of not complying with the ACPO national vetting policy.	Medium	Very High	8	Controls Tasked	March 2010	8
STR1651	Alison Naylor	BC for HR transactional work.	Medium	High	6	Controlled	March 2013	6
STR420	Peter Coogan	Energy use - environmental and financial risk.	High	Medium	6	Controls Tasked	February 2010	6
STR1672	Stuart Prior	Failure of custody CCTV.	High	Medium	6	Controls Tasked	May 2013	6
STR458	David Sandall	Failure to protect vulnerable persons.	High	Medium	6	Controlled	March 2010	6
STR1571	David Sandall	Genie/DASH not being used correctly resulting in incorrect risk assessments.	High	Medium	6	Controls Tasked	September 2012	6
STR1608	Steph Pandit	Governance of partnership working arrangements.	High	Medium	6	Controls Tasked	January 2013	6
STR1475	Martyn Ball	Limited ability to collate ASB incidents onto Sentinel.	High	Medium	6	Controls Tasked	May 2012	6
STR1768	Fiona Linton	Microsoft XP reaching 'end of life'.	High	Medium	6	Managed	February 2014	6
STR1519	Paul Hooseman	RMADS management for information security.	High	Medium	6	Controls Tasked	June 2012	6
STR1648	Stuart Prior	Failure to manage the licensing and holding of firearms within the force area.	Very High	Low	4	Controls Tasked	March 2013	4
STR508	Steph Pandit	Failure to meet requirements of the Police and Crime Plan.	Medium	Medium	4	Controlled	April 2010	4
STR893	Alison Naylor	Impact of Winsor/Hutton reforms.	Medium	Medium	4	Controlled	April 2011	4
STR325	Tim Glover	IT strategy at risk if each department requirement is not captured.	Medium	Medium	4	Controlled	November 2009	4
STR1706	Alison Naylor	Loss/absence/churn of key personnel.	Medium	Medium	4	Controlled	August 2013	4
STR1765	Chris Haward	Regional operational support command structure.	Medium	Medium	4	Managed	February 2014	4
STR533	Steph Pandit	The fair and effective use of stop and search to promote confidence.	Medium	Medium	4	Controls Tasked	June 2010	4
OPCC1690	Paul Stock	Failure to consult and engage sufficiently with the public.	Medium	Medium	4	Controls Tasked	July 2013	4
OPCC1700	Paul Stock	Failure to maintain relationships with key partners.	Very High	Low	4	Controls Tasked	July 2013	4

OPCC1695	Paul Stock	Failure to deliver Police and Crime Plan during period of reducing funding.	Medium	Medium	4	Controls Tasked	July 2013	4
OPCC1698	Paul Stock	Failure to provide governance to all East Midlands police collaboration projects.	High	Low	3	Managed	July 2013	6
STR310	Stuart Prior	Failure to recognise and respond to critical incidents and 'learn lessons'.	High	Low	3	Controlled	November 2009	3
STR459	Martyn Ball	Failure to respond to ASB.	High	Low	3	Managed	March 2010	3
STR520	Simon Edens	Governance of collaborative arrangements.	High	Low	3	Managed	May 2010	3
STR253	Tim Glover	High risk of virus introduction and data loss.	High	Low	3	Controls Tasked	July 2009	3
STR2	Tim Glover	Impact of Loss of IT and/or communications infrastructure.	High	Low	3	Controls Tasked	September 2007	3
STR564	David Sandall	Management of MFH enquiries.	High	Low	3	Controlled	August 2010	3
STR11	Alison Naylor	Potential for industrial action affecting our service.	High	Low	3	Controlled	October 2007	3
STR537	Martyn Ball	Risk of reduced service delivery if public confidence reduces.	High	Low	3	Managed	June 2010	3
STR1680	Luke Russell	Shortage of accredited CMD Inspectors to cover the 24/7 requirement.	High	Low	3	Controlled	April 2013	3
STR380	Alex Stacey-Midgley	Current JES unlikely to meet EOC (Equal Opportunities Commission) criteria.	Medium	Low	2	Controlled	January 2010	2
STR1660	Matt Hewson	Partnership funding withdrawal for ICSB analysts.	Low	Medium	2	Controlled	May 2013	6
STR1709	Stephen Potter	EMA policing provision - failure to sign PSA.	Low	Medium	2	Managed	August 2013	2
STR1479	Carol Hever	New version of DMS for HR regionalisation.	Medium	Low	2	Controlled	May 2012	9
STR1705	Steph Pandit	OPCC stage 2 transfers.	Medium	Low	2	Controls Tasked	August 2013	2
STR1623	Matt Hewson	Preparing for new and emerging communities.	Medium	Low	2	Controls Tasked	February 2013	2
STR1163	Stephen Potter	Risk to the force to deal with spontaneous or pre-planned widespread protest.	Medium	Low	2	Controls Tasked	September 2011	2
STR1335	Steph Pandit	Shift pattern review.	Medium	Low	2	Controlled	February 2012	2
OPCC1694	Paul Stock	Lack of resource and capacity available to OPCC.	High	Low	2	Controls Tasked	July 2013	2
OPCC1699	Paul Stock	Failure to produce and maintain a commissioning framework.	Medium	Low	2	Managed	July 2013	2
OPCC1696	Helen King	Poor data quality leads to inefficient decision making and use of resources.	Low	Low	1	Controls Tasked	July 2013	1

Risk of Note

Appendix C

### Risk Scoring Matrix

Impact							
	Score	Performance/ Service Delivery	Finance /Efficiency £	Confidence/Reputation	Health and Safety	Environment	Strategic Direction
<b>Very High</b>	<b>4</b>	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
<b>High</b>	<b>3</b>	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
<b>Medium</b>	<b>2</b>	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
<b>Low</b>	<b>1</b>	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	
<b>Very High</b>	<b>4</b>	>75% chance of occurrence	Almost certain to occur
<b>High</b>	<b>3</b>	51-75% chance of occurrence	More likely to occur than not
<b>Medium</b>	<b>2</b>	25-50% chance of occurrence	Fairly likely to occur
<b>Low</b>	<b>1</b>	<25% chance of occurrence	Unlikely to occur

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

