

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

PAPER MARKED

C

Report of	CHIEF CONSTABLE & POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER
Subject	RISK REGISTER
Date	TUESDAY 28 JANUARY 2014 – 1.00PM
Author	INSPECTOR DUNCAN MALLOY

## **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 7th November 2013 and was chaired by DCC Edens.
4. At this Board the OPCC was represented by Robert Vickers and the JARAP by Ian Prince.
5. 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**

6. 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.
7. 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 which is expressed as a "RAG" rating.

Priority Rating	“RAG” Rating	Review
9-16	Red	At least monthly review
5-8	Amber	At least 3 monthly review
1-4	Green	At least 3 monthly review

### Risk Status

8. A “controlled” risk is in the ideal state: circumstances or time may change this state.
9. A risk is “awaiting control” when additional controls have been identified to control it. These additional controls will have an owner and completion date.
10. A risk is “overdue control” when the completion date for additional controls has passed.
11. A risk is “managed “when no further controls have been identified, at that time to reduce the risk further, but the risk is not acceptably controlled.
12. Awaiting Review: A managed risk which requires a review (may also be a new risk prior to 1st review or a risk transferred to a new Responsible Officer).

### Strategic risks

13. On the Corporate Risk Register, there are 47 Police strategic risks and 8 OPCC strategic risks.
14. The overall risk rating grid is shown below for the Corporate Risk Register.

Corporate Risk Rating Grid		Likelihood			
		Very high	High	Medium	Low
Impact	Very High	0	1	0	2
	High	0	4	11	10
	Medium	1	1	11	8
	Low	1	0	1	4

15. The 5 highest risks are attached at appendix A and the full Corporate Risk register is attached as Appendix B.

### Implications

Financial :

Disability Related Harassment Risk STR430, there may be financial penalties levied.  
Transforming Services Risk STR1329 revolves around providing services with the reduced budget.

Legal : Disability Related Harassment Risk STR430 - the Force may face legal action if a finding is made against it

Equality Impact Assessment: Disability Related Harassment risk STR430 - 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

**List of Appendices**

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

**Background Papers**

None

**Persons to Contact**

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

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

Insp Duncan Malloy - Tel (0116 248) 2994  
Email: [Duncan.Malloy@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk](mailto:Duncan.Malloy@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk)

**STRATEGIC RISKS****Current High Priority Risks**

There are 5 High Priority Risks which are outlined below.

<b>STR430</b>	<b>Inquiry into Disability Related Harassment</b>		
Responsible Officer	Lynne Woodward	Impact / Likelihood	High / High
Date Recorded	02 March 2010	Residual Rating	High
Category	Stakeholders/Reputation	Inherent Rating	High
Risk Controls	EHRC Coordinating Group established ACPO full response to the inquiry submitted by the 30 Jun 2012 deadline Our evidence sent with the response to the EHRC December 2012 National Gold/Silver groups established Media Strategy produced Strategic Equality & Confidence Board Meeting of key internal stakeholders (Held 31 July 2013) Gold Group established		
Additional Controls	None		
Information	In 2012 Her Majesty's Inspectorate carried out an ASB inspection. It suggested that the Force still faces difficulties in identifying repeat and vulnerable callers. On 23 Oct 2012 the Chief Constable received a letter from the EHRC requesting further information on how Leicestershire Police was meeting its equalities duties. This response was sent to the EHRC by December 2012.		
Impact	The risk to the Force is reputational if disability groups express views that we have let them down or that we do not share information well or work well with partners.		
Update	January 2014- Review of risk with Lynne Woodward. A series of unproductive phone calls with EHRC lead officers has produced no further clarity as to whether the force will become involved in formal arrangements with the EHRC. Until a solid position is established, this risk has been reduced to High/High		

<b>STR1679</b>	<b>Missed opportunities: Failure to accurately record crime</b>		
Responsible Officer	Stuart Prior	Impact / Likelihood	High / V High
Date Recorded	12 June 2013	Rating	High
Category	Operational/Performance	Inherent Rating	High
Risk Controls	Audit of "STORM" incidents within CMD undertaken Audit Schedule established Task and Finish Groups set up Communication Plan produced Op Enigma - Gold Group established ACPO Lead appointed		
Additional Controls	Delivery Plan – Op Enigma Caroline Barker deadline 28 February 2014		
Information	The Force Service Improvement Unit has carried out a number of audits under the heading "Missed opportunities". These have identified issues with the accuracy of our crime recording, both on initial contact and in relation to the classification of crime. Her Majesty's Inspectorate has announced plans to examine crime data within forces in 2013/14.		
Impact	Operational Impact: Crimes not being recorded correctly. Reputational Impact: Any loss of confidence in published figures and in the Police Service as a whole.		
Update	10 January 2014. Review by Caroline Barker. The Op Enigma Delivery plan is in production. The risk rating remains high. An HMIC revisit is anticipated.		

<b>STR1329</b>	<b>Transforming Services - Fit For 2017</b>		
Responsible Officer	Rachel Swann	Impact / Likelihood	V High / High
Date Recorded	23 February 2012	Residual Rating	High (12)
Category	Operational/Performance	Inherent Rating	High (16)
Risk Controls	Workforce Modernisation Change Board - Monthly Executive Board (governance) Change Programme (governance) Regular review – Agenda item at Executive Boards and COT Force Restructure Change Team Agreement of one year plan – 2014/2015		
Additional Controls	No		
Information	In response to the Comprehensive Spending Review the Force budget has been reduced, requiring us to transform the way we protect our Communities, whilst delivering over £20M in revenue savings by 2017.		
Impact	These savings have the potential to have a substantial effect on Service Delivery for the Force.		
Update	3 January 2014. Review by Ch/Supt Swann. Continued progress made. Audit trail maintained through the Change Board papers.		

<b>STR1479</b>	<b>New version of DMS for HR Regionalisation</b>		
Responsible Officer	Carol Hever	Impact / Likelihood	High / High
Date Recorded	28 May 2012	Residual Rating	High
Category	Operational/Performance	Inherent Rating	Medium
Risk Controls	DMS Steering Group established Business Continuity Plan produced Dedicated Project Manager appointed Governance of the Project Project Board Lessons Learnt Local IT Lead		
Additional Controls	Action Plan for Project - Carol Hever - deadline 18 March 2014		
Information	HR Services are to be delivered collaboratively with Leicestershire Police providing the Service with Derbyshire and through a joint HR computer system; DMS. The system “upgrades” require the system to be taken down for 2 periods of 7+days in February 2014.		
Impact	Possible inability to manage staff / shifts, capture sickness and accident recording. Issues with stability of the DMS system.		
Update	10 January 2014. Review of risk by Carol Hever There is a project team overseeing the delivery of DMS with regular updates and meetings. Due to withdrawal of Nottinghamshire from the regional project there will only be one period of downtime in February 2014.		

<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 September 2008	Residual Rating	High
Category	Information Systems/Technology	Inherent Rating	Medium
Risk Controls	National vetting procedure adhered to Systems auditing for compliance Identified System Owners Op Chequers Effective internal investigation/sanctions System passwords/encryption HR to manage with IT the potential for misuse from staff who are put "at risk" Self-Assessment Force Information Officer in post and aware Comprehensive suite of policies and procedures Internal communication		
Additional Controls	Protective Monitoring System - Simon Hurst 2 June 2014		
Information	The Force has multiple IT systems, many holding personal information. This information is vulnerable to both external attack and internal misuse of systems.		
Impact	Loss of confidence, criminal conduct, loss of IT systems.		
Update	9 January 2014. The Force has purchased a protective monitoring system and this is due for implementation by 31 March 2014.		

**Risk of Note.** Since the last JARAP, the following risk has reduced from high to medium rating.

<b>STR1672</b>		<b>Failure of Custody CCTV</b>	
Responsible Officer	Pete Jackson	Impact / Likelihood	High / High
Date Recorded	28 May 2013	Residual Rating	Medium
Category	Information Systems/Technology	Inherent Rating	High
Risk Controls	Business case and outline of the new system agreed by the Change Board Keyham Lane & Euston Street have the new, upgraded CCTV system fitted. The old and new systems are running tandem during the snagging phase.		
Additional Controls			
Information	Safer Detention Guidance recommends that CCTV systems are installed within Custody Suites. The current systems are ageing leading to intermittent losses of recording		
Impact	Critical incidents and evidence may not be captured compromising investigations.		
Update	8 January 2014. The CCTV storage equipment has now been fitted and is working at Keyham Lane and Euston Street (currently in the snagging phase). The system for Beaumont Leys has been ordered and will be installed by 28 February 2014. The risk likelihood has reduced to Medium and the overall rating reduced to Medium.		

## Shared Force / OPCC Risk

<b>STR1705</b>	<b>OPCC Stage 2 Transfers</b>		
Responsible Officer	Steph Pandit	Impact / Likelihood	Medium / Medium
Date Recorded	16 August 2013	Residual Rating	Low
Category	People (Staff / Community )	Inherent Rating	Medium
Risk Controls	Development of Management Information Pack Review of Corporate Services H.O Process and guidelines Timetable for process Regional Meetings OPCC National engagement Ongoing dialogue between PCC and Chief Constable		
Additional Controls	Discussion with staff associations    Ali Naylor MofU and SLA for services            Steph Pandit		
Information	Following PCC implementation all Police assets and liabilities were transferred to the OPCC. Stage 2 concerns the transfer of staff/properties and rights back to the Chief Constable. This transfer should be completed by April 2014.		
Impact	Staff and staff association consultation needs to be carried out and the proposals delivered to the Home Secretary by September 2013. Failure to deliver proposals may mean the Home Secretary making a decision on the transfers. The transfer itself has resource implication for HR, Finance, etc.		
Update	8 January 2014. There is on-going work with the OPCC including an independent review of Corporate Communications arrangements.		

### OPCC Risks - Risks of note

None

Appendix B		Corporate Risk Register				10-Jan-2014		
Ref	Responsible	Title	Impact	Likelihood	Priority	Status	Recorded	Previous
STR1329	Rachel Swann	Transforming Services - Fit For 2017	Very High	High	12	Managed	23-Feb-12	→
STR430	Lynne Woodward	Inquiry into Disability Related Harassment	High	High	9	Managed	02-Mar-10	16
STR127	Jim Holyoak	Unauthorised use/misuse of IT systems, loss of information	High	High	9	Awaiting Control	22-Sep-08	→
STR1479	Carol Hever	New version of DMS for HR Regionalisation.	High	High	9	Awaiting Control	21-May-12	→
STR1679	Stuart Prior	Missed opportunities: Failure to accurately record crime	High	High	9	Awaiting Control	12-Jun-13	→
STR1521	Jim Holyoak	Criminal Behaviour/Impropriety by staff,	Medium	Very High	8	Awaiting Control	05-Jul-12	→
STR420	Peter Coogan	Energy Use. Environmental & financial risk.	High	Medium	6	Awaiting Control	24-Feb-10	→
STR459	Martyn Ball	Failure to respond to ASB	High	Medium	6	Awaiting Control	10-Mar-10	→
STR1475	Martyn Ball	Limited ability to collate ASB incidents onto Sentinel	High	Medium	6	Awaiting Control	11-May-12	→
STR1519	Paul Hooseman	RMADS management for Information Security.	High	Medium	6	Awaiting Control	27-Jun-12	→
STR1571	David Sandall	Genie / DASH not being used correctly results incorrect risk assessment	High	Medium	6	Awaiting Control	26-Sep-12	→
STR1608	Steph Pandit	Governance of partnership working arrangements	High	Medium	6	Awaiting Control	02-Jan-13	→
STR1650	David Sandall	Adverse impact of implementing new ACPO definition of missing/absent person	High	Medium	6	Awaiting Control	26-Mar-13	→
STR1651	Alison Naylor	BC for HR Transactional Work	Medium	High	6	Managed	28-Mar-13	→
STR1672	Stuart Prior	Failure of Custody CCTV	High	Medium	6	Awaiting Control	28-May-13	9
STR1680	Luke Russell	Shortage of accredited CMD Inspectors to cover the 24/7 requirement	High	Medium	6	Awaiting Control	22-Apr-13	→
OPCC1695	Paul Stock	Failure to deliver Police and Crime Plan during period of reducing funding	High	Medium	6	Awaiting Control	19-Jul-13	→
OPCC1698	Paul Stock	Failure to provide governance to all E.Mids Police collaboration projects	High	Medium	6	Managed	19-Jul-13	→
STR325	Tim Glover	IT Strategy at risk if each department requirement is not captured	Medium	Medium	4	Controlled	26-Nov-09	→
STR473	Simon Hurst	Organisational risk of not complying with the ACPO National Vetting Policy	Medium	Medium	4	Awaiting Control	22-Mar-10	→
STR508	Steph Pandit	Failure to meet requirements of the Police & Crime Plan.	Medium	Medium	4	Controlled	28-Apr-10	→
STR533	Chris Haward	The FAIR and EFFECTIVE use of stop and search to promote confidence	Medium	Medium	4	Awaiting Control	08-Jun-10	→
STR537	Martyn Ball	Risk of reduced service delivery if public confidence reduces	Medium	Medium	4	Controlled	15-Jun-10	→
STR893	Ali Naylor	Impact of Winsor / Hutton Reforms	Medium	Medium	4	Managed	04-Apr-11	→
STR1163	Duncan Cullen	Risk to the force to deal with spontaneous or pre-planned protest	Medium	Medium	4	Awaiting Control	05-Sep-11	→



STR1224	Matt Hewson	Inability to assess GENIE2 search information in a timely fashion	Medium	Medium	4	Awaiting Control	01-Nov-11	→
STR1552	Thomas Reynolds	New patrol vehicles without fitted MDT's	Low	Very High	4	Awaiting Control	10-Aug-12	→
STR1648	Stuart Prior	Fail to manage the licensing and holding of firearms within Force	Very High	Low	4	Awaiting Control	25-Mar-13	→
STR1705	Steph Pandit	OPCC Stage 2 Transfers	Medium	Medium	4	Awaiting Control	16-Aug-13	→
STR1706	Alison Naylor	Loss / absence/ churn of key personnel	Medium	Medium	4	Controlled	16-Aug-13	→
OPCC1690	Paul Stock	Failure to consult and engage sufficiently with public	Medium	Medium	4	Awaiting Control	19-Jul-13	→
OPCC1700	Paul Stock	Failure to maintain relationships with key partners	Very High	Low	4	Awaiting Control	19-Jul-13	8
STR2	Tim Glover	Impact of Loss of I.T. and/or Communications Infrastructure	High	Low	3	Awaiting Control	06-Sep-07	→
STR11	Alison Naylor	Potential for industrial Action Affecting our Service	High	Low	3	Controlled	09-Oct-07	→
STR253	Tim Glover	High risk of virus introduction and data loss	High	Low	3	Awaiting Control	03-Jul-09	→
STR310	Stuart Prior	Failure to recognise & respond to critical incidents & "learn lessons"	High	Low	3	Controlled	16-Nov-09	→
STR458	David Sandall	Failure to protect vulnerable persons	High	Low	3	Controlled	10-Mar-10	→
STR520	Simon Edens	Governance of collaborative arrangements	High	Low	3	Managed	13-May-10	→
STR564	David Sandall	Management of MFH enquiries	High	Low	3	Controlled	10-Aug-10	→
STR1660	Matt Hewson	Partnership funding withdrawal for ICSB analysts	High	Low	3	Awaiting Control	08-May-13	→
OPCC1693	Paul Stock	Failure in accountability of PCC during early stages of office	High	Low	3	Managed	19-Jul-13	→
OPCC1694	Paul Stock	Lack of resource and capacity available to OPCC	High	Low	3	Awaiting Control	19-Jul-13	→
STR187	Paul Hooseman	Implementation of the Police National Database (PND)	Medium	Low	2	Controlled	03-Mar-09	→
STR380	Alex Stacey-Midgley	Current JES unlikely to meet EOC (Equal Opportunities Commission) criteria	Medium	Low	2	Controlled	06-Jan-10	→
STR1164	Peter Coogan	Risk to Health & Safety management.	Medium	Low	2	Controlled	08-Sep-11	→
STR1172	Jim Holyoak	Publication of HMIC Integrity report	Medium	Low	2	Controlled	03-Oct-11	→
STR1335	Steph Pandit	Shift Pattern Review	Medium	Low	2	Controlled	29-Feb-12	→
STR1537	Simon Hurst	Persons working on Police premises without security vetting	Medium	Low	2	Controlled	26-Jul-12	→
STR1623	Matt Hewson	Preparing for New and Emerging Communities	Medium	Low	2	Awaiting Control	08-Feb-13	→
STR1709	Stephen Potter	EMA Policing Provision- Fail to sign PSA	Low	Medium	2	Managed	29-Aug-13	→
OPCC1699	Paul Stock	Failure to produce and maintain a commissioning framework	Medium	Low	2	Managed	19-Jul-13	→
STR612	Carol Hever	Changes to Pensions - 2012	Low	Low	1	Controlled	27-Oct-10	→
STR613	Carol Hever	Key people may leave the Force to protect their pensions	Low	Low	1	Controlled	29-Oct-10	→
STR1522	Steph Pandit	APP implementation.	Low	Low	1	Controlled	09-Jul-12	→
OPCC1696	Helen King	Poor data quality leads to inefficient decision making and use of resources	Low	Low	1	Awaiting Control	19-Jul-13	→

**Appendix C**

**RISK SCORING MATRIX**

**Overall “RAG” Risk Rating = Impact x Likelihood**

**IMPACT**

	Score	Performance/ Service Delivery	Finance /Efficiency £	Confidence/ Reputation	Health & 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 Regs	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

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