

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

Paper  
Marked

**C**

Report of	<b>OFFICES OF CHIEF CONSTABLE AND POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER</b>
Subject	<b>RISK REGISTER</b>
Date	<b>FRIDAY 9<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2016 – 1.00 P.M.</b>
Author	<b>LAURA SAUNDERS – RISK AND BUSINESS CONTINUITY ADVISOR</b>

## **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 21<sup>st</sup> November 2016 and was chaired by HR Director Ali Naylor. At this board the OPCC were represented.
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. 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

8. On the corporate risk register there are 38 police strategic risks and 9 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	0	0
	High	0	2	6	8
	Medium	3	1	17	5
	Low	0	0	1	3

There are 3 high priority risks, 2 new risks, 4 risks of note and 3 risks that have been archived since the last JARAP meeting; they 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.

#### **STR1329 – Transforming services.**

This revolves around providing services with the reduced budget.

### *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](mailto:Roger.Bannister@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 – Risk and Business Continuity Advisor – (0116) 248 2127

Email: [Laura.Saunders@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk](mailto:Laura.Saunders@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk)

## Appendix A – Strategic Risks

### High risks

STR1844		Failure to transition to the ESN	
Responsible Officer	Chief Superintendent Helen Chamberlain Tri Force Collaboration	Impact/Likelihood	Very High/High
Date Recorded	15/08/14	Current Rating	High (12)
Category	Information Systems/Technology	Previous Rating	High (12)
Information	The Tri force collaboration is managing the transition to ESN as a programme. Leicestershire Police's contract with Airwave is due to expire on 06/01/17. Airwave is a private network, based on the TETRA standard that uses masts to provide national coverage. Centrally the government are driving the procurement process as every emergency service will move to mobile communications. There is a national project team that is engaging with individual forces to gauge concerns and provide updates.		
Impact	This risk is concerned with the operational impact of not transitioning. There is uncertainty about how well the mobile network will respond to increased traffic and whether the emergency services will have priority. In addition, we do not know what functionality issues there may be and how our practices may have to be altered.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purchase of repair credits for existing Sepura Airwave radios.</li> <li>• Monitoring of Airwave performance</li> <li>• COT oversight</li> <li>• Maintaining close contact with national police project team</li> <li>• Regional Airwave user group</li> <li>• Regional coordination and strategic oversight</li> <li>• Tri Force Programme</li> <li>• ICCS infrastructure upgrade</li> </ul>		
Update	<b>31/10/16 – Andrew Rodwell (Communications Manager):-</b> The latest update from the Home Office was that Motorola had missed some milestone deliverables, but this will not currently impact on transition dates. There is a regional coordination group that meets regularly. Tri-Force Collaboration technical staff are meeting to discuss and allocate specific ESN work streams. <b>Current status: managed.</b>		

STR1679		Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime	
Responsible Officer	Sergeant 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 carried out a number of audits under the heading "Missed Opportunities" which 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 Crime reduced the crime recording timescale from 72 to 24 hours.		
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 – compliance check</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</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> <li>• HMIC inspection</li> <li>• Introduction of the Investigative Management Unit</li> </ul>		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Get it Right 1<sup>st</sup> Time delivery plan</li> </ul>		
Update	<b>27/10/16 – Caroline Barker:-</b> This risk is ongoing as work continues with the identified work streams, including training and audit regime. Close scrutiny remains in place with the governance group Get It Right First Time meeting on a regular basis and evaluating progress being made against the delivery plan. <b>Current status: controls tasked.</b>		

<b>STR1935</b>		<b>Management of seized and found property provision</b>	
Responsible Officer	Chief Superintendent Jason Masters Head of Corporate Services	Impact/Likelihood	High/High
Date Recorded	30/06/16	Current Rating	High (9)
Category	Operational/Performance	Previous Rating	New Risk
Information	A series of internal audits and related staff issues have highlighted that the organisational provision and processes relating to property are in need of comprehensive review. Some of the themes highlighted include; no single point of leadership, lack of clear processes and a high volume of property retained with no systematic process for disposal. With this risk there is an opportunity to improve the current service provision and also generate income through the sale of property.		
Impact	There is an operational impact of items being missing, which may be required for investigation purposes. There is a reputational risk associated to the poor management of the property provision where items are lost especially through theft.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal audit completed</li> <li>• Force Property Working Group</li> <li>• Safe audit</li> <li>• Appointment of Project Manager and team</li> <li>• Force Property Manager</li> <li>• Policies and procedures</li> </ul>		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property review project</li> </ul>		
Update	<p><b>27/10/16 – Jason Masters:-</b> The property project team is being led by a senior manager and comprises of different strands of work. These include a complete review of force policies relating to property which now completed is imminently about to be launched with training. We have a team of staff and officers who are working to reduce the high number of items we currently have in stock. Ultimately we are working towards a single site location. <b>Current status: controls tasked.</b></p>		

#### Risks of note

<b>STR473</b>		<b>Organisational risk of not complying with the ACPO Vetting Policy</b>	
Responsible Officer	Inspector Ross Dimmock Anti Corruption Lead	Impact/Likelihood	Medium/Very High
Date Recorded	22/03/10	Current Rating	Medium (8)
Category	Operational/Performance	Previous Rating	High (12)
Information	The ACPO National Vetting Policy is partially implemented; anybody joining the organisation after January 2012 is vetted to the ACPO national guidance. Anyone who joined the organisation before this date (approximately 60% of the current workforce - in excess of 2500 people) would not be vetted to the national standards.		
Impact	There is an ongoing risk associated to a) operational security, b) corruption and c) organisational reputation. The risk extends to resources deployed to regional units.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New starters vetted per ACPO policy</li> <li>• Renewal procedure for CTC introduced</li> <li>• Compliance with policy for all new employees</li> <li>• Centralisation of vetting within PSD</li> <li>• Review of the force vetting function</li> <li>• Priority EMOpSS vetting</li> <li>• Priority vetting cases identification</li> <li>• Operational security</li> <li>• Business case implementation</li> </ul>		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure all staff are vetted in line with policy</li> <li>• All staff to be subject of aftercare / review</li> </ul>		
Update	<p><b>31/10/16 – Simon Hurst (Head of Professional Standards):-</b> Steps have been taken to increase staffing and we are satisfied we now have adequate resilience to meet existing demand. Normal vetting research levels are being achieved and demand has been forecasted and catered for in the medium term. Planned recruitment will further alleviate any concerns over meeting such demand.</p>		

	<b>Current status: controls tasked.</b>		
<b>STR1910</b>	<b>Lack of resilience and foreseeable attrition in RTI-PNC</b>		
Responsible Officer	Chief Inspector Jason Ross Contact Management	Impact/Likelihood	Medium/Medium
Date Recorded	12/08/15	Current Rating	Low (4)
Category	Operational/Performance	Previous Rating	Medium (6)
Information	The Real Time Intelligence (RTI) Team provide a triage function undertaking intelligence checks and intelligence development in real time to assist front line resources. The role of staff is to prioritise task requests based on risk, threat, the time constraints attached to the request and the benefit the intelligence support can offer. Officers from the RTI have applied for other roles within the force. This has an obvious impact on the team being able to perform their tasks with fewer staff.		
Impact	There is a reputational and performance risk associated to the team not being able to manage the work with a decreased capacity.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous recruitment</li> <li>• 10 x CMD controllers trained in PNC enquiries</li> <li>• 3 x TAOP PCs posted into RTI</li> <li>• Additional training</li> </ul>		
Update	<b>26/09/16 – Jason Ross:-</b> There has been a programme of training developed and currently being rolled out with more staff being trained in PNC. By developing functionality with PNC for existing members of staff they are able to assist with RTI demand, creating greater resilience for this area of tasking. <b>Current status: controlled.</b>		

<b>STR1519</b>	<b>RMADS resilience for information security</b>		
Responsible Officer	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	Impact/Likelihood	Medium/Medium
Date Recorded	27/06/12	Current Rating	Low (4)
Category	Information Systems/Technology	Previous Rating	Medium (6)
Information	HMG require Leicestershire Police and it's partners to be able to demonstrate that their systems and processes are compliant with the relevant information security standards; ISO 27001. These assessment and risk management decisions must be recorded in the "Risk Management Accreditation Data Set" (RMADS) using HMG IA Standards. RMADS need to be reviewed annually, ideally by an independent reviewer and should be re-written every 5 years. Leicestershire Police have an Information Security Officer, who is trained in writing RMADS. There is currently no other capability within the Force. This is a single point of failure and there is no capability within Force to carry out the independent annual review.		
Impact	The consequence of failure to carry out these is a potential for loss of sensitive information leading to a threat to the Force reputation and a possibility of action by the Information Commissioner.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option to buy in expertise as required</li> <li>• Information Security Support Officer role created</li> <li>• Other Force ISOs available in advisory capacity</li> </ul>		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information Management Assurance review required</li> <li>• Regional Review of IA provision</li> </ul>		
Update	<b>30/09/16 – Paul Hooseman:-</b> The Information Security Officer has resigned and their role is being temporarily back filled by Information Security Support Officer. An Output Based Budgeting review is currently underway which is assisting to evaluate best and most efficient approach to working practises. In addition work in this areas has been initiated by the Tri Force Collaboration. <b>Current status: controls tasked.</b>		

<b>STR1917</b>		<b>Failure to comply with 'Building the Picture' HMIC recommendations</b>	
Responsible Officer	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	Impact/Likelihood	Medium/Medium
Date Recorded	20/08/15	Current Rating	Low (4)
Category	Operational/Performance	Previous Rating	Medium (6)
Information	Between 2013 and 2014 HMIC completed an assessment and inspection focussing on several key areas, which included; adhering to the principles of the 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.		
Impact	This risk is associated to failing to comply with the recommendations and the reputational, legal and operational implications as a result.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme support</li> <li>• Governance</li> </ul>		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme of work</li> </ul>		
Update	<b>30/09/16 – Paul Hooseman:-</b> An organisational MoPI RRD Review Group has been formed with defined terms of reference. The group will provide recommendations and proposals to inform the DCC SIRO risk appetite around the RRD provision. <b>Current status: controls tasked.</b>		

#### New risks

<b>STR1940</b>		<b>Failure to meet 101 call handling target</b>	
Responsible Officer	Jason Ross Chief Inspector - CMD	Impact/Likelihood	Medium/Very High
Date Recorded	12/09/16	Current Rating	Medium (8)
Category	Stakeholders/Reputation	Previous Rating	New Risk
Information	The current 101 call handling performance is below the intended target for the number of calls answered. The national target stands at 80% of calls answered within 30 seconds, with Leicestershire achieving on average 65-70%. A comfort message has been added for when calls cannot be answered and work is being undertaken to review the shift pattern to increase resilience of call handling staff. The risk is associated to the reputational impact of not answering calls to the police, albeit calls of a non-emergency nature.		
Impact	This risk is associated to the operational impact of incoming calls not being answered and the associated reputation risk that this presents.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shift pattern review</li> <li>• CMD Weekly Demand Meeting</li> <li>• Force Performance Gold Group</li> <li>• CMD Monthly Performance Meeting</li> </ul>		
Update	<b>26/09/16 – Jason Ross:-</b> The call handling performance is considered at the beginning of every week by the Contact Management senior management team. Ongoing performance is monitored on a monthly basis by the senior management team alongside the inspectors, team leaders and analyst. In addition, this is considered in the wider context of force performance at the Performance Delivery Group which is chaired by DCC Bannister. The shift pattern is being reviewed to achieve best resilience with the staffing available. <b>Current status: controlled.</b>		

<b>STR1939</b>		<b>Transition to new Contact Management phone platform</b>	
Responsible Officer	Andrew Rodwell Communications Manager	Impact/Likelihood	High/Medium
Date Recorded	12/09/16	Current Rating	Medium (6)
Category	Information Systems/Technology	Previous Rating	New Risk
Information	The Unify phone platform used by Contact Management has reached end of life. The maintenance contract has been extended until September 2017, however the new solution may require up to an 18 month lead time.		
Impact	The risk is associated to the transition to the platform replacement, whilst the full remit of the tri-force collaboration and the impact upon contact management is unclear. In addition, there will be an overlap with the transition to the ESN and the resources and potential disruption associated to that transition.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extended contract with Unify</li> <li>CMD and IT Monthly Meetings</li> <li>East Midlands Regional ESN Board</li> <li>Tri Force CMD Collaboration</li> </ul>		
Update	<b>15/09/16 – Alistair Roe (Head of Contact Management):-</b> Monthly meetings are being held between IT and the affected business area, Contact Management. As an initial means of mitigation the contract with existing supplier Unity has been extended for 18 months to ensure support is available to maximise resilience. <b>Current status: managed.</b>		

#### Archived risks

<b>STR1904</b>		<b>Safe keeping of property within force safes</b>	
Responsible Officer	Neil Castle Head of Investigations	Impact/Likelihood	High/Medium
Date Recorded	24/06/15	Current Rating	Medium (6)
Category	Operational/Performance	Previous Rating	Medium (6)
Information	The force has a number of safe facilities for the storage of property. This includes cash, valuables and drugs - which may be classed as found, seized or property other than found in the course of police activity, whether spontaneous, planned or enforcement activity. A recent incident has prompted a comprehensive review of all force safes.		
Impact	Loss of property has several implications:- financial compensation to the owner, reputational damage and compromised investigations where the property is required as an exhibit.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access restrictions for high value safes</li> <li>Cash limits for safes</li> <li>Restricted borer access</li> <li>Gold group oversight</li> <li>PSD intervention</li> <li>Property Working Group</li> <li>Dip sampling of safe contents</li> <li>Audit of all force safes</li> </ul>		
Update	<b>25/08/16 – Neil Castle:-</b> The audit of all safes has been completed resulting in increased security measures and processes in place. The current Corporate Services property management review is reviewing the current arrangements with the safes in the wider context of how the force handles found and seized property, which will result in a wider change of procedures and processes. <b>Current status: controlled.</b>		

STR1861	Risk of disclosing redacted information		
Responsible Officer	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	Impact/Likelihood	Medium/Low
Date Recorded	25/09/14	Current Rating	Low (2)
Category	Contracts/Partnerships	Previous Rating	Low (2)
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 has been 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 which could result in a lack of confidence in the police.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial risk mitigation due to incident</li> <li>• All departmental heads contacted</li> <li>• Contact with CPS</li> </ul>		
Update	<p><b>27/10/16 – Paul Hooseman:-</b> This risk was created following an incident that occurred in 2014. Mitigation was immediately put in place to deal with that matter and further steps undertaken to prevent further occurrences. There have not been any further occurrences and this no longer poses a threat. <b>Current status: controlled.</b></p>		

Appendix B		Corporate Risk Register				24 <sup>th</sup> November 2016			
Reference	Owner	Title	Impact	Likelihood	Status	Recorded	Last review	Priority	Previous rating
STR1844	Helen Chamberlain Tri Force Collaboration	Failure to transition to the ESN.	Very High	High	Managed	August 2014	15/11/16	12	12
STR1679	Caroline Barker Crime Registrar	Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime.	High	High	Controls Tasked	June 2013	27/10/16	9	9
STR1935	Jason Masters Head of Corporate Services	Management of seized and found property provision.	High	High	Controls Tasked	June 2016	27/10/16	9	9
STR473	Ross Dimmock Anti-Corruption Unit	Organisational risk of not complying with the ACPO national vetting policy.	Medium	Very High	Controls Tasked	March 2010	31/10/16	8	12
STR1922	Chris Cockerill Operations Lead Criminal Justice	Inability to adequately audit Niche.	Medium	Very High	Controls Tasked	October 2015	14/11/16	8	8
STR1940	Jason Ross Chief Inspector CMD	Failure to meet 101 call handling target.	Medium	Very High	Controlled	September 2016	26/09/16	8	New Risk
STR1936	Andy Elliott Head of Change	Impact of Tri-force Collaboration on local Change Programme.	High	Medium	Managed	June 2016	07/11/16	6	6
STR1926	Simon Cure Head of Serious Crime	Quality of video recorded evidence.	High	Medium	Controlled	January 2016	10/11/16	6	6
STR1939	Andrew Rodwell Communications Manager	Transition to the new Contact Management phone platform.	High	Medium	Controlled	September 2016	15/09/16	6	New Risk
STR420	Peter Coogan Head of Health and Safety	Management system for energy use.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	February 2010	13/10/16	6	6
STR1801	Alison Naylor HR Director	Ability to meet mandatory training requirements.	Medium	High	Controlled	June 2014	24/11/16	6	6
STR1329	Andy Elliott Head of Change	Transforming services – meeting the budget challenge for 2020.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	February 2012	31/10/16	6	6
OPCC1934	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Newly elected PCC for LLR could result in widespread change.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2016	23/11/16	6	6
STR1917	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	Failure to comply with the 'Building the Picture' HMIC recommendations.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	August 2015	30/09/16	4	6
STR1910	Jason Ross Contact Management	Lack of resilience and foreseeable attrition in RTI-PNC compromises service.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	August 2015	26/09/16	4	6
STR1519	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	RMADS management for information security.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	June 2012	30/09/16	4	6
STR1915	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	Failure to comply with the ICO recommendations - asset owners.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	August 2015	30/09/16	4	4
STR1916	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	Failure to comply with the ICO recommendations - records management.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	August 2015	30/09/16	4	4

STR11	Alison Naylor HR Director	Potential for industrial action affecting our service.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	October 2007	24/11/16	4	4
OPCC1700	Matthew Clarke Partnership Coordinator	Failure to maintain relationships with key partners.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	23/11/16	4	4
OPCC1690	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Failure to consult and engage sufficiently with the public.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	23/11/16	4	4
STR1521	Ross Dimmock Anti-Corruption Lead	Criminal behaviour/impropriety by staff.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2012	25/10/16	4	4
STR508	Jason Masters Head of Corporate Services	Failure to meet requirements of the Police and Crime Plan.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	April 2010	27/10/16	4	4
STR1875	Julie Saunders Senior HR Business Partner	Increased number of subject to vetting contracts issued.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	December 2014	07/11/16	4	4
STR1706	Alison Naylor HR Director	Loss/absence/churn of key personnel.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	August 2013	24/11/16	4	4
STR533	Jason Masters Head of Corporate Services	The fair and effective use of stop and search to promote confidence.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	June 2010	27/10/16	4	4
OPCC1698	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Failure to provide governance to all East Midlands police collaboration projects.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	23/11/16	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	23/11/16	4	4
OPCC1864	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Impact of changes in legislation on the PCC.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	October 2014	23/11/16	4	4
OPCC1699	Helen King Head of Commissioning	Failure to produce and maintain a commissioning framework.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	23/11/16	4	4
OPCC1694	Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer	Lack of resource and capacity available to OPCC.	High	Low	Controls Tasked	July 2013	23/11/16	3	3
STR1764	David Craig Head of IT	Accreditation for the use of the PSN.	High	Low	Controlled	January 2014	17/11/16	3	3
STR564	Simon Cure Head of Serious Crime	Management of MFH enquiries.	High	Low	Controlled	August 2010	10/11/16	3	3
STR1571	Simon Cure Head of Serious Crime	Genie/DASH not being used correctly resulting in incorrect risk assessments.	High	Low	Managed	September 2012	10/11/16	3	3
STR458	Simon Cure Head of Serious Crime	Failure to protect vulnerable persons.	High	Low	Controlled	March 2010	10/11/16	3	3
STR310	David Sandall Head of Crime and Intelligence	Failure to recognise and respond to critical incidents and 'learn lessons'.	High	Low	Controlled	November 2009	03/10/16	3	3
STR520	Jason Masters Head of Corporate Services	Governance of collaborative arrangements.	High	Low	Controlled	May 2010	27/10/16	3	3
STR253	David Craig Head of IT	High risk of virus introduction and data loss.	High	Low	Controls Tasked	July 2009	17/11/16	3	3
STR1927	David Craig Head of IT	Lack of agility in applying local change to shared services.	Low	Medium	Controlled	January 2016	13/09/16	2	2

STR1890	Kerry McLernon Strategic Partnerships Lead	Making the best use of the DNT to reduce demand upon other teams.	Medium	Low	Controls Tasked	April 2015	03/11/16	2	2
STR430	Lynne Woodward Head of Equalities	Inquiry into disability related harassment.	Medium	Low	Managed	March 2010	24/11/16	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	26/09/16	2	2
STR1765	Phil Kay Assistant Chief Constable	Regional operational support command structure.	Medium	Low	Controlled	February 2014	21/11/16	2	2
STR1623	Dave Purvis Director of Intelligence	Preparing for new communities, travelling and foreign national offending.	Medium	Low	Controlled	February 2013	10/10/16	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	23/11/16	1	1
STR1818	Paul Hooseman Information Manager	Government Security Classification (GSC) implementation.	Low	Low	Controls Tasked	June 2014	03/11/16	1	4
STR1475	Mark Newcombe Strategic Partnerships Lead	Limited ability to collate ASB incidents onto SENTINEL.	Low	Low	Controls Tasked	May 2012	08/11/16	1	1

Risk of note	New risk	New risk owner
--------------	----------	----------------

### 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>	

This page is intentionally blank.