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**Purpose of report**

1. This report provides JARAP with information about the corporate risk register, highlighting high priority, newly registered and risks of note.

**Recommendation**

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

**Summary**

1. The force Strategic Organisational Risk Board (SORB) oversees and directs the strategic risks facing the force. This board last met on 19th April 2016 and was chaired by DCC Bannister. At this board the OPCC were represented, JARAP were unrepresented.
2. The OPCC risks are overseen by its Chief Executive and presented to the Senior Management Team within the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

**Risk**

1. The corporate risk register identifies the key strategic risks. In the main these risks represent long-term issues and typically remain on the register for long periods.

1. All risks are scored on an ascending scale of 1 - 4 in terms of impact and likelihood. Multiplication of these two figures leads to a risk priority rating, which is expressed as a ‘RAG’ rating.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority Rating** | **‘RAG’ Rating** | **Review** |
|  9 - 16 | High | Monthly |
| 5 - 8 | Medium | 3 Monthly |
| 1 - 4 | Low | 3 Monthly |

**Risk status**

1. *Controlled* – this risk is in the ideal state. Circumstances or time may change this state.

*Controls Tasked* – when additional controls have been identified. These additional controls will have an owner tasked to complete them and a target completion date. Within the Orchid risk register the term ‘Awaiting Control’ is used to describe this status.

*Overdue Control* – when the completion date for additional controls has passed.

*Managed* – when no further controls have been identified at that time to reduce the risk further, however, the risk is not acceptably controlled.

*Awaiting Review* – a managed risk which requires a review. It may also be a new risk prior to first review or a risk transferred to a new ‘Responsible Officer’.

**Strategic risks**

1. On the corporate risk register there are 38 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| High | 0 | 1 | 7 | 9 |
| Medium | 2 | 2 | 11 | 9 |
| Low | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |

There are 2 high priority risks, 1 risk of note and 2 new risks. 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. In addition, costs associated to the possible extension of the Airwave contract. **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

Paul Stock – Chief Executive – (0116) 229 8981

Email: Paul.Stock@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk

Laura Saunders – Risk and Business Continuity Advisor – (0116) 248 2127

Email: Laura.Saunders@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk

**Appendix A – Strategic Risks**

1. High risks

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1844** | **Failure to transition to the ESN** |
| Responsible Officer  | Andrew Rodwell | 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, 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
* Creation of ESMCP Project Board
* COT oversight
* ICCS infrastructure upgrade
* Appointment of a project manager locally
* Monthly conference calls with national police team
* Purchase of repair credits for existing Airwave radios
 |
| Update | **21/04/16 – Andrew Rodwell:-** Some clarity is beginning to emerge regarding ESN charges and funding. We have also met once again with Capita who have shared their development plans and provided budgetary cost for an ICCS upgrade. The national police project team have also clarified the East Midlands transition window will commence on 01/12/17. **Current status: managed.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1679** | **Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime** |
| Responsible Officer  | Caroline Barker  | 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, in April 2015 the Home Office Crime Recording reduced the timescale for when crimes must be recorded from 72 hours 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 | * Audit of ‘STORM’ incidents within CMD – compliance check
* Audit schedule – conducted by the Service Improvement Unit
* Task and finish groups – part of Get it Right 1st Time
* Communication plan – as part of Get it Right 1st Time
* Get it Right 1st Time – Gold Group
* HMIC inspection
* Introduction of the Investigative Management Unit
 |
| Additional Controls | * Get it Right 1st Time delivery plan
 |
| Update | **13/04/16 – Caroline Barker:-** A lot of work is continuing to increase compliance with crime recording. This includes a robust audit regime and training, both with specific teams and also as part of a wider programme within PVP4 (Protecting Vulnerable People training programme). Progress continues to be monitored by the Getting it Right First Time Group.**Current status: controls tasked.** |

1. Risk of note

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1329** | **Transforming services – meeting the budget challenge for 2020** |
| Responsible Officer  | Andy Elliott | Impact/Likelihood | High/Medium |
| Date Recorded | 23/02/12 | Current Rating | Medium (6) |
| Category | Operational/Performance | Previous Rating | High (12) |
| Information | The budget shortfall of £4.6 million by 2020 presents some pressures on the force to identify suitable savings. The budget breakdown year on year presents savings increasing gradually from 17/18 with 16/17 budget already balanced. Though the budget gap presents a challenge for the force both the local Blueprint 2020 programme and the Strategic Alliance should be easily able to identify suitable savings opportunities within the time available. |
| Impact | These savings have the potential to have a substantial effect on service delivery for the force.  |
| Existing Controls | * Governance through the Change Board and Change Team
* Force restructure: BCU’s, directorates and services
* One year plan
* Stakeholder engagement plan
* External support – KPMG and objective based budgeting
* HMIC inspection
* Internal audit inspection
* JARAP meetings
* SAB meetings
* MTFP financial planning
 |
| Additional Controls | * Strategic Alliance
 |
| Update | **02/03/16 – Andy Elliott:-** The Change Programme and work streams associated to Blueprint 2020 have realised and continue to project savings. In addition, the CSR announcement of nil cuts has resulted in a smaller budget deficit than predicted. Whilst the impact of savings remains high it is realistic that the shortfall can be managed. **Current status: managed.** |

1. New risks

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1926** | **Quality of video recorded evidence** |
| Responsible Officer  | Jonathan Brown | Impact/Likelihood | High/Medium |
| Date Recorded | 04/01/16 | Current Rating | Medium (6) |
| Category | Operational/Performance | Previous Rating | New Risk |
| Information | Concerns have been raised by the judiciary regarding the quality of video recorded evidence produced by the force. This is both from a technical perspective, including picture and sound quality and also from an interview skills viewpoint. |
| Impact | This could lead to a serious reputational risk for the force should a serious case be lost through the quality of interview based evidence produced. |
| Existing Controls | * Equipment review and update
* Establishment of Achieving Best Evidence (ABE) Group
* Skills review
* Refresher training
 |
| Update | **15/03/16 – Jonathan Brown:-**Work has been undertaken with Learning and Development to ensure a large number of colleagues have received refresher video recorded interview training. The Achieving Best Evidence Group has been established to identify and track good practise and improvement measures. Work is ongoing with the judiciary to update equipment to ensure that evidence is presented in the best possible manner when transferred to the court.**Current status: controlled.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STR1927** | **Lack of agility in applying local change to shared services** |
| Responsible Officer  | Tim Glover | Impact/Likelihood | Low/Medium |
| Date Recorded | 15/01/16 | Current Rating | Low (2) |
| Category | Information Systems/Technology | Previous Rating | New Risk |
| Information | Shared systems may limit the agility to make change to meet local requirements. For example there was difficulty in scheduling some changes to Leicestershire beat boundaries in Niche because of the extent of change as Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire go live. |
| Impact | Ability to make timely changes to our systems to ensure that the information contained is as accurate and up to date as possible. This could have a detrimental impact on systems which directly support operational activity. |
| Existing Controls | * Process alignment
* Reduce interdependencies
* Geo Spatial capability
* Minimise back record conversion
* Slot for boundary changes identified
 |
| Update | **25/02/16 – Tim Glover:-**The Niche project team have identified a short gap in the programme where the Leicestershire boundary changes can be accommodated. Work is being undertaken with the Contact Management Department to ensure that the required changes to STORM can be synchronised.**Current status: managed.** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix B** | **Corporate Risk Register** | **28th April 2016** |
| **Reference** | **Owner** | **Title** | **Impact**  | **Likelihood** | **Status** | **Recorded**  | **Last****review** | **Priority** | **Previous rating** |
| STR1844 | Andrew RodwellCommunications System Manager | Failure to transition to the ESN. | Very High | High | Managed | August 2014 | 21/04/16 | 12 | 12 |
| STR1679 | Caroline BarkerCrime Registrar | Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime. | High | High | Controls Tasked | June 2013 | 13/04/16 | 9 | 9 |
| STR473 | Ross DimmockAnti-Corruption Unit | Organisational risk of not complying with the ACPO national vetting policy. | Medium | Very High | Controls Tasked | March 2010 | 02/02/16 | 8 | 8 |
| STR1922 | Chris Cockerill Operations Lead Criminal Justice | Inability to adequately audit Niche. | Medium | Very High | Controls Tasked | October 2015 | 29/02/16 | 8 | 8 |
| STR1926 | Jonathan BrownHead of Serious Crime | Quality of video recorded evidence. | High | Medium | Controlled | January 2016 | 15/03/16 | 6 | New risk |
| STR1917 | Paul Hooseman Information Manager | Failure to comply with the ‘Building the Picture’ HMIC recommendations. | High | Medium | Controls Tasked | August 2015 | 04/04/16 | 6 | 6 |
| STR1904 | Neil CastleHead of Crime and Intel | Safe keeping of property within force safes. | High  | Medium | Controls Tasked | June 2015 | 27/04/16 | 6 | 6 |
| STR1910 | Dharmendra BhaktaContact Management | Lack of resilience and foreseeable attrition in RTI-PNC compromises service. | Medium | High | Managed | August 2015 | 25/04/16 | 6 | 6 |
| STR420 | Peter Coogan Head of Health and Safety | Management system for energy use. | High | Medium | Controlled | February 2010 | 24/03/16 | 6 | 6 |
| STR1608 | Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services | Governance of partnership working arrangements. | High | Medium | Controls Tasked | January 2013 | 08/02/16 | 6 | 6 |
| STR1519 | Paul Hooseman Information Manager | RMADS management for information security. | High | Medium | Controls Tasked | June 2012 | 04/04/16 | 6 | 6 |
| STR1801 | Alison NaylorHR Director | Ability to meet mandatory training requirements. | Medium | High | Controlled | June 2014 | 06/04/16 | 6 | 6 |
| STR1329 | Andy ElliottHead of Change  | Transforming services – meeting the budget challenge for 2020. | High | Medium | Managed | February 2012 | 02/03/16 | 6 | 12 |
| STR1915 | Paul Hooseman Information Manager | Failure to comply with the ICO recommendations - asset owners. | Medium | Medium | Controls Tasked | August 2015 | 04/04/16 | 4 | 4 |
| STR1916 | Paul Hooseman Information Manager | Failure to comply with the ICO recommendations - records management. | Medium | Medium | Controls Tasked | August 2015 | 04/04/16 | 4 | 4 |
| STR11 | Alison NaylorHR Director | Potential for industrial action affecting our service. | Medium | Medium | Controlled | October 2007 | 06/04/16 | 4 | 4 |
| OPCC1700 | Matthew ClarkePartnership Coordinator | Failure to maintain relationships with key partners. | Medium | Medium | Controls Tasked | July 2013 | 29/01/16 | 4 | 4 |
| OPCC1690 | Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer  | Failure to consult and engage sufficiently with the public. | Medium | Medium | Controls Tasked | July 2013 | 29/01/16 | 4 | 4 |
| STR1521 | Simon HurstAnti-Corruption Lead | Criminal behaviour/impropriety by staff. | Medium | Medium | Controls Tasked | July 2012 | 16/03/16 | 4 | 4 |
| STR508 | Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services | Failure to meet requirements of the Police and Crime Plan. | Medium | Medium | Controlled | April 2010 | 08/02/16 | 4 | 4 |
| STR1875 | Alison CoultonSenior HR Business Partner | Increased number of subject to vetting contracts issued. | Medium | Medium | Controlled | December 2014 | 06/04/16 | 4 | 4 |
| STR1706 | Alison NaylorHR Director | Loss/absence/churn of key personnel. | Medium | Medium | Controlled | August 2013 | 06/04/16 | 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 | 08/02/16 | 4 | 4 |
| STR1818 | Paul Hooseman Information Manager | Government Security Classification (GSC) implementation. | Medium  | Medium | Controls Tasked | June 2014 | 04/04/16 | 4 | 4 |
| OPCC1694 | Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer | Lack of resource and capacity available to OPCC. | High | Low | Controls Tasked | July 2013 | 29/01/16 | 3 | 3 |
| OPCC1698 | Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer | Failure to provide governance to all East Midlands police collaboration projects. | High | Low | Controls Tasked | July 2013 | 29/01/16 | 3 | 3 |
| STR1764 | Tim Glover Head of IT | Accreditation for the use of the PSN. | High | Low | Controlled | January 2014 | 30/03/16 | 3 | 3 |
| STR564 | Jonathan BrownHead of Serious Crime | Management of MFH enquiries. | High | Low | Controlled | August 2010 | 27/04/16 | 3 | 3 |
| STR1571 | Jonathan BrownHead of Serious Crime | Genie/DASH not being used correctly resulting in incorrect risk assessments. | High | Low | Managed | September 2012 | 27/04/16 | 3 | 3 |
| STR458 | Jonathan BrownHead of Serious Crime | Failure to protect vulnerable persons. | High | Low | Controlled | March 2010 | 27/04/16 | 3 | 3 |
| STR310 | David SandallHead of Crime and Intelligence | Failure to recognise and respond to critical incidents and ‘learn lessons’. | High | Low | Controlled | November 2009 | 16/03/16 | 3 | 3 |
| STR520 | Steph Pandit Head of Corporate Services | Governance of collaborative arrangements. | High | Low | Controlled | May 2010 | 08/02/16 | 3 | 3 |
| STR253 | Tim Glover Head of IT | High risk of virus introduction and data loss.  | High | Low | Controls Tasked | July 2009 | 16/03/16 | 3 | 3 |
| STR1927 | Tim Glover Head of IT | Lack of agility in applying local change to shared services. | Low | Medium | Managed | January 2016 | 25/02/16 | 2 | New risk |
| OPCC1695 | Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer | Failure to deliver Police and Crime Plan during period of reducing funding. | Medium | Low | Controls Tasked | July 2013 | 29/01/16 | 2 | 2 |
| STR1765 | Ian HowickHead of EMOpSS | Regional operational support command structure. | Medium | Low | Controlled | February 2014 | 08/02/16 | 2 | 2 |
| STR1890 | Mark NewcombeStrategic Partnerships Lead | Making the best use of the DNT to reduce demand upon other teams. | Medium | Low | Controls Tasked | April 2015 | 07/04/16 | 2 | 2 |
| STR430 | Lynne WoodwardHead of Equalities | Inquiry into disability related harassment. | Medium | Low | Managed | March 2010 | 28/04/16 | 2 | 2 |
| STR380 | Alex Stacey-MidgleySenior HR Business Partner | Current JES unlikely to meet Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) criteria. | Medium | Low | Controls Tasked | January 2010 | 15/03/16 | 2 | 2 |
| STR1623 | Andy LeeDirector of Intelligence  | Preparing for new communities, travelling and foreign national offending.  | Medium | Low | Controlled | February 2013 | 23/02/16 | 2 | 2 |
| STR1861 | Fiona Linton Information Security Manager | Risk to redacted information. | Medium | Low | Controls Tasked | September 2014 | 20/04/16 | 2 | 2 |
| OPCC1864 | Paul Stock Chief Executive Officer | Impact of changes in legislation on the PCC. | Medium | Low | Controls Tasked | October 2014 | 29/01/16 | 2 | 2 |
| OPCC1699 | Sue HaslettHead of Commissioning | Failure to produce and maintain a commissioning framework. | Medium | Low | Managed | July 2013 | 29/01/16 | 2 | 2 |
| OPCC1696 | Helen KingChief Finance Officer | Poor data quality leads to inefficient decision making and use of resources. | Low | Low | Controlled | July 2013 | 29/01/16 | 1 | 1 |
| STR1475 | Mark NewcombeStrategic Partnerships Lead | Limited ability to collate ASB incidents onto SENTINEL. | Low | Low | Controls Tasked | May 2012 | 07/04/16 | 1 | 1 |
| STR459 | Mark NewcombeStrategic Partnerships Lead | Failure to respond to ASB. | Low | Low | Controlled | March 2010 | 21/04/16 | 1 | 1 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Risk of note | New risk |

Appendix C

**Risk Scoring Matrix**

|  |
| --- |
| **Impact** |
|  | **Score** | **Performance/****Service Delivery** | **Finance/ Efficiency £** | **Confidence/Reputation** | **Health and Safety** | **Environment** | **Strategic Direction** |
| **Very High****Very High** | **4** | Major disruption to service delivery.Major impact on performance indicators noticeable by stakeholders. | Force>1,000,000Business area>150,000 | Major stakeholder/investigations/longer lasting community concerns.Major reputational damage; adverse national media coverage > 7 days. | Death or a life changing injury. | Very high negative environmental impact (high amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected). | Major impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective. |
| **High****High** | **3** | Serious disruption to service delivery.Serious impact on performance indicators noticeable by stakeholders. | Force251,000-1,000,000Business area41,000-150,000 | Serious stakeholder/investigations/prolonged specific section of community concerns.Serious reputational damage; adverse national media coverage < 7 days. | An injury requiring over 24 hours hospitalisation and/or more than 3 days off work or a major injury as defined by the RIDDOR regulations. | High negative environmental impact (medium amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected). | Serious impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective. |
| **Medium****Medium** | **2** | Significant disruption to service delivery.Noticeable impact on performance indicators. | Force51,000-250,000Business area11,000-40,000 | Significant investigations/specific section of community concerns.Significant reputational damage; adverse local media coverage. | An injury requiring hospital/professional medical attention and/or between one day and three days off work with full recovery. | Medium negative environmental impact (low amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected). | Significant impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective. |
| **Low** | **1** | Minor disruption to service delivery.Minor impact on performance indicators. |  Force<50,000Business area<10,000  | Complaints from individuals.Minor impact on a specific section of the community. | An injury involving no treatment or minor first aid with no time off work. | Low negative environmental impact (limited amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected). | Minor impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Likelihood** |  | **Overall Risk Rating:****Impact x Likelihood** |
|  Score |
| **Very High** | **4** |  >75% chance of occurrence Almost certain to occur |
| **High** | **3** |  51-75% chance of occurrence More likely to occur than not |  **9 - 16 = High** |
| **Medium** | **2** |  25-50% chance of occurrence Fairly likely to occur |  **5 - 8 = Medium** |
| **Low** | **1** |  <25% chance of occurrence Unlikely to occur |  |  **1 - 4 = Low** |
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