

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

Paper
Marked

C

Report of	OFFICES OF CHIEF CONSTABLE AND POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER
Subject	RISK REGISTER
Date	WEDNESDAY 20th JUNE 2018 – 10.00 A.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 15th May 2018 and was chaired by DCC Nixon. At this board the OPCC were represented.
4. The OPCC risks are overseen by the Head of Governance and Assurance 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 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	0	4	1
	High	0	3	10	7
	Medium	1	0	10	5
	Low	0	1	0	4

There are 3 high priority risks and 3 risks of note. All of these risks are outlined within Appendix A. Since the last JARAP meeting, there has been 1 new risk. No risks that were archived at the last SORB meeting.

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, ongoing contract with Airwave in the event of a transition delay 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

Rob Nixon – Deputy Chief Constable – (0116) 248 2002

Email: Rob.Nixon@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk

Angela Perry – Head of Governance and Assurance – (0116) 229 8982

Email: Angela.Perry@leics.pcc.pnn.gov.uk

Appendix A – Strategic Risks

High risks

STR1679		Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime	
Responsible Officer	Johnny Starbuck D/Superintendent	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit of 'STORM' incidents within CMD – compliance check • Audit schedule – conducted by the Service Improvement Unit • Monthly Crime Integrity Meeting • Crime Integrity Sub Group Meetings • Communication plan • Get it Right 1st Time – Gold Group • HMIC inspection • Introduction of the Investigative Management Unit 		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crime Integrity delivery plan 		
Update	<p>06/05/18 – Darren Goddard (Deputy Crime Registrar):- We are still working through the 42 strand action plan and progress is being made. We have delivered training to approx. 540 officers and staff in relation to ethical crime recording training. We have produced an updated risk based audit schedule for the audit team. CMD have temporarily relocated 2 of their part time call takers into the for 12 months and we have recruited another member of staff on a temporary 12 month contract. These 3 staff will be undertaking real time audit review of STORM incidents to assist with our incident to crime conversion. The Force Audit team have just completed an audit which mirrored, as far as possible, the HMIC audit and whilst we are improving there is still a real possibility that HMIC could still grade the Force as inadequate. Current status: controls tasked.</p>		

STR2006		Management of Archive provision	
Responsible Officer	Jason Masters Chief Superintendent	Impact/Likelihood	High/High
Date Recorded	03/10/17	Current Rating	High (9)
Category	Operational/Performance	Previous Rating	High (9)
Information	The current Archive provision lacks resilience through adequate governance, policy and procedure and staffing establishment. Items received from across the force, including crime case files, interview tapes and pocket notebooks are not always catalogued or stored in a methodical manner, case files are separated and difficult to re-locate owing to system legacy issues and review, retention and disposal processes are fragmented and not NRAC compliant. Retrieval of records for further investigation or review is difficult. There are also over 200,000 evidential interview cassette tapes that have not been digitised and are degrading, with some being unreadable. With this risk there is an opportunity to significantly improve the current service provision.		
Impact	There is an operational impact of records/items found to be missing or un-locatable, which may be required for investigation purposes or case review. The current system provides little assurance that our obligations under MOPI are being met. This presents a significant reputational risk to the force.		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archive review project • New Force data manager and 6 RRD staff • Proposed regional MOPI RRD procedure 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archive provision moving to shared property new build • Centralised structure incorporated into the Evidential Property Team
Update	<p>03/05/18 – Jez Leavesley (Project Manager):- We are working on a policy and procedure for Retention Review and Disposal of archives. It is not straight forward as legacy archives do not provide the info we need to be able to apply standard MOPI criteria to review them. We need to take a decision on what to do with these legacy archives. We have sought national and then local guidance through East Midlands Police solicitors. Based on this advice a number of proposals will be put forward to chief officers for a decision on how to proceed. Current status: controls tasked.</p>

OPCC1696		Poor data quality leads to inefficient decision making in the OPCC and use of resources	
Responsible Officer	Angela Perry Head of Governance & Assurance	Impact/Likelihood	High/High
Date Recorded	19/07/13	Current Rating	High (9)
Category	Governance	Previous Rating	High (9)
Information	The PCC is making decisions which are informed by force data and information.		
Impact	If the data is not up to date or accurate this may affect the decisions made or where resources are allocated.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data quality audits undertaken by HMIC • Systems in place for providing good quality financial information • Additional scrutiny applied by SAB • Identify and communicate data requirements to the force • Ongoing data audit and assurance programme • Review the findings of recent data quality audits to understand current position • Regular reports on data quality to appropriate forums • Review performance and information requirements to meet PCC's priorities • Detailed action plan review at June SAB meeting • PCC update to Police and Crime Panel in July 2017 		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HMIC effectiveness audit reviewed • Force action plan requested by PCC at each SAB meeting • HMIC data integrity audit underway • Hot debrief and full report awaited • Force to review internal audit methodology to ensure it reflects HMIC methodology 		
Update	<p>28/03/18 – Nish Padhiar (Assurance Officer):- This risk has received an interim review, whilst a risk identification process is being planned when new emerging threats and opportunities will be benchmarked against all existing OPCC risks. Current status: controls tasked.</p>		

New risk

STR2017		Implementing the HMIC Targeting the risk recommendation for firearms checks	
Responsible Officer	Chief Inspector Sian Walls	Impact/Likelihood	Medium/High
Date Recorded	25/04/18	Current Rating	Medium (6)
Category	Operational/Performance	Previous Rating	New Risk
Information	This threat has arisen from a recommendation from the HMIC 'Targeting the Risk' thematic inspection. The recommendation is that within three months, all chief constables should ensure that systems designed to identify, prior to police attendance, whether a reported incident involves or is at the address of a firearm certificate holder are in place and are always applied by staff dispatching officers to incidents; and that officers understand the risk assessment which they should be undertaking in such circumstances, and their power, when appropriate, to seize firearms and firearm certificates.		
Impact	A review of the current systems for Leicestershire showed that the gazetteer differed between the NFLMS system and the STORM command and control system. This proved		

	problematic in that addresses would be missed on an automated system.
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reminder to CMD staff about need to complete Genie checks • Processes in CMD around Genie • An analytical processes has been developed with the firearms licensing department • A review of current practice completed to ensure there is no new technology solutions to allow auto generated checks.
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of options
Update	<p>25/04/18 – Sian Walls: - A review is being undertaken by the Local Policing Directorate in conjunction with Contact Management – to understand the options available. Mitigation has also been put in place which includes CMD staff are appropriately briefed with the expectation of completing GENIE checks. Current status: controls tasked.</p>

Risks of note

STR1844	Failure to transition to the ESN		
Responsible Officer	Ian Freeman IT Communications Manager	Impact/Likelihood	Very High/Low
Date Recorded	15/08/14	Current Rating	Low (4)
Category	Information Systems/Technology	Previous Rating	High (12)
Information	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"> • Purchase of repair credits for existing Sepura Airwave radios. • Monitoring of Airwave performance • COT oversight • Maintaining close contact with national police project team • Regional Airwave user group • Regional coordination and strategic oversight • Tri Force Programme • ICCS infrastructure upgrade 		
Update	<p>04/06/18 – Sally Brooks (ESN Project Manager):- The risk and controls have been reviewed. At this point it is recommended that the risk is split into three separate risks rather than reporting as one. The Risks would therefore be reviewed under the following work streams: Control Room, Airwave Resilience and Finance so each area of threat can be specifically outlined with individual risk assessments and controls. Current status: managed.</p>		

STR473	Organisational risk of not complying with the ACPO policy		
Responsible Officer	Mandy Bogle-Reilly Vetting Manager	Impact/Likelihood	HighMedium
Date Recorded	22/03/10	Current Rating	Medium (6)
Category	Operational/Performance	Previous Rating	High (12)
Information	The ACPO National Vetting Policy is partially implemented; anybody joining the organisation after January 2012 are vetted to the ACPO national guidance. Anyone who joined the organisation before this date are not vetted to the national standards. The risk posed extends to resources deployed to regional units.		
Impact	There is an ongoing risk associated to operational security, corruption and reputation.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralisation of vetting within PSD • Review of the force vetting function • Priority EMOpsSS vetting 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewal procedure for CTC introduced • Compliance with policy for all new employees • Operational security • New starters vetted per ACPO policy • Business Case Implementation 2015
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure all staff are vetted in line with policy • All staff to be subject of aftercare / review
Update	<p>04/06/18 – Mandy Bogle-Reilly:- We are currently well ahead of target and have now adjusted the expected project completion date to between March-June 2019, from the original date of December 2019. We have had sign off for the new IT system for some time but we are still awaiting IT confirmation on the delivery schedule. Current status: controls tasked.</p>

OPCC1694		Lack of appropriate resource and capacity available to OPCC	
Responsible Officer	Angela Perry Head of Governance & Assurance	Impact/Likelihood	High/Low
Date Recorded	19/07/13	Current Rating	Low (3)
Category	Governance	Previous Rating	High (9)
Information	Lack of appropriate resource and capacity available to OPCC		
Impact	Ability to undertake key work.		
Existing Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake interim and permanent review of structure to ensure appropriate to deliver new PCC priorities • Continuous development permanent resource • Review and consider options for new PCC Deputy and Advisor arrangements • PDR process to monitor and enhance staff performance and development • OPCC structure reviewed and new structure finalised • Staff Consultation Period- New structure • Undertake appropriate consultation with staff • Skills analysis requirements for the OPCC completed as part of new structure • Deputy PCC review of office structure • Undertake OPCC team development sessions to focus and develop the workforce • Business Plan in place and under review • Existing staff matched into roles within the new structures. • Experienced and interim staff provide capacity • All "non operational" employees of the Office of the Chief Constable available to PCC at all times under legislation. • PDRs in place for all staff 		
Additional Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruit to roles in office • Force and interim staff to provide additional capacity • Develop Training and PDRs for all office staff 		
Update	<p>01/03/18 – Nish Padhiar (Assurance Officer):- This risk has received an interim review, whilst a risk identification process is being planned when new emerging threats and opportunities will be benchmarked against all existing OPCC risks. Current status: controls tasked.</p>		

Appendix B		Corporate Risk Register				4 th June 2018			
Reference	Owner	Title	Impact	Likelihood	Status	Recorded	Last review	Priority	Previous rating
STR2006	Jason Masters Assistant Chief Constable	Management of archive provision.	High	High	Control Tasked	October 2017	03/05/18	9	9
OPCC1696	Angela Perry Head of Governance & Assurance	Poor data quality leads to inefficient decision making in the OPCC and use of resources.	High	High	Controls Tasked	July 2013	28/03/18	9	9
STR1679	Johnny Starbuck D/Superintendent	Missed opportunities: failure to accurately record crime.	High	High	Controls Tasked	June 2013	09/05/18	9	9
STR1954	Mick Graham Director of Intelligence	Failure of ANPR server resulting in loss of live feed.	Very High	Medium	Managed	January 2017	31/01/18	8	8
STR1935	Jason Masters Assistant Chief Constable	Management of seized and found property provision.	Very High	Medium	Controls Tasked	June 2016	31/01/18	8	8
STR1949	Mick Graham Director of Intelligence	Inability to upload non crime statistics from Niche onto PND.	Very High	Medium	Managed	December 2016	03/04/18	8	8
STR1961	Michelle Chambers DBS Vetting Manager	Failure to upload information from Niche to the DBS PLX system.	Very High	Medium	Managed	March 2017	01/02/18	8	8
STR1922	Chris Cockerill Operations Lead Criminal Justice	Inability to adequately audit Niche.	Medium	Very High	Controls Tasked	October 2015	07/12/17	8	8
STR473	Mandy Bogle-Reilly Security Vetting Manager	Compliance with the ACPO vetting policy for the policing community.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	March 2010	04/06/18	6	12
STR1991	David Craig Head of IT	Threat of cyber-attack on Leicestershire Police.	High	Medium	Managed	June 2017	30/05/17	6	6
STR1953	Alex Stacey-Midgley Senior HR Business Partner	Risk of significant change following implementation of Hay Review.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	December 2016	31/01/18	6	6
STR1926	Simon Cure Head of Serious Crime	Quality of video recorded evidence.	High	Medium	Controlled	January 2016	31/10/17	6	6
STR1939	Ian Freeman IT Communications Manager	Transition to the new Contact Management phone platform.	High	Medium	Controlled	September 2016	29/05/18	6	6
STR420	Peter Coogan Head of Health and Safety	Management system for energy use.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	February 2010	03/11/17	6	6
STR1801	Alison Naylor HR Director	Ability to meet mandatory training requirements.	High	Medium	Controlled	June 2014	14/05/18	6	6
STR1329	Andy Elliott Head of Change	Transforming services – meeting the budget challenge for 2020.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	February 2012	29/05/18	6	6
STR1910	Jason Ross Contact Management	Lack of resilience and foreseeable attrition in RTI-PNC compromises service.	High	Medium	Controlled	August 2015	10/05/18	6	6
OPCC1690	Angela Perry Head of Governance & Assurance	Failure to consult and engage sufficiently with the public.	High	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	01/03/18	6	6

STR1844	Ian Freeman IT Communications Manager	Failure to transition to the ESN.	Very High	Low	Managed	August 2014	25/04/18	4	12
STR1917	Steve Morris Information Manager	Failure to comply with the 'Building the Picture' HMIC recommendations.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	August 2015	08/02/18	4	4
STR1946	Steve Morris Information Manager	Adoption of EU General Data Protection Regulations and Directive in May 2018.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	November 2016	08/02/18	4	4
STR1916	Steve Morris Information Manager	Failure to comply with the ICO recommendations - records management.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	August 2015	08/02/18	4	4
STR11	Alison Naylor HR Director	Potential for industrial action affecting our service.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	October 2007	14/05/18	4	4
OPCC1700	Angela Perry Head of Governance & Assurance	Failure to maintain relationships with key partners.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	14/03/18	4	4
STR508	Adam Streets Head of Corporate Services	Failure to meet requirements of the Police and Crime Plan.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	April 2010	03/05/18	4	4
STR1706	Alison Naylor HR Director	Loss/absence/churn of key personnel.	Medium	Medium	Controlled	August 2013	14/05/18	4	4
OPCC1698	Angela Perry Head of Governance & Assurance	Failure to provide governance to all East Midlands police collaboration projects.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	14/03/18	4	4
OPCC1864	Angela Perry Head of Governance & Assurance	Impact of changes in legislation on the PCC.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	October 2014	14/03/18	4	4
OPCC1699	Angela Perry Head of Governance & Assurance	Failure to produce and maintain a commissioning framework.	Medium	Medium	Controls Tasked	July 2013	28/03/18	4	4
OPCC1694	Angela Perry Head of Governance & Assurance	Lack of resource and capacity available to OPCC.	High	Low	Controls Tasked	July 2013	01/03/18	3	6
STR2007	Andrew Wroe Head of Estates	Continuity of power supply to the FHQ site.	High	Low	Controls Tasked	October 2017	11/01/18	3	3
STR1940	Jason Ross Chief Inspector CMD	Failure to meet 101 call handling target.	Low	High	Controlled	September 2016	10/05/18	3	3
STR1764	David Craig Head of IT	Accreditation for the use of the PSN.	High	Low	Controlled	January 2014	30/05/18	3	3
STR564	Simon Cure Head of Serious Crime	Management of MFH enquiries.	High	Low	Controlled	August 2010	31/10/17	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	31/10/17	3	3
STR458	Simon Cure Head of Serious Crime	Failure to protect vulnerable persons.	High	Low	Controlled	March 2010	31/10/17	3	3
STR253	David Craig Head of IT	High risk of virus introduction and data loss.	High	Low	Controls Tasked	July 2009	10/05/18	3	3
STR1519	Steve Morris Information Manager	RMADS management for information security.	Medium	Low	Controls Tasked	June 2012	08/02/18	2	2
STR1915	Steve Morris Information Manager	Failure to comply with the ICO recommendations - asset owners.	Medium	Low	Controls Tasked	August 2015	08/02/18	2	2

STR430	Lynne Woodward Head of Equalities	Inquiry into disability related harassment.	Medium	Low	Managed	March 2010	03/05/18	2	2
STR1975	Carol Hever Head of HR	Gateway upgrade project.	Medium	Low	Controls Tasked	April 2017	26/10/17	2	2
STR1623	Mick Graham Director of Intelligence	Preparing for new communities, travelling and foreign national offending.	Medium	Low	Controlled	February 2013	04/04/18	2	2
STR310	David Sandall Head of Crime and Intelligence	Failure to recognise and respond to critical incidents and 'learn lessons'.	Low	Low	Controlled	November 2009	03/05/18	1	1
STR1990	David Craig Head of IT	Risk of uncertainty of impact of IT changes upon Leicestershire	Low	Low	Controls Tasked	June 2017	10/05/18	1	3
OPCC1695	Angela Perry Head of Governance & Assurance	Failure to deliver Police and Crime Plan during period of reducing funding.	Low	Low	Controls Tasked	July 2013	01/03/18	1	1
STR1475	Shane O'Neill Local Policing Lead	Limited ability to collate ASB incidents onto SENTINEL.	Low	Low	Controls Tasked	May 2012	31/01/18	1	1

Risk of note

Risk Scoring Matrix

Impact							
	Score	Performance/ Service Delivery	Finance/ Efficiency £	Confidence/Reputation	Health and Safety	Environment	Strategic Direction
Very High	4	Major disruption to service delivery. Major impact on performance indicators noticeable by stakeholders.	Force >1,000,000 Business area >150,000	Major stakeholder/investigations/longer lasting community concerns. Major reputational damage; adverse national media coverage > 7 days.	Death or a life changing injury.	Very high negative environmental impact (high amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected).	Major impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective.
High	3	Serious disruption to service delivery. Serious impact on performance indicators noticeable by stakeholders.	Force 251,000-1,000,000 Business area 41,000-150,000	Serious stakeholder/investigations/prolonged specific section of community concerns. Serious reputational damage; adverse national media coverage < 7 days.	An injury requiring over 24 hours hospitalisation and/or more than 3 days off work or a major injury as defined by the RIDDOR regulations.	High negative environmental impact (medium amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected).	Serious impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective.
Medium	2	Significant disruption to service delivery. Noticeable impact on performance indicators.	Force 51,000-250,000 Business area 11,000-40,000	Significant investigations/specific section of community concerns. Significant reputational damage; adverse local media coverage.	An injury requiring hospital/professional medical attention and/or between one day and three days off work with full recovery.	Medium negative environmental impact (low amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected).	Significant impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective.
Low	1	Minor disruption to service delivery. Minor impact on performance indicators.	Force <50,000 Business area <10,000	Complaints from individuals. Minor impact on a specific section of the community.	An injury involving no treatment or minor first aid with no time off work.	Low negative environmental impact (limited amount of natural resources used, pollution produced, biodiversity affected).	Minor impact on the ability to fulfil strategic objective.

Likelihood			
Score			
Very High	4	>75% chance of occurrence	Almost certain to occur
High	3	51-75% chance of occurrence	More likely to occur than not
Medium	2	25-50% chance of occurrence	Fairly likely to occur
Low	1	<25% chance of occurrence	Unlikely to occur

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

This page is intentionally blank.