



JOINT STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

RISK ASSESSMENT SCHEME

Key:

- L** Likelihood
- I** Impact
- R** Risk rating

<u>Scores</u>				
Likelihood				
<u>remote</u>	<u>possible</u>	<u>probable</u>	<u>more likely than not (>50%)</u>	
1	2	3	4	
Impact e.g. on Reputation, Finances or Service				
<u>minor</u>	<u>moderate</u>	<u>significant</u>	<u>major</u>	
1	2	3	4	

Rating Risks: Matrix of Impact / Likelihood and Criticality scores:

The risk owner should first consider and assess the severity of the impact on the business if the identified risk were to crystallise. Then assess the likelihood of the risk occurring in one of four categories. The criticality score or risk rating is where the assessments of impact and likelihood intersect in the matrix.

Impact	Major	4	8	12	16
	Significant	3	6	9	12
	Moderate	2	4	6	8
	Minor	1	2	3	4
		Remote 1 – 10%	Possible 10 – 30%	Probable 30 – 50%	As likely as not ≥50%
		Likelihood			

**Policy for intervention
based on explicit risk appetite:**

A risk policy will be set which appropriately reflects its risk appetite. Where there is a preparedness to accept a higher level of risk then the thresholds for high, medium and low will move accordingly e.g. no risks rating above 8 without further mitigating action, or the appetite can vary by risk area. Interventions should ideally be kept to a minimum.

Criticality - Key	Associated level of intervention:	
9-16	High	Take immediate mitigation action
6-8	Medium	Review current controls and action plan
1-4	Low	Limited action or long term planning

IMPACT categories & examples of grading

IMPACT GRADING		Safety	Reputation/ Public Confidence	Performance	Compliance	Financial
MAJOR	4	Multiple fatalities	Adverse and persistent national media coverage, massive damage to reputation. Or complete lack of representative police visibility.	Total failure to achieve performance targets	Improvement notice/ civil litigation/ criminal prosecution/ serious intervention	Loss of other budget allocations (£1M)
	3	Single fatality or severe injury to several people.	Adverse publicity in local media of a persistent nature and some adverse national coverage. Or major lack of representative police visibility.	Major impact on achieving performance targets	Authority in breach of legislative requirements.	Significant impact on other budgets/ potential loss of external funding (£500K)
MODERATE	2	Major injury	Short-term adverse local publicity. Or extended lack of representative police visibility.	Relevant & noticeable impact on achieving performance targets	Non-compliance with regulatory framework	Additional funds required (£100K)
MINOR	1	Slight injury	Little or no adverse media coverage or minor lack of representative police visibility	No/minimal impact on achieving performance targets	At worst breach of policy & procedure only	On or within allocated budget (+/- £5K)

RISK CATEGORISATION: Key accountabilities mapped to Commissioner and Chief Constable responsibilities for keeping Cambridgeshire safe and secure.

1. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT: The Commissioner as local link between the police and communities, working to turn the desires and ambitions of the public, in terms of policing and crime reduction, into action and responsibility for holding the police to account on behalf of the public. The Chief Constable regularly explaining to the public the actions of Cambridgeshire Constabulary	
1A. PUBLISH INFORMATION	Commissioner and Chief Constable
1B. OBTAIN VIEWS OF COMMUNITY	Commissioner and Chief Constable
2. SETTING DIRECTION: The Commissioner setting the strategic direction and aims for the Constabulary and more widely for community safety and reducing crime through the Police and Crime Plan	
2A. PUBLISH A POLICE AND CRIME PLAN	Commissioner
3. RESOURCING & ENABLING DELIVERY: Delivering community safety and reducing crime. The Commissioner receiving all the funding relating to policing and reducing crime and, after consulting the Chief Constable, responsibility for deciding how it is spent	
3A. DELIVER EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE POLICING (IN LINE WITH POLICE AND CRIME PLAN AND STRATEGIC POLICING REQUIREMENT)	Chief Constable
3B. MAKE CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION GRANTS	Commissioner
3C. CO-OPERATIVE WORKING WITH COMMUNITY SAFETY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM PARTNERS	Commissioner
3D. RECEIVE FUNDING	Commissioner
3E. ISSUE PRECEPT	Commissioner
3F. ENTER INTO COLLABORATION AGREEMENTS	Commissioner and Chief Constable

3G. MANAGE RESOURCES AND SPENDING	Chief Constable
3H. APPOINTING THE CHIEF CONSTABLE (AND REMOVE THEM FROM OFFICE WHEN NECESSARY)	Commissioner
3I. APPOINT CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND COMMISSIONER'S CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER	Commissioner
3J. APPOINT CHIEF CONSTABLE'S CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER AND OTHER CONSTABULARY OFFICERS AND STAFF	Chief Constable
4. BEING ACCOUNTABLE: The Commissioner being accountable and, on behalf of the public, holding the Chief Constable to account for the delivery and performance of the Constabulary	
4A. HOLD THE CHIEF CONSTABLE TO ACCOUNT	Commissioner
4B. PROVIDE INFORMATION AND SUPPORT TO THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER	Chief Constable
4C. VISIBLY SCRUTINISE PERFORMANCE AGAINST THE POLICE AND CRIME PLAN	Commissioner
4D. ENSURE BETTER VALUE FOR MONEY AND IMPROVED EFFECTIVENESS	Commissioner and Chief Constable
4E. MANAGE AND MONITOR COMPLAINTS	Commissioner and Chief Constable
4F. RESPOND TO THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL	Police and Crime Commissioner

Risk Description & Cause <i>The key risk or challenge that could prevent the Commissioner and Chief Constable in achieving their objectives, the reason this risk could occur and the impact if the risk materialised</i>	Risk Controls <i>Method of controlling or managing the risk</i>	Controls Assurance <i>Method of verification which provides an opinion on the operation of controls in place to manage the risk</i>	Level of Assurance
RISK AREA 1: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT			
<p>1/1 <u>Risk</u>: The Commissioner fails to provide the local link between the police and communities. The Chief Constable fails to explain to the public the actions of Cambridgeshire Constabulary.</p> <p><u>Cause</u>: Capability and capacity to identify and implement appropriate mechanisms.</p> <p><u>Effect</u>: Poor engagement and a lack of openness and transparency. The desires and ambitions of the public in Cambridgeshire, in terms of policing and crime reduction, are not identified and turned into action. The public are not able to assess the performance of the Commissioner and the Chief Constable. The ability of the Commissioner to be accountable to voters is compromised. Public confidence and trust in how crime is being cut and policing delivered in Cambridgeshire is undermined.</p> <p><u>Owner</u>: Commissioner's Head of Communications and Engagement and Constabulary's Head of Corporate Communications</p> <p><u>Initial Risk</u>: likelihood =3, Impact = 3</p> <p><u>Residual Risk</u>: likelihood =2, Impact = 3 Medium Risk (keep action plan under review)</p>	<p>Joint Engagement Strategy and action plan</p> <p>Constabulary / Commissioner Publication Schemes including Constabulary and Commissioner websites</p> <p>Proactive Engagement with and monitoring of media by Commissioner and Chief Constable jointly and separately (ongoing)</p> <p>Bespoke Commissioner engagement with community (ongoing).</p> <p>PSD management of police complaints and Commissioner monitoring of complaints.</p>	<p>Force Performance Group performance manages: satisfaction survey undertaken by Chief Constable; British Crime Survey information; and other evaluation and initiates action if metrics (monthly)</p> <p>Commissioner review of the Chief Constable, publication of monitoring reports on satisfaction, confidence, progress on the Joint Engagement Strategy and complaints and concerns (quarterly).</p> <p>Report on engagement to be taken to the Police and Crime Panel (Nov).</p>	
RISK AREA 2: SETTING DIRECTION			

<p>2/1 <u>Risk</u>: The Commissioner fails to take the appropriate decisions to enable them to fulfil their statutory functions effectively.</p> <p><u>Cause</u>: Capacity and ineffective or unclear decision making process set against complex landscape, including the implementation of transfer order 2.</p> <p><u>Effect</u>: Reputational damage and the Commissioner’s ability to shape and enable delivery compromised. Partnership working and public confidence compromised.</p> <p><u>Owner</u>: Chief Executive</p> <p><u>Initial Risk</u>: Likelihood =3 Impact = 3</p> <p><u>Residual Risk</u> Likelihood = 3 Impact = 2 Medium risk (Review current controls and action plan)</p>	<p>Proactive executive team management of capacity and processes to ensure decisions required by the Commissioner are taken in a timely manner</p> <p>Creation of new transfer order 2 implementation action plan and governance arrangements.</p>	<p>Risk based rolling programme of Internal Audit to assess adequacy of fulfilment of statutory functions</p> <p>External Audit to consider whether appropriate statutory functions are fulfilled effectively</p> <p>Publication of future decisions to be taken and the Commissioner website to allow public scrutiny</p>	
<p>2/2 <u>Risk</u>: The Commissioner, despite consultation with the Chief Constable and due regard to the Strategic Policing Requirement and priorities of community-safety and criminal-justice partners, fails to ensure the Police and Crime Plan sets objectives which provide a clear focus to reduce crime and disorder and meet the expectations of the people of Cambridgeshire. The Police and Crime Commissioner’s manifesto commitments are not delivered.</p> <p><u>Cause</u>: Lack of clear direction from the Commissioner or poor planning, public engagement, engagement with the constabulary, partnership working, lack of understanding of evidence of need and cost-effectiveness.</p> <p><u>Effect</u>: Crime is not reduced and the long-term effectiveness and efficiency of policing, the Criminal Justice System and community safety in Cambridgeshire is not improved. Public confidence and trust in how crime is being cut and policing delivered in Cambridgeshire is undermined.</p> <p><u>Owner</u>: Police and Crime Commissioner</p>	<p>Clear planning processes in place covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence base • Engagement with stakeholders including the Chief constable • Review of SPR • Linkage with financial and other key strategies <p>Arrangements for keeping the Plan under review</p> <p>Star chambers to enable the Commissioner to understand the work of partnerships and how grant funding will add</p>	<p>Cambridgeshire Countywide Strategic Community Safety Board ensures strategic engagement with community-safety and criminal justice partners. (quarterly)</p> <p>On-going panel scrutiny of precept and Police and Crime Plan changes</p> <p>Valuing Policing HMIC inspection</p>	

<p><u>Initial Risk:</u> Likelihood =3 Impact = 4</p> <p><u>Residual Risk</u> Likelihood = 2 Impact = 3 Medium Risk (keep progress under review)</p>	<p>value</p> <p>Victim and Offender Needs Assessment Steering Group to ensure understanding of local priorities / needs to inform Plan</p> <p>Police and Crime Partnership Working Group ensuring effective engagement with community-safety and criminal justice officers (quarterly)</p>		
<p>2/3 <u>Risk:</u> The Chief Constable fails to meet the operational expectation of the Home Office with respect to the Strategic Policing Requirement. <u>Cause:</u> Lack of understanding of statutory duties, resources and poor horizon scanning, planning and collaboration nationally, regionally and through the strategic alliance <u>Effect:</u> Operational delivery only addresses local service delivery. National or international policing issues may not be properly prioritised, compromising the collective abilities of police forces to protect the public from serious harm and maintain national security. <u>Owner:</u> Chief Constable</p> <p><u>Initial Risk:</u> Likelihood =2 Impact = 4</p> <p><u>Residual Risk:</u> Likelihood =2 Impact = 2 Low risk</p>	<p>Needs of Strategic Policing Requirement integrated into the Policing Strategic Assessment</p> <p>Performance Boards (monthly) and Force Executive Board Meetings.</p>	<p>Collaborative governance arrangements ensure proper prioritisation of regional and national policing issues</p> <p>HMIC inspection</p>	
<p>2/4 <u>Risk:</u> The Commissioner and Chief Constable are unable to influence national, regional, or strategic alliance policies</p>	<p>Constabulary Horizon scanning processes in place</p>	<p>Implementation of collaborative governance arrangements to ensure</p>	

<p><u>Cause:</u> Insufficient horizon scanning, engagement with and influence of national, regional and strategic alliance issues and policies due to poor prioritisation or inadequate resources.</p> <p><u>Effect:</u> National, regional or strategic alliance policies are not informed by the experience within Cambridgeshire and do not meet its requirements.</p> <p><u>Owner:</u> Police and Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable</p> <p><u>Initial Risk:</u> Likelihood =3 Impact = 4</p> <p><u>Residual Risk:</u> Likelihood =2 Impact = 3 Medium Risk (close monitoring required of regional collaboration arrangements)</p>	<p>Chief Constable, Commissioner and Chief Executive engage proactively with relevant national bodies</p> <p>Effective agenda setting through the strategic alliance and the Eastern Regional Collaboration terms of reference</p> <p>The Commissioner recognises the national role of the Chief Executive and the Chief Constable within PDR processes</p>	<p>they produce properly informed policies and inform appropriate responses to national, regional or strategic alliance issues which are effectively monitored</p> <p>Business Coordination Board (monthly) ensure effective co-ordination in relation to national issues</p> <p>Commissioner engagement with national work through his role as co-chair of the APCC</p> <p>Chief Constable engagement with national Chief Constable meetings</p>	
RISK AREA 3: RESOURCING & ENABLING DELIVERY			
<p>3/1 <u>Risk:</u> The Commissioner and Chief Constable fail to manage the finances effectively i.e. arrangements are not in place for strategic financial planning, receiving funding, financial management, accounting and auditing, monitoring value for money, setting the police precept, allocating funding and issuing crime and disorder reduction grants, planning for major police operations. Statutory duties are not met and the accounts are qualified.</p> <p><u>Cause:</u> Poor strategic and financial planning and budgetary control mechanisms. Against uncertainty of budgetary landscape. Uncertainty of delegation.</p> <p><u>Effect:</u> Impact on service quality and performance. Reputational</p>	<p>Scheme of governance, Financial regulations and contract standing orders clearly set out duties of the two corporation soles</p> <p>Medium term financial planning processes</p> <p>Regular joint working between the Deputy Commissioner, Commissioner's CFO and the</p>	<p>Internal and external audit of all financial systems ensure accounting and finances are managed effectively.</p> <p>Business Coordination Board (monthly) ensures proper strategic planning, consideration of the national budgetary landscape, ensuring the Medium Term Financial Strategy is in line with the Police and Crime Plan and drives efficiency and oversees financial</p>	

<p>damage and the Commissioner is not able to implement their objectives for reducing crime and the long-term effectiveness and efficiency of policing, the Criminal Justice System and community safety in Cambridgeshire as set out in their Police and Crime Plan.</p> <p><u>Owner:</u> Commissioner's CFO/Chief Constable's CFO</p> <p><u>Initial Risk:</u> Likelihood =3 Impact = 4</p> <p><u>Residual Risk:</u> Likelihood =2 Impact = 3 Medium Risk (controls assurance processes kept under review)</p>	<p>Chief Constable's CFO including monitoring revenue, and capital spending (including IT and estate) and approving in year revisions to the revenue budget (including virement) and the capital programme and to oversee financial monitoring arrangements..</p> <p>Revenue provisional outturn report, Budget monitoring report, Monthly budgetary control procedures, Revenue Budget Monitoring cover all aspects of the Commissioners budgets (Quarterly)</p> <p>Quality of service provision report, Internal value for money investigations</p> <p>Capital Programme Monitoring</p> <p>Prudential Indicators, Treasury Management and Minimum Revenue Provision (Annually)</p> <p>Financial Reserves (Annually), including general reserve as a contingency for the cost of major police operations</p> <p>Treasury Management Annual</p>	<p>monitoring arrangements. .</p> <p>Business Coordination Board (monthly) ensures adequate service quality and performance and that the finances are managed effectively.</p> <p>Audit Committee to provide independent assurance on the adequacy of the risk management framework and the associated control environment, independent scrutiny of the Commissioner's and Chief Constable's financial and nonfinancial performance to the extent that it affects exposure to risk and weakens the control environment, and to oversee the financial reporting process.</p> <p>External Audit statements published</p> <p>Police and Crime Commissioner has oversight of the Chief Constable's budgetary framework and this is included in the Police and Crime Plan allowing public scrutiny.</p>	
---	---	--	--

	<p>Report</p> <p>Medium Term Financial Plan (Bi-annual)</p> <p>Capital Programme (Bi-annual)</p> <p>Draft revenue and capital estimates (annual)</p> <p>Fees and charges review (annual)</p> <p>Asset disposals, leases of land or property, value for Money statement/strategy</p>		
<p>3/2 <u>Risk</u>: The Commissioner and the Chief Constable fail to work together effectively.</p> <p><u>Cause</u>: Lack of understanding of respective roles and responsibilities and poor planning.</p> <p><u>Effect</u>: Breakdown in constructive relationship between the two individuals and/or organisations. The Commissioner cannot access the information and resources held by the Constabulary necessary to make well informed decisions and to carry out their functions effectively. The operational independence of the Chief Constable and the Constabulary is obstructed. Reputational damage. The effectiveness of policing in Cambridgeshire is compromised and public confidence is undermined.</p> <p><u>Owner</u>: Monitoring Officer</p> <p><u>Initial Risk</u>: Likelihood =3 Impact = 4</p> <p><u>Residual Risk</u>: Likelihood =2 Impact = 2 Low Risk (controls assurance processes kept under review)</p>	<p>Regular Commissioner / Chief Constable informal meetings</p> <p>Scheme of governance and Policing Protocol Order 2011 and any local protocols clarify respective roles and responsibilities</p> <p>Joint Audit Committee (Quarterly)</p> <p>Liaison between Constabulary / Commissioner's staff (ongoing).</p> <p>Governance framework lays out the requirements of joint planning work and separate responsibilities and commitment to Nolan</p>	<p>Joint Audit Committee (quarterly)</p> <p>Integrity Committee (six monthly)</p> <p>Review of complaints against the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner by the Police and Crime Panel.</p>	

	<p>Principles ensure that the Commissioner and Chief Constable act with integrity and ethically towards each other</p> <p>Signing of the Oath by the Commissioner and Police conduct regulations and standards</p> <p>Agreement of proposed transfer order 2.</p>		
<p>3/3 <u>Risk</u>: The Commissioner (and Chief Constable if this relates to the functions of the police force) fails to enter into or achieve the benefits of collaboration agreements where it is in the interest of the efficiency or effectiveness of their own or another police force.</p> <p><u>Cause</u>: Ineffective governance and working arrangements with other Police and Crime Commissioners and Forces. A shortfall in capacity or capability.</p> <p><u>Effect</u>: Potential savings cannot be achieved. Resilience of services cannot be maintained. The effectiveness of both specialist and local policing in Cambridgeshire and elsewhere is compromised.</p> <p><u>Owner</u>: Commissioner / Chief Constable</p> <p><u>Initial Risk</u>: Likelihood =4 Impact = 4</p> <p><u>Residual Risk</u>: Likelihood =2 Impact = 3 High Risk (new collaboration governance processes being developed)</p>	<p>Business Cases development process within collaboration team</p> <p>Eastern Regional Collaboration Strategy</p> <p>Regional Budgets 2012-13 and Regional Finance Scrutiny Group Updates</p> <p>Strategic Alliance Memorandum of Understanding and move to lead force arrangement through revised section 22 arrangements</p>	<p>Collaboration – Internal Audits</p> <p>BCH collaboration governance arrangements ensure effective overview of governance arrangements with other Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire Commissioners and forces as well as ensuring appropriate capacity and capability</p> <p>Eastern Region collaboration governance arrangements ensure overview of effective governance arrangements with other Police and Crime Commissioners and forces as well as ensuring appropriate capacity and capability</p>	
3/4 <u>Risk</u> : The Commissioner and Chief Constable fail to work effectively	Partners in many local	Strategic engagement through the	

<p>in partnership with local leaders in community safety and criminal justice.</p> <p><u>Cause:</u> Complex partnership landscape and/or ineffective partnership arrangements. Lack of shared strategic vision. Lack of a shared understanding of the desires and ambitions of the public in Cambridgeshire in terms of policing and crime reduction.</p> <p><u>Effect:</u> It is not possible to engage in or initiate work to improve the ways that services work together in future. The Commissioner's ability to develop their role in reducing crime and increasing the long-term effectiveness and efficiency of policing, the Criminal Justice System and community safety in Cambridgeshire is compromised.</p> <p><u>Owner:</u> Commissioner / Chief Constable</p> <p><u>Initial Risk:</u> Likelihood =3 Impact = 3</p> <p><u>Residual Risk:</u> Likelihood =2 Impact = 3 Medium Risk (control assurance processes kept under review)</p>	<p>partnerships, all of which monitored by the Constabulary Engagement Board. Also have responsibilities such as Safer Schools initiative.</p> <p>Partner owned victim and offender needs assessment and appropriate linkages with policing strategic assessment and Community Safety Partnership strategic assessments</p> <p>Police and Crime Partnership Working Group ensuring effective engagement with community-safety and criminal justice officers (quarterly)</p> <p>Police / Crime Planning process and proposed development of partnership performance framework</p>	<p>Cambridgeshire Countywide Strategic Community Safety Board ensures the views of the community-safety and criminal justice partners are ascertained and considered in public (6 monthly)</p> <p>Strategic engagement through the Greater Peterborough Partnership ensures that the views of a wide range of stakeholders are ascertained within Peterborough.</p> <p>Commissioner/Chief Constable meetings (monthly) engagement with the Cambridgeshire Chief and Chair Meetings</p> <p>Police and Crime Panel Review of Police and Crime Plan and Annual Report ensures feedback from partners on the work of the Commissioner</p>	
<p>3/5 <u>Risk:</u> The Commissioner fails to ensure effective arrangements for the Deputy Commissioner, Chief Executive and the Commissioner's Chief Finance Officer to be appointed, supported and challenged while in post and to remove them from office when necessary. The Commissioner fails to provide the Chief Executive with the resources necessary to carry out their duties.</p>	<p>Succession planning</p> <p>Appointment/recruitment processes</p> <p>Regular Commissioner/ Deputy Commissioner / Chief</p>	<p>Police and Crime Panel scrutiny of the appointment of the Deputy Commissioner, Chief Executive and Treasurer.</p> <p>Joint Audit Committee (quarterly)</p>	

<p><u>Cause:</u> Poor planning, relationships and ineffective processes. A shortfall in capacity or capability.</p> <p><u>Effect:</u> The statutory duty to appoint (and if necessary dismiss) is not met. The Commissioner's ability to fulfil their roles and responsibilities and deliver their vision, strategy and identified priorities is compromised. Reputational impact. A shortfall in capacity or capability.</p> <p><u>Owner:</u> Commissioner</p> <p><u>Initial Risk:</u> Likelihood =2 Impact = 4</p> <p><u>Residual Risk:</u> Likelihood =3 Impact = 4 Medium Risk review control assurance systems)</p>	<p>Constable and Deputy Chief Constable / Chief Executive (monitoring officer) meetings</p>	<p>Public scrutiny by the Police and Crime Panel</p>	
<p>3/6 <u>Risk:</u> The Commissioner fails to ensure effective arrangements for the Chief Constable to be appointed, supported and challenged while in post and to remove them from office when necessary.</p> <p><u>Cause:</u> Poor planning, relationships and ineffective processes. A shortfall in capacity or capability.</p> <p><u>Effect:</u> The statutory duty to appoint (and if necessary dismiss) is not met. The Commissioner's ability to fulfil their roles and responsibilities and deliver their vision, strategy and identified priorities is compromised. Leadership of the Constabulary is compromised. Reputational impact. A shortfall in capacity or capability.</p> <p><u>Initial Risk:</u> likelihood =2, Impact =4</p> <p><u>Residual Risk:</u> likelihood =2, Impact =3 Medium, Risk</p>	<p>Commissioner / Chief Constable meetings (monthly)</p> <p>Commissioner induction process</p> <p>Succession planning</p> <p>Appointment/recruitment processes</p> <p>Policing Protocol</p> <p>Performance Monitoring Framework in place</p>	<p>Police and Crime Panel scrutiny of the appointment of the Chief Constable.</p> <p>Joint Audit Committee (quarterly)</p> <p>Public scrutiny by the Police and Crime Panel.</p>	
<p>RISK AREA 4: BEING ACCOUNTABLE</p>			
<p>4/1 <u>Risk:</u> The Commissioner and Chief Constable fail to apply and</p>	<p>Signing of the Oath by the</p>	<p>Audit Committee takes an overview of</p>	

<p>demonstrate good governance, in accordance with best practice, including the Nolan principles.</p> <p><u>Cause:</u> Transition to the new governance requirements dictated by Transfer Order 2. Ineffective and opaque governance and decision-making processes.</p> <p><u>Effect:</u> Adverse comments from the Police and Crime Panel. Inability to ensure the Chief Constables answers for their decisions and actions. The ability of the Commissioner to be accountable to voters is compromised. The public are not able to see that the force is acting ethically.</p> <p><u>Owner</u> Chief Executive (Monitoring Officer)</p> <p><u>Initial Risk:</u> Likelihood =3 Impact = 4</p> <p><u>Residual Risk:</u> Likelihood =2 Impact = 4 Medium Risk (controls processes kept under review)</p>	<p>Commissioner and Police conduct regulations and standards</p> <p>Scheme of governance and Decision Making Policy</p> <p>Role of the Monitoring Officer</p> <p>Engagement strategy</p> <p>Complaints and integrity handling and oversight processes</p> <p>Oversight, where appropriate, of appeals processes associated with police pensions regulations and any other quasi-judicial decision</p> <p>Information Governance, e.g. incident reporting process and effective management of FOIs</p> <p>Risk Management Strategy and Risk Register updates</p> <p>Contracts and Procurement Annual Report</p> <p>External Audit Plan</p> <p>Report to those charged with governance – Financial Statement.</p> <p>Consolidated (financial and non-financial) External</p>	<p>regulatory framework and integrity issues and ensures good governance in line with the Nolan principles (Quarterly).</p> <p>Internal Audit Progress Report (Quarterly) reviews whether good governance practices are being adhered to and implemented and appropriate decision making processes are in use</p> <p>Head of Internal Audit Annual Report considers whether good governance practices are being adhered to and implemented and appropriate decision making processes are in use</p> <p>Annual Report of the Governance and Audit Committee considers whether good governance practices are being adhered to and implemented and appropriate decision making processes are in use</p> <p>Standards Integrity Committee</p>	
---	--	---	--

	<p>Audit/Inspection/Internal Audit Plan</p> <p>Action plan for management of transition relating to Transfer Order 2</p>		
<p>4/2 <u>Risk</u>: The Chief Constable fails to deploy appropriately those staff under his Direction and Control to deliver the policing objectives in the Police and Crime Plan. The Commissioner fails to establish appropriate mechanisms to hold the Chief Constable to account.</p> <p><u>Cause</u>: Poor planning, performance management / monitoring processes and/or ineffective working arrangements. Operational interference</p> <p><u>Effect</u>: Constabulary delivery, performance and improvement are not scrutinised visibly on behalf of the public against delivery of the Police and Crime Plan and other Chief Constable duties. The long-term effectiveness of policing is compromised and public confidence that the Police can deliver their aspirations is undermined.</p> <p><u>Owner</u>: Commissioner and Chief Constable</p> <p><u>Initial Risk</u>: Likelihood =3 Impact = 4</p> <p><u>Residual Risk</u>: Likelihood =2 Impact = 3 Medium Risk (keep progress under review)</p>	<p>Proactive approach to recruitment through OPCC and use of agency staff when appropriate</p> <p>Force Performance Management Group (monthly)</p> <p>Performance reporting to Commissioner (Quarterly, more frequent if necessary).</p> <p>Police and Crime Plan Performance Framework (Annual)</p> <p>Annual cycle of reports on the Police and Crime Plan (quarterly).</p> <p>Commissioner programme of visits linked to Police and Crime Plan objectives (ongoing).</p> <p>Constabulary Annual Report</p> <p>Commissioner Annual Report</p>	<p>Force Executive Board (Chief Constable, Quarterly).</p> <p>Business Coordination Board (quarterly) to scrutinise performance reports to ensure performance against Police and Crime Plan and quality of service provision.</p> <p>HMIC inspection reports (ongoing and on request) reviewed by Commissioner when received and response published.</p> <p>Audit reports reviewed by Joint Audit Committee (ongoing).</p> <p>Feedback through delivery of Engagement Strategy (ongoing).</p> <p>Commissioners Annual Report reviewed by Police and Crime Panel</p>	
<p>4/3 <u>Risk</u>: The Commissioner fails to meet the requirements of the Police and Crime Panel as it assess the performance of the</p>	<p>Commissioner's and Panel's</p>	<p>The Police and Crime Panel meets in public which ensures that progress in</p>	

<p>Commissioner and scrutinise the Commissioner's strategic actions and decisions.</p> <p><u>Cause:</u> Lack of understanding of respective roles and responsibilities or insufficient planning and resources.</p> <p><u>Effect:</u> The Panel is not able to fulfil its duties in relation to the precept, annual report, Police and Crime Plan, appointments. The Commissioner's performance is not appropriately scrutinised, undermining public confidence.</p> <p><u>Owner:</u> Policy and Performance Manager</p> <p><u>Initial Risk:</u> Likelihood =3 Impact = 3</p> <p><u>Residual Risk:</u> Likelihood =2 Impact = 3 Medium Risk (controls processes kept under review)</p>	<p>induction</p> <p>Proactive management of future agenda planning through the Police and Crime Partnership Working Group (quarterly).</p>	<p>this area is visible to the media and the local community.</p>	
<p>4/4 <u>Risk:</u> The Chief Constable fails to safeguard the welfare (including health and safety as well as equality and diversity) of all officers and staff within their direction and control, and ensure that members of the public, offenders and employees of other service contractors are not exposed to risks as far as reasonably practicable (including safeguarding children, the promotion of child welfare and safer detention and handling).</p> <p><u>Cause:</u> Lack of awareness, poor planning or ineffective processes.</p> <p><u>Effect:</u> The relevant legal duties are not met. Death of an individual or multiple fatalities. Public confidence is undermined.</p> <p><u>Owner:</u> Chief Constable</p> <p><u>Initial Risk:</u> Likelihood =3 Impact = 3</p> <p><u>Residual Risk:</u> Likelihood =2 Impact = 3 Medium Risk (controls processes kept under review)</p>	<p>Reports on health and safety, equality and diversity, safeguarding children, the promotion of child welfare and detection and handling to People Board (frequency determined by risk).</p> <p>Review of Human Rights Issues – Custody, TASER, Covert surveillance, custody data</p> <p>Equality Duty – Review/Monitor</p> <p>Workforce Survey and Reports</p> <p>Health and Safety Constabulary Improvement Report</p>	<p>The People Board ensures the need for relevant action is identified and that action plans are progressed.</p> <p>Internal Audit ensures independent validation of risk controls</p> <p>Police and Crime Commissioner holds the Chief Constable to account in these key areas.</p>	

<p>4/5 <u>Risk</u>: The Commissioner fails to establish effective mechanisms for holding the Chief Constable to account for the exercise of their duties to safeguard the welfare (including health and safety as well as equality and diversity) of all officers and staff within their direction and control, and ensure that members of the public, offenders and employees of other service contractors are not exposed to risks as far as reasonably practicable (including safeguarding children, the promotion of child welfare and safer detention and handling). The Commissioner fails to fulfil their own duties in this area (including data protection and equality and diversity).</p> <p><u>Cause</u>: Lack of awareness, poor planning or ineffective processes.</p> <p><u>Effect</u>: The relevant legal duties are not met. Death of an individual or multiple fatalities. Public confidence is undermined.</p> <p><u>Owner</u>: Commissioner</p> <p><u>Initial Risk</u>: Likelihood =3 Impact = 3</p> <p><u>Residual Risk</u>: Likelihood =2 Impact = 3 Medium Risk (controls processes kept under review)</p>	<p>Police and Crime Plan Performance framework (Annual) Documented approach to performance monitoring</p> <p>Police and Crime Plan Objectives</p> <p>Ensuring reports on health and safety, equality and diversity, safeguarding children, the promotion of child welfare and detection and handling are considered through constabulary processes</p> <p>Monitoring of the ICV Scheme/Custody (Quarterly)</p> <p>ICV Scheme Management Update</p> <p>Local ICV Scheme Panel Meetings</p>	<p>Audit Committee review of performance framework</p> <p>Ability of Police and Crime Panel to scrutinise areas of concern.</p>	
---	---	---	--