

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

Strategic Risks Summary - New Risk

| | |
|-------|---|
| SR1.1 | There is a potential risk of failure to achieve benefits of the link between police and communities and Chief Constable fails to explain actions of Constabulary. |
| SR1.2 | There is a risk that Collaboration ventures could expose Cambridgeshire to reputational risk. |
| SR2.1 | There is a risk that the Commissioner fails to set clear direction in Police and Crime and objectives and manifesto commitments are not delivered. |
| SR2.2 | There is a risk that the Chief Constable fails to meet the operational expectation of Home Office with respect to Strategic Policing Requirement. |
| SR2.3 | There is a risk that the Commissioner and Chief Constable are unable to influence national, regional or strategic alliance policies. |
| SR3.1 | There is a risk that the Commissioner and Chief Constable fail to manage finances effectively. |
| SR3.2 | There is a risk that the Commissioner and Chief Constable fail to work together effectively. |
| SR3.3 | There is a risk that the Commissioner and Chief Constable fail to enter into or achieve benefits of collaboration. |
| SR3.4 | There is a risk that the Commissioner and Chief Constable fail to work effectively in partnership with community safety and CJ partners and objectives of Police and Crime Plan are not delivered. |
| SR3.5 | There is a risk that the Commissioner fails to ensure effective arrangements for appointment, support and challenge for DPCC, CE and CFO, and fails to provide necessary resources to CE to carry out duties. |
| SR3.6 | There is a risk that the Commissioner fails to ensure effective arrangements to recruit, support and challenge and if necessary remove from office the Chief Constable. |
| SR4.1 | There is a risk that the Commissioner and Chief Constable fail to apply and demonstrate good governance and fail to deliver statutory duties. |
| SR4.2 | There is a risk that the Chief Constable fails to deploy staff to deliver policing objectives in Police & Crime Plan. The Commissioner fails to establish mechanisms to hold the Chief Constable to account. |
| SR4.3 | There is a risk that the Commissioner fails to meet requirements of Police and Crime Plan and performance as scrutinised by Police and Crime Panel. |
| SR4.4 | There is a risk that the Chief Constable fails to safeguard the welfare of all officers, staff and members of the public. |
| SR4.5 | There is a risk that the Commissioner fails to establish mechanisms to hold the Chief Constable to account for exercise of their duty in safeguarding the welfare of officers, staff and Members of the Public. |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

Strategic Risk Current ratings

| | 1 Unlikely | 2 Possible | 3 Likely | 4 More likely than not | 5 Probable |
|--------------------|---------------|---|-------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| 5 Catastrophic | | | | | |
| 4 Significant | SR1.1 | SR4.4 | | | |
| 3 Moderate | SR4.3 | SR1.2 SR3.4 SR4.2 SR4.5 | | | |
| 2 Minor | SR3.6 | SR2.1 SR2.2 SR2.3 SR3.1 SR3.2 SR3.5 SR4.1 | SR3.3 | | |
| 1 Insignificant | | | | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| ▲ | Likelihood rating increased |
| ▼ | Likelihood rating decreased |
| △ | Likelihood rating expected to increase |
| ▽ | Likelihood rating expected to decrease |
| ► | Impact rating increased |
| ◄ | Impact rating decreased |
| ▷ | Impact rating expected to increase |
| ◁ | Impact rating expected to decrease |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| Reference | SR1.1 | Objective | Public Engagement | | | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | | |
|--|-------|---|-------------------|--|---------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------|-------------------------------------|--------|---|---|
| <p>There is a potential risk that the Commissioner fails to achieve the benefits of the local link between the police and communities. The Chief Constable fails to explain to the public the actions of Cambridgeshire Constabulary.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | Effects | | | | Inherent | | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | | |
| | | | | | | L | I | R | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capability and capacity to identify, co-ordinate and implement appropriate mechanisms. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. | | | | 2 | 4 | 14 | OPCC | Head of Public Engagement and Comms | | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | | Current | | | Future Actions | | | Future | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Force Performance Group manages performance relating to satisfaction survey undertaken by Chief Constable; British Crime Survey information; and other evaluation and initiates action if merits (monthly). Public Engagement Board reports to Organisational Support Board and Business Co-ordination Board. Commissioner's review of the Chief Constable, publication of monitoring reports on satisfaction, confidence, progress on OPCC and Force Engagement Strategy and | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close liaison between PCC's Director of Public Engagement and Communications and the Constabulary's Head of Corporate Communications ensures consistency and clarity of public engagement activity and messages. The activity is in line with the Joint OPCC and Force Engagement Strategy and monitored action plan. Close liaison with communication leads in Beds and Herts relating to BCH Collaboration messages. Transparency by the Constabulary/Commissioner Publication Schemes/Information Order compliance and other | | | 1 | 4 | 10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with partners to develop Community Resilience Strategy Ensure consistent and effective incoming and outgoing engagement in all areas. Identify and target areas where there are gaps including increased use of social media / E-Cops / Community engagement tools to maintain dialogue with community groups Strengthen resilience of CSPs and their ability to respond to local community safety issues Drive forward and support increased volunteering and building of community capacity Work to ensure the constabulary is representative of the community it serves. | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>complaints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PSD Governance Board and PSD Alliance Group. | <p>information on the Constabulary and Commissioner Websites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proactive engagement with monitoring of media and public via social media, by Commissioner and Chief Constable jointly and separately. Timely response to criticism and proactive promotion of positive activity. PSD management of police complaints and Commissioner's monitoring of complaints. | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|-------------------|---------|-------------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|
| Reference | SR1.2 | Objective | Public Engagement | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | | |
| <p>There is a theoretical risk that Collaboration ventures could expose Cambridgeshire to reputational risk if one of the other forces is portrayed negatively in the media. This could impact in the public confidence of Cambridgeshire officers.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | Effects | | | Inherent | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative media publicity could result in losing public confidence. The public are not able to assess the effectiveness of the Commissioner and the Chief Constable. The ability of the Commissioner to be accountable to voters is compromised. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The public are not able to assess the performance of the Commissioner and 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. | | | 3 | 4 | 18 | OPCC | Director of Public Engagement and Comms | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | Current | | | Future Actions | | Future | | |
| | | | | L | I | R | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BCH PCC's and CC's meetings holding collaboration team to account and consideration of joint communication following major decisions. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular BCH meetings to maintain transparency and dialogue between collaboration partners. PCC and Constabulary Comms leads meet regularly with Strategic Alliance Comms Lead. Agreed communication support for Tri-Force units in place | | 2 | 3 | 9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7 Force Collaboration quarterly meetings with all Comms leads commencing. | | 2 | 2 | 5 |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|-------------------|---------|-------------------|---|-----------|---|--|--------|---|---|
| Reference | SR2.1 | Objective | Setting Direction | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | | | |
| <p>There is a theoretical risk that the Commissioner, despite consultation with the Chief Constable and due regard to the Strategic Policing Requirement and other statutory functions, 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> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | Effects | | | Inherent | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Lack of preparation for the third term of PCC transition. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A clear direction is not set allowing 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. | | | 2 | 4 | 14 | PCC | Head of Strategic Partnerships and Commissioning | | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | | Current | | | Future Actions | | Future | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arrangements for keeping the Plan and Strategic Policing Requirement under review. Linkage with financial and other key strategies. Engagement with stakeholders including the Chief Constable. Wide consultation and joint engagement strategy on Police and Crime Plan | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambridgeshire Countywide Strategic Community Safety Board ensures strategic engagement with community safety and criminal justice partners (quarterly). On-going panel scrutiny of precept and Police and Crime Plan changes. Valuing Police HMIC inspection regime. Review and sign off by the BCB of Grants. | | | 2 | 2 | 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete full consultation with stakeholders of Police and Crime Plan | | | | |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|-------------------|---------|-------------------|----------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------|----------|
| Reference | SR2.2 | Objective | Setting Direction | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | | | |
| There is a theoretical risk that the Chief Constable fails to meet the operational expectation of the Home Office with respect to the Strategic Policing Requirement. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | Effects | | | Inherent | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of understanding of statutory duties, resources and poor horizon scanning, planning and collaboration nationally, regionally and through Strategic alliance. National increase in firearms capability to meet terrorism threat. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. | | | 2 | 4 | 14 | Constabulary | Chief Constable | | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | | Current | | | Future Actions | | Future | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The needs of the Strategic Policing Requirement are integrated into the Strategic Assessment. Performance Boards (monthly) and Force Executive Board meetings. Implementation of recommendations from HMIC inspections. Broaden collaboration with existing partners to enhance resilience of protective services. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborative governance arrangements ensure proper prioritisation of regional and national policing issues. HMIC inspection regime. National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC) has set national uplift in firearms capability. | | | 2 | 2 | 5 | • | | | | |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|--|---------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Reference | SR2.3 | Objective | Setting Direction | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | | | |
| The risk that the Commissioner and Chief Constable are unable to influence national, regional, or Strategic Alliance policies. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | | Effects | | | Inherent | | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | |
| | | | | | | L | I | R | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient horizon scanning, engagement with and influence of national, regional and strategic alliance issues and policies due to poor prioritisation or inadequate resources. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National, regional or strategic alliance policies are not informed by the experience within Cambridgeshire and do not meet its requirements, or help address impact. | | | 3 | 4 | 18 | PCC | Commissioner and Chief Constable | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | | Current | | | Future Actions | | Future | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constabulary and OPCC horizon scanning processes in place. Chief Constable, Commissioner and Chief Executive and members of OPCC engage proactively with relevant national bodies | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chief Executive is Vice Chair of Association of Police & Crime Chief Executives (APACE); Chief Constable is on Operations Co-ordinations Committee for NPCC; Constabulary Director of Finance & Resources is National Police Lead on Charging for Police Services; CFO for OPCC is on Strategic Police Procurement Board and PACCTS. Director of ICT is on Police ICT Company Board. The PCC is a member of the Local Government Association and has APCC roles. Proactive engagement with the BCH and Seven Force governance arrangement. BCB ensures proper strategic planning, consideration of the national budgetary landscape, ensuring Medium Term Financial Plan is in line with the Police and Crime Plan and drives efficiency and oversees financial monitoring arrangements are effective. | | | 2 | 2 | 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | | | | |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint Audit Committee provides 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 non-financial performance to the extent that it affects exposure to risk and weakens the control environment, and to oversee the financial reporting process. • IA/EA updates provide alerts to emerging issues and initiatives which are reviewed by CFOs. | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|----------------------------------|--|---------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------|------------------------|---|---|
| Reference | SR3.1 | Objective | Resourcing and Enabling Delivery | | | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | |
| <p>There is a theoretical risk that 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> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | Effects | | | | Inherent | | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | |
| | | | | | | L | I | R | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing complexity of collaboration (both tri-force and regional) and devolution plans leads to poor strategic, financial planning, budgetary and contractual control mechanisms. Financial unsustainability of partnership body poses risk to PCC/CC due to increased pressure on services. Continued uncertain economic and funding environment Cost pressure of Emergency Service Network | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on service quality and performance. Reputational 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. Additional local costs of £2.5m over the next few years to fund ESN have to be found. | | | | 3 | 4 | 18 | OPCC | Chief Finance Officers | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | | Current | | | Future Actions | | Future | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheme of Governance, Financial regulations and contract standing orders clearly set out duties of the two corporations sole. Regular joint working between the Commissioner, the Deputy Commissioner, Commissioner's CFO and Chief Constable's CFO. Iterative financial planning process throughout year. Revenue provisional outturn reports, budget monitoring reports cover all aspects of OPCC budget. Quality of service provision report, Internal VFM investigations. Capital programme monitoring. Prudential Indicators, Treasury | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> External Audit statements published and VFM conclusion. IA/EA of all financial systems ensure accounting and finances are effectively managed. BCB ensures adequate service quality and performance and that finances are managed effectively. PCC has oversight of Chief Constable's budgetary framework and this is included in the Police and Crime Plan allowing public scrutiny. Police and Crime Panel review Police and Crime Plan including MTFP, budget and precept. Specific governance arrangements are established for collaboration and large | | | 2 | 2 | 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Link to collaboration agenda and considering each business case in detail to ensure savings are realistic and achievable Treasury management review Partnership working/financial planning, including monitoring for risk of cost pressures on local government leading to increased demand on policing resources (and hence increased cost) Metis – ICT benefits realisation to ensure cashable savings Workforce planning Strategic use of grants to support reductions in demand Use of reserves to balance budget in 2016/17 and 2017/18 Devolution progression – maintaining | | 1 | 1 | 1 |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Management and Minimum Revenue Provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial Reserves. • Annual reviews of Revenue and Capital estimates, Fees and Charges review. • VFM statement/strategy. • Regular meetings of OPCC CFO and Constabulary CFO and Chief Executive with opposite numbers from other county public sector bodies for horizon scanning and identification of emerging risks. • Devolution controls and savings plans enabling enhanced service provision on reduced budget. | <p>contractual agreements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly Finance Sub Group meetings and minutes go to Business Co-ordination Board. • Reserves are available to fund initial additional costs of ESN. • Regular review of costs of ESN and progress by OPCC CFO and Director of F&R and reported to BCB. | | | | <p>momentum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued horizon-scanning for new and emerging cost pressures • Analysis of allocation of savings and costs in collaborated functions • Ongoing review of financial health of other partners with escalation if necessary • Review generation opportunities • Continue to monitor progress of National and BCH ESN projects and risks and issues arising from it. | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|---|--|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------|----------|
| Reference | SR3.2 | Objective | Resourcing and Enabling Delivery | | | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | |
| There is a theoretical risk that the Commissioner and Chief Constable fail to work together effectively. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | | Effects | | | Inherent | | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | |
| | | | | | | L | I | R | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change in personnel causes lack of understanding of respective roles and responsibilities and poor planning. Scheme of delegation does not clearly articulate roles and responsibilities. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. | | | 2 | 4 | 14 | OPCC | Chief Executive | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | | Current | | | Future Actions | | Future | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular Commissioner/Chief Constable informal meetings and at staff level. Scheme of governance and Policing Protocol Order 2011 and any local protocols clarify respective roles and responsibilities. Signing of the Oath by the Commissioner and Police conduct regulations and standards. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business Co-ordination Board, protocols when calling for papers, clear holding to account mechanisms. BCB considers recommendations and is the decision making board in relation to issuing a police and crime plan; determining police and crime objectives and calculating a budget requirement. BCB is where the PCC holds the Chief Constable to account for organisation wide performance; budgets and use of resources and audit/inspection compliance. | | | 2 | 2 | 5 | • | | | | |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| Reference | SR3.3 | Objective | Resourcing and Enabling Delivery | | | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|----------------------------------|--|---------|----------|-------------------|---|----------------------|--------------------------------|--------|---|---|
| There is a theoretical risk that the Commissioner (and Chief Constable if this relates to the functions of the constabulary) 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. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | Effects | | | | Inherent | | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | | |
| | | | | | | L | I | R | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ineffective governance and working arrangements with other Police and Crime Commissioners and Forces. A shortfall in capacity or capability. Financial unsustainability of another police force poses risk to other collaboration partners. Continued delays in delivery and implementation of Athena. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential savings cannot be achieved or costs materialise due to a failure in a partner organisation. Resilience of services cannot be maintained. The effectiveness of both specialist and local policing in Cambridgeshire and elsewhere is compromised. Strategic requirements are unable to be met due to delays in delivery of Athena. | | | | 3 | 4 | 18 | OPCC Chief Executive | Commissioner & Chief Constable | | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | | Current | | | Future Actions | | | Future | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic Alliance MoU for BCH Collaboration. Implementation of arrangements and S22s at BCH and Eastern Region MoU Eastern Region continuing to develop additional controls assurance at that level. Regional budgets and Regional Finance Scrutiny Group updates. Single scheme of delegation for BCH Regular close scrutiny by Chief Constable's, PCC's and Chief Executives of all Forces involved in Athena. Operational Support Board formally review on a monthly basis. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration – Internal Audits. Strategic Alliance Summit Eastern Region Alliance Summit Risk Management Effective governance arrangements for BCH and Eastern Region Collaboration Medium term finance plan meetings between CFOs and change team to evaluate and model savings programmes. Strategic Athena Management Board provides regular reports and has attendance from key senior managers. | | | 3 | 2 | 8 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued refinement of local term savings delivery schedule to enable MTFP planning and correct definition of risk appetite Improved benefits realisation processes that also consider impact on local policing Continued work to define future visions of collaboration across policing and wider public sector collaboration with improved systems Continued development of governance systems Continued development of performance management and monitoring arrangements for collaborated function Ensure section 22s are completed and updated in a timely way Direct PCCs involvement in lead force/OPCC governance arrangements Link with devolution agenda as it gathers pace to ensure no gaps or conflicts Explore benefits of Fire & Police Collaboration | | | 1 | 2 | 3 |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|----------------------------------|---------|-------------------|---|-----------|---|--------------------------------|--------|---|---|
| Reference | SR3.4 | Objective | Resourcing and Enabling Delivery | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | | | |
| <p>There is a theoretical risk that the Commissioner and Chief Constable fail to work effectively in partnership with local leaders in community safety and criminal justice, including devolution to support delivery of the Police and Crime Plan.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | Effects | | | Inherent | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The opportunities and challenges presented by the Victims Commissioning, Transforming Rehabilitation and devolution increase complexity. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. | | | 4 | 4 | 21 | OPCC Chief Executive | Commissioner & Chief Constable | | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | | Current | | | Future Actions | | Future | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner agencies have agreed a victims' strategy and attend CCJB victims and witnesses group. Chief Executive and Chief Constable of Cambs, through links with the Public Service Board, co-ordinate effective partnership working. Capacity to effectively commission and monitor grants and contracts which support delivery of the Police and Crime Plan objectives. Engagement with the six Community Safety Partnerships. Sub group infrastructure which underpins the Criminal Justice Board. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Countywide Community Safety Cambridgeshire Criminal Justice Board Chief & Leaders Meeting Police and Crime Panel review of Police and Crime Plan and Annual Report ensures feedback from partners on the work of the Commissioner. Effective engagement by the Constabulary and OPCC into devolution. Representation on National and local boards. | | | 2 | 3 | 9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive PESTLE analysis/strategic assessment informs updates of Police and Crime Plan Review of new performance monitoring framework at end of first year Strengthen effectiveness and resilience of CSPs in order to create strong local partnerships which learn from good practice in other areas in order to maximise their impact on local crime and disorder issue Improve tactical response (exploration of the use of deferred prosecutions) and strategic planning with Health and Wellbeing Board in order to meet the needs of offenders and reduce crime building on the work of the mental health concordat, DAAT and IOM. Explore the impact of blue light collaboration on local community safety work | | 1 | 2 | 3 |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work through the Public Service Board to explore the benefits of devolution • Community resilience • Implementation of BeNCH reducing offending strategy • Implementation and monitoring of new computer enabled crime strategy • Innovation Fund implementation of effective management of offenders and appropriate response to victims' needs. • Qualitative and quantitative evaluation and scrutiny of existing initiatives to explore if partnership structures can be streamlined to release resources for improved needs assessments, strategic and operational planning and performance monitoring. • Work on 'Community Resilience Strategy' to reduce demand on services, drive forward increased volunteering and build community capacity. • More effective rehabilitation of offenders and initiatives to tackle the root cause of offending (toxic trio). Exploration of restorative justice approaches with perpetrators. • Careful allocation of Crime and Disorder Reduction Grants by PCCs to tackle demand management. | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|--|---------|---|----------|-------------------|----|-----------|--------------|---|---|
| Reference | SR3.5 | Objective | Resourcing and Enabling Delivery | | | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | |
| <p>There is a theoretical risk that 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> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | | Effects | | | Inherent | | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | |
| | | | | | | L | I | R | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor planning, relationships and ineffective processes. A shortfall in capacity or capability. Unplanned retirement, resignation or illness | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. | | | 2 | 4 | 14 | OPCC | Commissioner | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | Current | | | Future Actions | | | Future | | |
| | | | | L | I | R | | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appointment/recruitment processes. PDR process. Regular Commissioner/Deputy Commissioner/Chief Constable and Deputy Chief Constable/Chief Executive (monitoring officer) meetings. Succession planning | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Police and Crime Panel scrutiny of the appointment of the Deputy Commissioner, Chief Executive and Director of Finance. Public scrutiny by the Police and Crime Panel. | | 2 | 2 | 5 | • | | | | | |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|----------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------|----------|
| Reference | SR3.6 | Objective | Resourcing and Enabling Delivery | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | | |
| There is a theoretical risk that 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 if necessary. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | Effects | | | Inherent | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor planning, relationships and ineffective processes. A shortfall in capacity or capability. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. | | | 2 | 4 | 14 | OPCC | Commissioner | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | Current | | | Future Actions | | Future | | |
| | | | | L | I | R | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commissioner/Chief Constable meetings Commissioner induction meeting Capacity and experience to run successful appointment/recruitment processes Performance Monitoring Framework in place | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Police and Crime Panel scrutiny of the appointment of the Chief Constable Public scrutiny by the Police and Crime Panel. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | • | | | | |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|---|---------|-------------------|----------|---|--|-------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Reference | SR4.1 | Objective | Being Accountable | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | | | |
| There is a theoretical risk that the Commissioner and Chief Constable fail to apply and demonstrate good governance, in accordance with best practice, including the Nolan principles and fail to deliver statutory duties. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | | Effects | | | Inherent | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | | |
| | | | | | | L | I | R | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective processes are in place to promote good decision making. Clear Governance principles not established. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adverse comments from the Police and Crime Panel. Inability to ensure the Chief Constable answers for their decisions and actions. The ability of the Commissioner to discharge his functions is compromised. | | | 2 | 4 | 14 | OPCC | Chief Executive | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | | Current | | | Future Actions | | Future | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signing of the Oath by the Commissioner and Police conduct regulations and standards Scheme of Governance and Decision making policy Appointment of a Monitoring Officer with capacity to undertake their role Effective risk management strategy and risk register proactively managed. External Audit Plan Annual Governance Statement Governance Board established for Organisational Support, Operational Support and Joint Protective Services. Consolidated (financial and non-financial) External Audit/Inspection/Internal Audit Plan. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint Audit Committee takes an overview of regulatory framework and integrity issues and ensures good governance in line with the Nolan principles. IA progress report reviews good governance practices are being adhered to and implemented and appropriate decision making processes are in use. Head of IA Annual Report considers whether good governance practices are being adhered to and implemented and appropriate decision making processes are in use. Cambs Constabulary have an Equalities and Inclusion Board with members from Cambs Independent Advisory Network (CIAN). Developing an Ethics Committee to report to this board. BCH Representative Workforce Board created. | | | 2 | 2 | 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to develop governance processes Continued scrutiny by Police and Crime Panel | | | | |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• PSD Alliance sub group holds Tri-Force to account.• Standards Integrity Committee. | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|---|---------|-------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Reference | SR4.2 | Objective | Being Accountable | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | | | |
| <p>There is a theoretical risk that 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> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | | Effects | | | Inherent | | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | |
| | | | | | | L | I | R | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor planning, performance management, monitoring processes and/or ineffective working arrangements. Lack of engagement between OPCC and CC and understanding of operational independence. Failure to implement Emergency Service Network means Chief Constable is unable to deploy resources. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. | | | 3 | 4 | 18 | Chief Executive | Commissioner & Chief Constable | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | | Current | | | Future Actions | | Future | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chief Executive charged with maintaining sufficient capacity Force Performance Management Group, Performance Officers Group regular monitoring by Commissioner. Performance reporting to Commissioner. Police and Crime Plan Performance Framework. Strategic Tasking and Co-ordination process reviews Threat, Risk and Harm and demand patterns which inform policing element of Police and Crime Plan. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Force Executive Board chaired by Chief Constable and Strategic Performance Board. Business Co-ordination Board to scrutinise performance reports to ensure performance against Police and Crime Plan and quality of service provision. HMIC Inspection reports reviewed by Commissioner when received and response published. Audit reports reviewed by JAC. Commissioner's Annual Report reviewed by Police and Crime Report. Complaints made against Chief Constable regarding deployment. | | | 2 | 3 | 9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Police and Crime Plan under development. Consultation with partners and stakeholders ongoing. Continued scrutiny by Police and Crime Panel. | | | | |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|---|---------|-------------------|----------|---|---|-----------|------------------------------|--------|---|---|
| Reference | SR4.3 | Objective | Being Accountable | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | | | | |
| There is a theoretical risk that the Commissioner fails to meet the requirements of the Police and Crime Panel as it assesses the performance of the Commissioner and scrutinises the Commissioner's strategic actions and decisions. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | | Effects | | | Inherent | | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | | |
| | | | | | | L | I | R | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of understanding of respective roles and responsibilities or insufficient planning and resources. Police and Crime Plan fails to articulate their needs. Lack of organisational support for Police and Crime Plan through secretariat. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel is not able to fulfil its duties in relation to the precept, annual report, Police and Crime Plan, and appointments. The Commissioner's performance is not appropriately scrutinised, undermining public confidence. | | | 2 | 4 | 14 | OPCC | Head of Policy & Performance | | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | | Current | | | Future Actions | | | Future | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commissioner's and Panel induction processes. Proactive management of future agenda planning by the Panel's work programme which sets out scrutiny plan for the year. Engagement between OPCC and Police and Crime secretariat. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Police and Crime Panel meets in public which ensures that progress in this area is visible to the media and the local community. Panel has now operated for 2 years, controls established & working. Annual report including performance report scrutinised. Commissioner's internal governance arrangements are in place. | | | 1 | 3 | 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to develop governance processes. Continued scrutiny by the Police and Crime Panel. Work with Panel to enhance the challenge and support provided by the Panel. | | | | | |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|---|--|---------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Reference | SR4.4 | Objective | Being Accountable | | | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | |
| <p>There is a theoretical risk that the Chief Constable fails to safeguard the welfare (including health & safety as well as equality & 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> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | | Effects | | | Inherent | | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | |
| | | | | | | L | I | R | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of awareness, training investment, poor planning or ineffective processes. Inadequate training of responsible staff. Custody provision for Cambridge is required to meet future custody requirements. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relevant legal duties are not met. Death of an individual or multiple fatalities. Public confidence is undermined. Significant investment in Parkside has ensured it meets current standards for custody provision. | | | 3 | 4 | 18 | Chief Executive | Chief Constable | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | | Current | | | Future Actions | | Future | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports on Health & Safety, equality and diversity, safeguarding children, the promotion of child welfare and detention and handling are scrutinised by People Board on a risk based frequency. Review of Human Rights Issues – Custody, Taser, Covert Surveillance. Equality duty – review/monitored. Workforce surveys and reports. Health & Safety Constabulary improvement report. Reports to Estates Sub Group Health & Safety statement signed by Chief Constable and PCC. Joint H&S Policy in operation. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The People Board ensures the need for relevant action is identified and action plans are progressed. Internal Audit ensures independent validation of risk controls. Police and Crime Commissioner holds the chief Constable to account in these key areas. BCH Engagement & Wellbeing Board created. Launch of Parkside Custody Board to manage the search for land and subsequent construction of a Police Investigation Centre (PIC) as the replacement for Parkside Custody. | | | 2 | 4 | 14 | • | | | | |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|-------------------|--|---------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------|--------------|---|---|
| Reference | SR4.5 | Objective | Being Accountable | | | Status: | Update 11/08/2016 | | | | | |
| <p>There is a theoretical risk that 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 & safety as well as equality & 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> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | Effects | | | | Inherent | | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | |
| | | | | | | L | I | R | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of awareness, investment, poor planning or ineffective processes and performance monitoring. Failure to provide oversight over the Constabulary's responsibility to ensure access to healthcare for detainees. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relevant legal duties are not met. Death of an individual or multiple fatalities. Public confidence is undermined. | | | | 3 | 4 | 18 | OPCC | Commissioner | | |
| Controls in place | | Controls assurance | | | Current | | | Future Actions | | Future | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | L | I | R |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Police and Crime Plan performance framework documented approach to performance monitoring. Police and Crime Plan objectives. Ensuring reports on H&S, equality & diversity, safeguarding children, the promotion of child welfare and detention and handling are considered through Constabulary processes. Monitoring of the ICV Scheme ICV Scheme Management update Local ICV Scheme Panel meetings Monitoring of dog welfare H&S statement of intent signed by Chief Constable and PCC. Joint H&S policy in operation. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JAC review of performance framework. Ability of Police and Crime Panel to scrutinise areas of concern. | | | 2 | 3 | 9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | | | | |

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sufficient investment to allow activity of training and supervision.• Work through BCH governance mechanism to ensure effective oversight of the custody health care contract.• Follow up to ensure actions are in place in response to ICV concerns regarding individual detainees. | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

This page is intentionally blank.

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

Appendix A:

Strategic Risk overall ratings

| | 1 Unlikely | 2 Possible | 3 Likely | 4 More likely than not | 5 Probable |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| 5 Catastrophic | 15 | 19 | 22 | 24 | 25 |
| 4 Significant | 10 | 14 | 18 | 21 | 23 |
| 3 Moderate | 6 | 9 | <i>Tolerance Level</i> 13 | 17 | 20 |
| 2 Minor | 3 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 16 |
| 1 Insignificant | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 11 |

Risk ratings key:

| | |
|----------|-------------------|
| Dark red | Critical risks |
| Red | High risks |
| Amber | Medium-high risks |
| Yellow | Medium risks |
| Green | Low risks |

Likelihood

1. **Unlikely** – unlikely to occur
2. **Possible** – may occur
3. **Likely** – likely to occur
4. **More likely than not** - More likely than not to occur at some time
5. **Probable** – expected to occur

Impact

Political – local or government policy

1. **Insignificant** – little impact on stakeholder groups
2. **Minor** – minor impact on stakeholder groups
3. **Moderate** – loss of support from local stakeholders
4. **Significant** – capability of organisation questioned
5. **Catastrophic** – viability of organisation under threat

Economic – internal budget and benefits pressures, % of budget

1. **Insignificant** – overspend of up to 2% of agreed or notional budget or shortfall of up to 3% of approved target savings
2. **Minor** – overspend of 2% to 5% of agreed or notional budget or shortfall of 3% to 5% of approved target savings
3. **Moderate** – overspend of 5% to 10% of agreed or notional budget or shortfall of 5% to 10% of approved target savings
4. **Significant** - overspend of 10% to 15% of agreed or notional budget or shortfall of 10% to 15% of approved target savings
5. **Catastrophic** - overspend of 15% of agreed or notional budget or shortfall of 15% of approved target savings

Social – Public Confidence

1. **Insignificant** – little impact on stakeholder groups
2. **Minor** – minor impact on stakeholder groups
3. **Moderate** – loss of support from local stakeholders
4. **Significant** – capability of organisation questioned
5. **Catastrophic** – viability of organisation under threat

Technological – consequences of failure, pay/scale of change

1. **Insignificant** – insignificant shortfalls in mandatory requirements and/or other requirements
2. **Minor** – minor shortfalls in mandatory requirements and/or other requirements
3. **Moderate** – moderate shortfalls in one or more key requirements
4. **Significant** – significant shortfalls in mandatory requirements and/or other requirements which have a direct impact on service delivery
5. **Catastrophic** – complete system failure which has a direct impact on service delivery

Environmental – consequences on environment

1. **Insignificant** – little disruption
2. **Minor** – some disruption
3. **Moderate** – considerable disruption to environment
4. **Significant** – serious impact on environment, signalling mid-term damage
5. **Catastrophic** – critical impact on environment, signalling long term damage

Legislative – National or European law, Contract Law

1. **Insignificant** – little affect, compliance with Legislation
2. **Minor** – minor affect, exposure to local sanctions e.g. Breach of Local Bye Laws
3. **Moderate** – considerable affect, exposure to fines/penalties e.g. failure to meet contractual obligations
4. **Significant** – serious affect, exposure to prosecution, resulting in substantial fine and serious damage to reputation
5. **Catastrophic** – critical, exposure to prosecution, which prevents organisation from continuing to discharge its duties

Organisation – adjustments that may affect our organisation and staff

1. **Insignificant** – insignificant adjustment required
2. **Minor** – minor adjustments required
3. **Moderate** – moderate adjustments required
4. **Significant** – significant adjustments required
5. **Catastrophic** – extensive long term to permanent adjustments required

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, AUGUST 2016

Risk scores are calculated by determining the Likelihood and the highest Impact score from the PESTELO categories. An overall risk score is determined by using the matrix at Appendix A.

The **risk tolerance** is set at risk rating of 13 (**yellow**)

- All risks above the risk tolerance (that is critical, high and medium-high) are reported to the relevant Executive Board.
 - Controls, assurances and actions aim to bring risks within the risk tolerance.
 - External issues may raise inherent risk likelihood or impact.
 - Some risks may be accepted above the risk tolerance level where it is considered unrealistic or unaffordable to bring the risks within tolerance.
-
- **Critical** and **High** risks are key issues requiring immediate and on-going management attention to embed and maintain controls, assurances and actions that will reduce likelihood and/or impact.
 - **Medium-high** risks are significant issues requiring attention to reduce likelihood and/or impact.
 - **Medium** risks are less significant but need to be monitored to capture any increase in the inherent risk position.
 - **Low** risks require no special action.