

OPCC STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, January 2017

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.

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	SR3.3 ▶ SR3.1 ▶		
3 Moderate	SR4.3	SR1.2 SR3.4 SR4.2 SR4.5			
2 Minor	SR3.6	SR2.1 SR2.2 SR2.3 SR3.2 SR3.5 SR4.1			
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

Reference	SR1.1	Objective	Public Engagement	Status:	Update 31/01/2017							
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.												
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. A lack of openness and transparency. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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"> i. Close liaison between PCC's Director of Public Engagement and Communications and the Constabulary's Head of Corporate Communications and their respective teams 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. ii. Reporting of compliance with Transparency by the Constabulary/Commissioner Publication Schemes/Information Order compliance and other information on the Constabulary and Commissioner Websites. iii. Proactive engagement with monitoring of media and public via social media, by Commissioner and Chief Constable jointly and 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. 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). i. Engagement Strategic Group reports to Organisational Support Board and Business Co-ordination Board. iii. Commissioner's review of the Chief Constable, publication of monitoring reports on satisfaction, confidence, progress on OPCC and Force Engagement Strategy and complaints. iv. PSD Governance Board and PSD Alliance Group. 			1	4	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with partners to develop Community Resilience Strategy (March 2018) Continue to 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 (ongoing) Strengthen resilience Review priorities of CSPs and their ability to respond to local community safety issues (April 2017) Drive forward and support increased volunteering and building of community capacity (ongoing) Work to ensure the constabulary is representative of the community it serves (ongoing) Local policing review –2017. (2017/18) 		1	1	1

iv. separately. Timely response to criticism and proactive promotion of positive activity. PSD management of police complaints and Commissioner's monitoring of complaints.								
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Reference	SR1.2	Objective	Public Engagement			Status:	Update 31/01/2017					
There is a theoretical risk that Collaboration ventures could expose Cambridgeshire to reputational risk if one of the partners is portrayed negatively in the media. This could impact in the public confidence of Cambridgeshire officers.												
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. 		<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"> i. PCC and Constabulary Comms leads meet regularly with Strategic Alliance Comms Lead. ii. Agreed communication support for Tri-Force units in place. iii. Joint meetings between Police and Fire. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. BCH PCC's and CC's meetings holding collaboration team to account and consideration of joint communication following major decisions. i. 7Force Alliance Summit and Oversight Group. i. BCH Alliance Summit. 			2	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building Comms links with Cambs Fire and 7 Force Strategic Partners for future collaboration (ongoing) 7 Force Collaboration quarterly meetings with all Comms leads (ongoing) 		2	2	5

Reference	SR2.1	Objective	Setting Direction	Status:	Update 31/01/2017							
<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"> i. Arrangements for keeping the Plan and Strategic Policing Requirement under review. ii. Linkage with financial and other key strategies. iii. Engagement with stakeholders including the Chief Constable. iv. Wide consultation and joint engagement strategy on Police and Crime Plan 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Cambridgeshire Countywide Strategic Community Safety Board ensures strategic engagement with community safety and criminal justice partners (quarterly). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. On-going panel scrutiny of precept and Police and Crime Plan changes. ii. Valuing Police HMIC inspection regime. iii. 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 (November 2016) Finalised Plan presented to Police and Crime Panel 1 February 2017 				

Reference	SR2.2	Objective	Setting Direction	Status:	Update 31/01/2017							
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"> i. The needs of the Strategic Policing Requirement are integrated into the Strategic Assessment. ii. Performance Boards (monthly) and Force Executive Board meetings. iii. Implementation of recommendations from HMIC inspections. iv. Broaden collaboration with existing partners to enhance resilience of protective services. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Collaborative governance arrangements ensure proper prioritisation of regional and national policing issues. iii. HMIC inspection regime. iv. National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC) has set national uplift in firearms capability. 			2	2	5	•				

Reference	SR2.3	Objective	Setting Direction	Status:	Update 31/01/2017							
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"> i. Constabulary and OPCC horizon scanning processes in place. ii. Chief Constable, Commissioner and Chief Executive and members of OPCC engage proactively with relevant national bodies 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Chief Executive is 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; National Finance Lead on the HMIC Reference Group and a member of HMIC working groups on finance and efficiency. 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. ii. Proactive engagement with the BCH and Seven Force governance arrangement. i. BCB ensures proper strategic planning, consideration of the national budgetary landscape, ensuring Medium Term Financial Plan is in line with the Police and 			2	2	5					

	<p>Crime Plan and drives efficiency and oversees financial monitoring arrangements are effective.</p> <p>i. 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.</p> <p>i. IA/EA updates provide alerts to emerging issues and initiatives which are reviewed by CFOs.</p>							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Reference	SR3.1	Objective	Resourcing and Enabling Delivery			Status:	Update 24/01/2017					
<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"> Failure to realise the benefits of collaboration. 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. Failure to realise the opportunities of the Policing and Crime Bill. Athena, changing landscape/business pressures on Collaboration benefits. 			<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
i.	Scheme of Governance, Financial regulations and contract standing orders clearly set out duties of the two corporations sole.	x.	External Audit statements published and VFM conclusion	3	4	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Link to collaboration agenda and considering each business case collaborative service in detail to ensure savings benefits generation are realistic and achievable (17/18) Treasury management review (Mid 2017) 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) (17/18) ICT benefits realisation to ensure cashable savings Workforce & succession planning (ongoing) Strategic use of grants to support reductions 			1	2	3
ii.	Regular joint working between the Commissioner, Commissioner's CFO and Chief Constable's CFO.	v.	IA/EA of all financial systems ensure accounting and finances are effectively managed.									
iii.	Iterative financial planning process throughout year.	ii.	BCB ensures adequate service quality and performance and that finances are managed effectively.									
iv.	Revenue outturn reports, budget monitoring reports/dashboard cover all aspects of OPCC budget.	i.	PCC has oversight of Chief Constable's budgetary framework and this is included in the Police and Crime Plan allowing public scrutiny.									
v.	Quality of service provision report, Internal VFM investigations.	iv.	Police and Crime Panel review Police									

<p>vi. Capital programme monitoring.</p> <p>vii. Prudential Indicators, Treasury Management and Minimum Revenue Provision.</p> <p>iii. Financial Reserves.</p> <p>x. Annual reviews of Revenue and Capital estimates, Fees and Charges review.</p> <p>x. VFM statement/strategy.</p> <p>xi. 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.</p> <p>ii. Devolution controls and savings plans enabling enhanced service provision on reduced budget.</p> <p>iii. Huntingdon Accommodation Review Board enabling police, fire and ambulance service estates to be used effectively.</p> <p>v. Police and Fire Strategic Governance Board managing the production of a business case to review the best governance model for closer working between police and fire.</p>	<p>and Crime Plan including MTFP, budget and precept and plans for closer working between police and fire.</p> <p>i. Specific governance arrangements are established for collaboration and large contractual agreements.</p> <p>ii. Monthly Finance Sub Group (FSG) meetings and minutes go to Business Co-ordination Board. Plans for FSG to become the overarching body responsible for driving forward the realisation of the benefits of transformation.</p> <p>viii. Reserves are available to fund initial additional costs of ESN.</p> <p>viii. Regular review of costs of ESN and progress by OPCC CFO and Director of F&R and reported to BCB.</p>				<p>in demand (17/18)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of reserves to balance budget in 2016/17 and 2017/18 (17/18) • Devolution progression – maintaining momentum (17/18) • Continued horizon-scanning for new and emerging cost pressures (ongoing) • Analysis of allocation of savings and costs in collaborated functions (17/18) • Ongoing review of financial health of other partners with escalation if necessary (ongoing) • Review revenue generation opportunities (17/18) • Continue to monitor progress of National and BCH ESN projects and risks and issues arising from it. (17/18) • Developing further work with Cambs Fire & Rescue Service/Fire Authority to realise the opportunities from the Policing and Crime Bill. • Identify and fully understand future demand profile to aid workforce planning. (17/18) • Ensure plans identify necessary cost savings. (17/18) • Better business planning including considerations of demand and capital planning. (ongoing) 		
---	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Reference	SR3.2	Objective	Resourcing and Enabling Delivery			Status:	Update 31/01/2017					
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"> i. Regular Commissioner/Chief Constable informal meetings and at staff level. ii. Scheme of governance and Policing Protocol Order 2011 and any local protocols clarify respective roles and responsibilities. iii. Signing of the Oath by the Commissioner and Police conduct regulations and standards. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Business Co-ordination Board, protocols when calling for papers, clear holding to account mechanisms. ii. 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. i. 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	•					

Reference	SR3.3	Objective	Resourcing and Enabling Delivery			Status:	Update 24/01/2017					
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. Failure to deliver or achieve the benefits of Information Technology. 			<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"> i. Implementation of arrangements and S22s at BCH and Eastern Region ii. MoU Eastern Region continuing to develop additional controls assurance at that level. iii. Regional budgets and Regional Finance Scrutiny Group updates. iv. Single scheme of delegation for BCH v. Regular close scrutiny by Chief Constable's, PCC's and Chief Executives of all Forces involved in Athena. vi. Operational Support, Organisational Support and JPS Governance Boards formally review on a monthly basis. vii. Direct PCCs involvement in lead force/OPCC governance 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vii. Collaboration – Internal Audits. vi. Strategic Alliance Summit viii. Eastern Region Alliance Summit i. Risk Management ii. Effective governance arrangements for BCH and Eastern Region Collaboration iii. Medium term finance plan meetings between CFOs and change team to evaluate and model savings programmes. v. Strategic Athena Management Board provides regular reports and has attendance from key senior managers. 		3	4	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued refinement of local term savings delivery schedule to enable MTFP planning and correct definition of risk appetite (17/18) Improved benefits realisation and performance monitoring processes that also consider impact on local policing (17/18) Continued work to define future visions and governance of collaboration across policing and wider public sector collaboration. (17/18) Link with devolution agenda as it gathers pace to ensure no gaps or conflicts. (17/18) Explore benefits of Fire & Police Collaboration (see Risk 3.1) (17/18) Continue to explore the merits of creating a 'user pays' methodology for transactional collaborated services. (17/18) Mitigate the risks associated with a complex IT change programme. (17/18) 					

viii. arrangements Quarterly Eastern Region Alliance Summits								
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Reference	SR3.4	Objective	Resourcing and Enabling Delivery	Status:	Update 31/01/2017								
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.													
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"> i. Partner agencies have agreed a victims' strategy and attend CCJB victims and witnesses group. ii. Chief Executive and Chief Constable of Cambs, through links with the Public Service Board, co-ordinate effective partnership working. iii. Capacity to effectively commission and monitor grants and contracts which support delivery of the Police and Crime Plan objectives. iv. Engagement with the six Community Safety Partnerships. v. Sub group infrastructure which underpins the Criminal Justice Board. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Countywide Community Safety as required i. Cambridgeshire Criminal Justice Board ii. Chief & Leaders Meeting iii. Police and Crime Panel review of Police and Crime Plan and Annual Report ensures feedback from partners on the work of the Commissioner. iv. Effective engagement by the Constabulary and OPCC into devolution. v. Representation on National and local boards. 			2	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of new performance monitoring framework partnership. (17/18) 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 (17/18) Explore the impact of blue light collaboration on local community safety work (17/18) Implementation and monitoring of new computer enabled crime strategy (17/18) Work on 'Community Resilience Strategy' to reduce demand on services, drive forward increased volunteering and build community capacity. (17/18) More effective rehabilitation of offenders and initiatives to tackle the root cause of offending (toxic trio). Exploration of restorative justice approaches with perpetrators. (17/18) Careful allocation of Crime and Disorder Reduction Grants by PCCs to tackle demand management. (17/18) 			1	2	3

Reference	SR3.5	Objective	Resourcing and Enabling Delivery			Status:	Update 31/01/2017					
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.												
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"> i. Appointment/recruitment processes. ii. PDR process. iii. Regular Commissioner/Deputy Commissioner/Chief Constable and Deputy Chief Constable/Chief Executive (monitoring officer) meetings. iv. Succession planning 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Police and Crime Panel scrutiny of the appointment of the Deputy Commissioner, Chief Executive and Director of Finance. i. Public scrutiny by the Police and Crime Panel. 		2	4	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put in place appropriate arrangements to cover the OPCC CFO post during the current period of transition. (17/18) 			2	3	9

Reference	SR3.6	Objective	Resourcing and Enabling Delivery	Status:	Update 31/01/2017						
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"> i. Commissioner/Chief Constable meetings ii. Commissioner induction meeting iii. Capacity and experience to run successful appointment/recruitment processes iv. Performance Monitoring Framework in place 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Police and Crime Panel scrutiny of the appointment of the Chief Constable iii. Public scrutiny by the Police and Crime Panel. 		1	2	3	•				

Reference	SR4.1	Objective	Being Accountable	Status:	Update 26/01/2017							
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 not 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"> i. Signing of the Oath by the Commissioner and Police conduct regulations and standards ii. Scheme of Governance and Decision making policy iii. Appointment of a Monitoring Officer with capacity to undertake their role iv. Effective risk management strategy and risk register proactively managed. v. External Audit Plan vi. Annual Governance Statement vii. Governance Board established for Organisational Support, Operational Support and Joint Protective Services. viii. Consolidated (financial and non-financial) External Audit/Inspection/Internal Audit Plan. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Joint Audit Committee takes an overview of regulatory framework and integrity issues and ensures good governance in line with the Nolan principles. iv. IA progress report reviews good governance practices are being adhered to and implemented and appropriate decision making processes are in use. iv. 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. vii. BCH Representative Workforce Board created. vii. PSD Alliance sub group holds Tri-Force to account. 			2	2	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to develop governance processes (17/18) Continued scrutiny by Police and Crime Panel (ongoing) Internal Audit of Governance (17/18) 				

	Standards Integrity Committee.							
--	--------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Reference	SR4.2	Objective	Being Accountable	Status:	Update 26/01/2017							
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.												
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"> i. Chief Executive charged with maintaining sufficient capacity within OPCC. ii. Force Performance Management Group, Performance Officers Group regular monitoring by Commissioner. iii. Performance reporting to Commissioner. iv. Police and Crime Plan Performance Framework. v. 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"> v. Force Executive Board chaired by Chief Constable and Strategic Performance Board. iii. Business Co-ordination Board to scrutinise performance reports to ensure performance against Police and Crime Plan and quality of service provision. iii. HMIC Inspection reports reviewed by Commissioner when received and response published. i. Audit reports reviewed by JAC. iv. Commissioner's Annual Report reviewed by Police and Crime Report. v. Complaints made against Chief Constable regarding deployment. 			2	3	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Police and Crime Plan under development. (march 2017) Consultation with partners and stakeholders ongoing embedding new performance framework. (17/18) 				

Reference	SR4.3	Objective	Being Accountable	Status:	Update 31/01/2017							
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"> i. Commissioner's and Panel induction processes. ii. Proactive management of future agenda planning by the Panel's work programme which sets out scrutiny plan for the year. iii. Engagement between OPCC and Police and Crime secretariat. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. The Police and Crime Panel meets in public which ensures that progress in this area is visible to the media and the local community. ii. Panel has now operated for 2 years, controls established & working. ii. Annual report including performance report scrutinised. i. Commissioner's internal governance arrangements are in place. 			1	3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to develop governance processes. (17/18) Continued scrutiny by the Police and Crime Panel. (ongoing) Work with Panel to enhance the challenge and support provided by the Panel. Ongoing programme of Panel briefing sessions. (ongoing) 				

Reference	SR4.4	Objective	Being Accountable			Status:	Update 31/01/2017					
<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. Capacity within BCH HR function is under pressure. 			<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"> i. 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. ii. Review of Human Rights Issues – Custody, Taser, Covert Surveillance. iii. Equality duty – review/monitored. iv. Workforce surveys and reports. v. Health & Safety Constabulary improvement report. vi. Reports to Estates Sub Group vii. Health & Safety statement signed by Chief Constable and PCC. Joint H&S Policy in operation. iii. Officers have received Management Action from ACC for driving defective force vehicles 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. The People Board ensures the need for relevant action is identified and action plans are progressed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Internal Audit ensures independent validation of risk controls. vi. Police and Crime Commissioner holds the chief Constable to account in these key areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. BCH Engagement & Wellbeing Board created. vi. 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of BCH Annual People Plan and People Strategy. (17/18) Consideration of a review of Target Operating Model (TOM) for BCH Collaborated HR function. (17/18) 				

Reference	SR4.5	Objective	Being Accountable	Status:	Update 31/01/2017							
<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. Sufficient investment to allow activity 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JAC review of performance framework. Ability of Police and Crime Panel to scrutinise areas of concern. Strategic Alliance overview of healthcare in custody. Organisational Support Governance Board. 			2	3	9	•				

<p>of training and supervision.</p> <p>x. Work through BCH governance mechanism to ensure effective oversight of the custody health care contract.</p> <p>xi. Follow up to ensure actions are in place in response to ICV concerns regarding individual detainees.</p> <p>xii. Increased BCH performance management of healthcare in custody.</p>								
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

This page is intentionally blank.

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

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.