

CAMBRIDGESHIRE OPCC and CONSTABULARY STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER, April 2020

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. |
| 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 enter into or achieve benefits of collaboration. |
| SR3.3 | 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. |
| SR3.4 | 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. |
| SR3.5 | There is a 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. |
| 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 | | SR3.4 | SR1.1 SR3.1 SR3.2 SR4.4 | | |
| 3 Moderate | | SR3.3 SR4.2 SR4.3 SR4.5 | | | |
| 2 Minor | SR3.5 | SR2.1 SR2.2 SR2.3 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 03/04/2020 | | | | | |
| There is a 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. Collaboration could expose Cambridgeshire to reputational risk if one of the partners is portrayed negatively in the media. Changes are put in place by partners to balance their budget and impact on communities is unknown and unintended. Lack of effective neighbourhood policing strategy Public concern at the use (or lack of use) of Covid19 legislation. Public concern regarding delivery of policing/keeping communities safe. | | <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. Currently unknown or unintended consequences on policing of Cambridgeshire materialise and increase demands on policing. Public take enforcement action into their own hands. | | | | 4 | 4 | 21 | 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. Joint work between the OPCC and the Constabulary and Collaboration Team. ii. Reporting of compliance with transparency by the Constabulary and Commissioner Publication Schemes/Information Order compliance and other information on the Constabulary and Commissioner Websites. iii. Constabulary management of police complaints, Commissioner's responsibility for monitoring complaints system and handling | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Business Co-ordination Board ii. Commissioner chairs BCH Strategic Alliance Summit ii. Police and Crime Panel. iii. CoPACC¹ annual award. iv. Professional Standards Department (PSD) Governance Board. v. BCH Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Board and Cambs Tactical Board. Internal Audit of Equality & Diversity. vi. Business Co-ordination Board | | | 3 | 4 | 18 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with partners to develop Think Communities Approach and link this to emerging Neighbourhood Policing Strategy (2019/20) Work with PSD, Constabulary and preferred service provider to prepare for complaints reform responsibilities coming into force in Q4 2019-20. Understand and prepare for additional officers from Government's 20,000 officers | | 1 | 2 | 3 |

¹ Comparing Police and Crime Commissioners

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| complaints against Chief Constable. iv. Equality objectives in place v. Horizon scanning of partners budgetary plans. Partnership work as articulated in the Community Safety matrix. vi. Monitoring use of new Covid19 legislation. vii. Monitoring incidents of vigilantism. | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| Reference | SR2.1 | Objective | Setting Direction | Status: | Update 03/04/2020 | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|-------------------|---------|-------------------|---|-----------|---|--|--|--------|---|---|
| <p>There is a 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 and these objectives are not delivered.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | Effects | | | Inherent | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | | | | |
| <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. Lack of public awareness of the Plan Changes are put in place by partners to balance their budget. PCC election delayed due to Covid19 and Acting PCC cannot update Police and Crime Plan. Responsible authorities are unable to set strategic priorities or provide a clear strategic direction because of the Covid19 crisis. | | <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. Lack of effective financial planning Impact on ability to set and deliver appropriate Police and Crime Plan objectives. Police and Crime Plan objectives may not have due regard to the priorities of the responsible authorities. | | | L | I | R | PCC | Head of Strategic Partnerships and Commissioning | | | | |
| | | | | | 2 | 4 | 14 | | | | | | |
| 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 resources needed to deliver the Police and Crime Plan under review. Priorities for action by the Constabulary and the broader partnership support required during 2019-20. ii. Linkage with financial and other key strategies via BCB Wide consultation and joint engagement strategy Police and Crime Plan iii. New objective setting process for Chief Constable to lead, contribute and influence the achievement of the delivery of the objectives of the | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Engagement with stakeholders including the Chief Constable. Cambridgeshire Countywide Strategic Community Safety Board ensures strategic engagement with community safety PCC Chairs Criminal Justice Board engaging with CJS partners. ii. On-going Police and Crime Panel scrutiny of precept, Police and Crime Plan changes, and deep dive reports on Plan themes. iii. Engagement with HMICFRS inspection regime. iv. Internal audit of delivery plan. | | | 2 | 2 | 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing dialogue with partners through existing established governance mechanisms to understand the future budget risks. Candidate briefing event being arranged to ensure PCC candidates are informed on future issues. Project plan in place to ensure appropriate preparation for PCC elections. Victim & offender needs assessment data being refreshed Jan-Apr 2020. Horizon scanning work to be completes to assess what strategies have been delayed and could impact upon the Police and Crime Plan objectives (e.g. Health and Wellbeing Strategy; Early Help and Vulnerable Adolescent Strategy). | | | 2 | 2 | 5 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>iv. Police and Crime Plan. Chief Constable's operational direction and structures managing operational response to pandemic.</p> <p>v. Review of the approach to grants during Covid19.</p> <p>vi. Local partnership working structures and relationships being maintained through the command structure.</p> | <p>v. Review and sign off by the BCB of variations to the Police and Crime Plan.</p> <p>vi. The command structure includes key strategic decision makers from responsible authorities.</p> | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|-------------------|---------|-------------------|----------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------|----------|
| Reference | SR2.2 | Objective | Setting Direction | Status: | Update 03/04/2020 | | | | | | | |
| There is a 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. Implementation of recommendations from HMICFRS inspections. iii. Broaden collaboration with existing partners to enhance resilience of protective services. iv. Assessment and preparation of the Force Management Statement v. Constabulary's Strategic Threat Risk Assessment incorporates assessment against Strategic Policing Requirement. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Collaborative governance arrangements ensure proper prioritisation of regional and national policing issues. iii. HMICFRS inspection regime. iv. Regional engagement with Specialist Capabilities Delivery Board. v. Planning and business processes STRA action plan created. Local SLTs are responsible for management of their actions, which will be monitored by CDD Governance & Inspection and reported/escalated to Change Board as necessary. | | | 2 | 2 | 5 | • | | | | |

| Reference | SR2.3 | Objective | Setting Direction | Status: | Update 03/04/2020 | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|---|-------------------|---------|-------------------|---|-----------|--|----------------------------------|--|--------|---|---|
| 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. Inability to influence the Police Transformation Fund Inability to influence Brexit developments which then could have implications for Cambridgeshire if current policing tools are not available. | | <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. Cambs has to divert local resources to national projects that are of little value to Cambridgeshire. Unknown or unintended consequences on policing of Cambridgeshire. | | | 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. The PCC links effectively with the APCC, is Chair of the National Commercial Board and a member of the Local Government Association. Effective linkage with National Groups such as the Chief Executive is Deputy Chair of Association of Police & Crime Chief Executives (APACE); Member of Policing Transformation Board. ii. Proactive engagement with the BCH and Seven Force governance arrangement. iii. 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. iv. IAVEA updates provide alerts to | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. PCC chairs 7F oversight group PCC chairs BCH Strategic Alliance. Eastern Region CJB Chairs meeting now established. ii. Police and Crime Panel hold PCC to account. iii. 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. iv. STRA action plan created. Local SLTs are responsible for management of their actions, which will be monitored by CDD | | | 2 | 2 | 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constabulary's Strategic Threat Risk Assessment incorporates assessment against Strategic Policing Requirement. | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>emerging issues and initiatives which are reviewed by CFOs.</p> <p>v. Force and Commissioner link into national contingency planning relating to Brexit. Local contingency planning mechanisms in place.</p> <p>Vi. Constabulary's Strategic Threat Risk Assessment incorporates assessment against Strategic Policing Requirement.</p> | <p>Governance & Inspection and reported/escalated to Change Board as necessary.</p> | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| Reference | SR3.1 | Objective | Resourcing and Enabling Delivery | | | Status: | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|----------------------------------|--|----------|---------|-----------|---|------------------------|--------|---|---|
| There is a risk that the Commissioner and Chief Constable fail to manage the finances effectively. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Causes | | Effects | | | Inherent | | Exec Lead | Senior Lead | | | | |
| | | | | | L | I | R | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrangements not in place for strategic financial planning, receiving funding, financial management, accounting and auditing, monitoring, value for money, setting precept, allocating funding and issuing grants and planning for major police operations. • 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 • Potential cost pressure of Emergency Service Network. • Failure to realise the opportunities of the Policing and Crime Act. • Failure to identify the impact of partners' budgetary changes. • Government changes to Pension calculations • Failure to effectively manage the transition period for the Constabulary's Director of Finance & Resources • Changes to public finance as a result of the Covid19 create significant uncertainty around future funding. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory duties are not met and the accounts are qualified. • 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. • Ability to fund Government initiatives i.e. Digital Programmes • Unknown and unintentional consequences placed on policing. • Pressures on budgets for future years. • Inability to fund previously assumed projects. | | | 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"> i. Scheme of Governance, Financial regulations and contract standing orders clearly set out duties of the two corporations sole. ii. Regular joint working between | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. PCC has oversight of Chief Constable's budgetary framework and this is included in the Police and Crime Plan allowing public scrutiny. ii. External Audit statements published and VFM conclusion and provided to | | | 3 | 4 | 18 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic use of grants to support reductions in demand and prevention agenda and prevention agenda. • Ongoing review of financial health of other partners with escalation if necessary, to understand the impact of the actions to | | 1 | 2 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>the Commissioner, Commissioner's CFO and Chief Constable's CFO.</p> <p>iii. Iterative financial planning process throughout year.</p> <p>iv. Revenue outturn reports, budget monitoring reports/dashboard cover all aspects of OPCC budget.</p> <p>v. Capital programme monitoring.</p> <p>vi. Prudential Indicators, Treasury Management and Minimum Revenue Provision.</p> <p>vii. Financial Reserves.</p> <p>viii. Monthly reviews of Revenue and Capital estimates, Fees and Charges review.</p> <p>ix. External Audit VFM statement/strategy.</p> <p>x. 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>xi. Continued horizon-scanning for new and emerging cost pressures.</p> <p>xii. Integrated BCH strategic performance, and financial planning process.</p> <p>xiii. Analysis of allocation of savings and costs in collaborated functions.</p> | <p>JAC.</p> <p>iii. HMICFRS Efficiency Reports.</p> <p>iv. IA/EA of all financial systems ensure accounting and finances are effectively managed.</p> <p>v. BCB ensures adequate service quality and performance and that finances are managed effectively.</p> <p>vi. Police and Crime Panel review Police and Crime Plan including MTFP, budget and precept and plans for closer working between police and fire.</p> <p>viii Compliant with Home Office requirements to publish Reserves strategy.</p> <p>vii. Force Management Statement is used to better forecast future demand, with alignment to budgetary and planning processes.</p> | | | | <p>balance their budgets on policing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to monitor progress of multiple National and BCH ICT projects and risks and issues arising from it. • Introduction of regular away days between Constabulary and OPCC. • Spend analysis of BCH collaborated functions being undertaken in conjunction with Chief Executives review. | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|---|---|---------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|---|----------------------|--------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Reference | SR3.2 | Objective | Resourcing and Enabling Delivery | Status: | Update 03/04/2020 | | | | | | | |
| There is a 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. Failure to deliver the requirements in the Police and Crime Plan to keep under consideration whether entering into a collaboration agreement with one or more other relevant emergency services in England could be in the interests of the efficiency or effectiveness of that service and those other services. A shortfall in capacity or capability. Financial unsustainability of another police force poses risk to other collaboration partners. Challenges with functionality of Athena Failure to deliver or achieve the benefits of Information Technology. Changes are put in place by collaborated police forces to balance their budget and impact on Cambridgeshire is unknown and unintended. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential savings cannot be achieved or costs materialise due to a failure in a partner organisation. Resilience of police 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 service disruption in delivery of Athena. Resilience of blue light services External inspections raise concerns Currently unknown or unintended consequences on policing of Cambridgeshire materialise and increase demands on policing. | | | 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. Eastern Region Governance process 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. Operational Support, Organisational Support and JPS Governance | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. BCH Strategic Alliance Summit ii. Eastern Region Alliance Summit. iii. Medium term finance plan meetings between CFOs and change team to evaluate and model savings programmes. iv. Collaboration – Internal Audits. v. Strategic Athena Management Board provides regular reports and has attendance from key senior managers. ix. Monthly reports to Force Change Board | | | 3 | 4 | 18 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to explore the merits of creating a ‘user pays’ methodology for transactional collaborated services. (19/20) Mitigate the risks associated with a complex IT change programme. (19/20) Through 7 Force programme work ongoing to align the Police 2025 vision to work locally. Benefits realisation to be undertaken for current and proposed collaborations to understand the contribution to service delivery for Cambridgeshire and the cost of that delivery to ensure efficiencies and productivity. | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>vi. Boards formally review on a monthly basis including finances. Direct PCCs involvement in lead force/OPCC governance arrangements now supported by Head of Finance</p> <p>vii. Fire, Police, Ambulance Interoperability Board</p> <p>viii. Transition for decoupling Custody and CJ from Beds & Herts</p> | <p>x. BCH offering resilience during Covid19.</p> | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition for decoupling Custody and CJ from Beds & Herts reports monthly to Force Change Board (1 April 2020) • BCH review work is near completion and this affords the opportunity to change existing governance processes. | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| Reference | SR3.3 | Objective | Resourcing and Enabling Delivery | Status: | Update 03/04/2020 | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|----------------------------------|---------|-------------------|---|-----------|---|--------------------------------|--|--------|---|---|
| There is a 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 against demands of public sector financial landscape. 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. National Serious Violence Strategy has identified that there are changing trends in serious crime with homicide, knife crime and gun crime increasing accompanied by a shift in younger victims and perpetrators. On-going changes in the criminal justice landscape, probation and prisons, increase complexity. Changes to working practices as a result of Covid19 means that trials are not taking place, this will create a backlog of cases. Offender management – Offender pathways are not resilient during Covid19, early prison releases without adequate support in the community, housing not available. | | <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. Victims, witnesses and the public may perceive that criminal justice is not effective. Victims and witnesses may withdraw from criminal justice process and increase the risk to themselves and others. Potentially dangerous offenders do not face justice and could re-offend. Potential impact on police demand. Potential impact on social care demand through increased safeguarding requirements. | | | 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"> Refreshed ToR-and subgroup structure linked to PCC Chairmanship. Countywide Community Safety Board subgroups. CJB has, an offender group and delivery group. OPCC are linking with the Local Authorities workstreams of Housing, Skills and | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Countywide Community Safety Board chaired by PCC. PCC observer member of the Combined Authority. Countywide Cambridgeshire Criminal Justice Board chaired by PCC Safeguarding Boards attended by Constabulary and Chief Executive Police and Crime Panel review of Police and Crime Plan and Annual Report | | | 2 | 3 | 9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative monitoring of progress in delivering Police and Crime Plan objectives Explore the impact of blue light collaboration on local community safety work Careful allocation of Crime and Disorder Reduction Grants by PCCs to tackle demand and manage risk and prevention agenda. (20/21) | | | 2 | 3 | 9 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Transport. Partnership signatory to the Countywide includes Peterborough Community Safety Agreement</p> <p>iii. Clear processes in place to monitor progress of Police and Crime Plan.</p> <p>iv. The PCC links effectively with ongoing changes in the Criminal Justice landscape with the APCC, Chief Executive is Deputy Chair of the Association of Police & Crime Chief Executives (APACE).</p> <p>v. Development of Countywide Strategic Assessments to ensure good shared understanding of risks in Cambs</p> <p>vi. Local Resilience Forum managing community risks during Covid19.</p> | <p>ensures feedback from partners on the work of the Commissioner. Eastern Region Commissioners meeting provides a mechanism to influence ongoing changes in the Criminal Justice landscape.</p> <p>Internal Audit Partnership Working – Community Safety</p> <p>v. Public Service Board Chaired by Chief Executive of OPCC.</p> | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued development of the Countywide Community Safety arrangements. Development of Countywide Strategic Assessments to ensure good shared understanding of risks in Cambs (Dec 2018) 2019/20 Police and Crime Plan objective setting identifies areas where to influence partner's delivery towards the achievement of the delivery of the objectives of the Police and Crime Plan is required. Input to Eastern Region Commissioners meeting on Criminal Justice landscape developments. Clear Commissioning and Grants Strategy – enabling robust commissioning of local victim support services to provide support to victims and witnesses during the Covid19 to keep them engaged. | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---|--|---------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------|--------------|---|---|
| Reference | SR3.4 | Objective | Resourcing and Enabling Delivery | | | Status: | Update 03/04/2020 | | | | | |
| There is a 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 Organisational Change | | | <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 impacts on ability to deliver good governance | | | 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 v. New OPCC structure in place from 13/04/2020 to provide resilience to Chief Executive and CFO. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Police and Crime Panel scrutiny of the appointment of the Deputy Commissioner, Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer/ s151 Officer i. Public scrutiny by the Police and Crime Panel. | | | 2 | 4 | 14 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring arrangements until Fire Authority legal action is resolved. | | 2 | 3 | 9 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|--|---------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--|------------------|--------------------|----------|----------|
| Reference | SR3.5 | Objective | Resourcing and Enabling Delivery | Status: | Update 03/04/2020 | | | | | | | |
| There is a 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. Poor relationship between Chief Constable and Commissioner leads to failure to work effectively | | | <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/Chief Constable induction meetings 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. iv. Business Co-ordination Board. | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective setting for 19/20 underway | | 1 | 2 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|---|--|---------|----------|-------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|---|
| Reference | SR4.1 | Objective | Being Accountable | | | Status: | Update 03/04/2020 | | | | | |
| There is a 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. Consolidated (financial and non-financial) External Audit/Inspection/Internal Audit Plan. viii. 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. viii. Rapid change to remote working | | <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. ii. Annual Integrity Controls Assurance report to BCB and JAC regarding PCC's and Constabulary's controls processes, evidence of their effectiveness, and complaints handling IA progress report reviews good governance practices are being adhered to and implemented and appropriate decision making processes are in use. vi.. Head of IA Annual Report considers whether good governance practices are being adhered to and implemented and appropriate decision making processes are in use. v. PSD Governance Board holds PSD function to account. vi. Police and Crime Panel hold PCC to account. | | | 2 | 2 | 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued support and scrutiny by Police and Crime Panel (ongoing) Internal Audit link to governance with paper to BCB for visibility Future delivery of PCC business through revised governance structure of BCB. Decision policy taken to first BCB meeting with Acting PCC. Police and Crime Panel to become virtual meetings during Covid19. | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| where possible during Covid19. | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|-------------------|---------|-------------------|----------|------------------|--|--------------------------------|---------------|----------|----------|
| Reference | SR4.2 | Objective | Being Accountable | Status: | Update 03/04/2020 | | | | | | | |
| There is a 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. Failure to adequately plan for changes in police officer training | | <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 within OPCC. Increased understanding of nature of current and likely future demand has informed local policing review to ensure a sustainable policing model. Force Corporate Development Department undertake regular performance monitoring and analysis. Force Monthly Strategic Performance Meeting Board chaired by Assistant Deputy Chief Constable. Regular monitoring by OPCC and reporting from Force inform Business Co-ordination Board. Police and Crime Plan Performance Framework. Strategic Tasking and Co-ordination process reviews Threat, Risk and | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business Co-ordination Board to scrutinise performance reports to ensure performance against Police and Crime Plan and quality of service provision. HMICFRS Inspection reports reviewed by Commissioner when received and response published. Force Executive Board and Force Performance Board chaired by Chief Constable Business Co-ordination Board Audit reports reviewed by JAC. Commissioner's Annual Report reviewed by Police and Crime Panel. Effective engagement with the IOPC for referral of complaints. Force Management Statement is used to better forecast future demand, with alignment to budgetary and planning processes. STRA action plan created. Local | | | 2 | 3 | 9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans to implement PEQF underway Understand and prepare for additional officers from Government's 20,000 officers | | 1 | 3 | 6 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>vii. Harm and demand patterns which inform policing element of Police and Crime Plan.</p> <p>viii. Complaints made against Chief Constable dealt with in line with statutory requirements.</p> <p>viii. STRA process - During Covid19 pandemic, delivery against Threat, Risk and Harm rather than Police and Crime Plan.</p> | <p>SLTs are responsible for management of their actions, which will be monitored by CDD Governance & Inspection and reported/escalated to Change Board as necessary.</p> | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|-------------------|---------|-------------------|----------|------------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------|----------|----------|
| Reference | SR4.3 | Objective | Being Accountable | Status: | Update 03/04/2020 | | | | | | | |
| There is a 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 Panel fails to articulate their needs. Lack of organisational support for Police and Crime Plan through secretariat. Changes in Chairmanship leads to changes in approaches and expectations. | | <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. Ad-hoc demands from the Panel impact on the ability of the OPCC to respond effectively. | | | 2 | 4 | 14 | OPCC | Head of Policy for Police and Fire | | | |
| 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 OPCC agenda planning informed by the Panel's work programme which sets out scrutiny plan for the year. iii. Engagement between OPCC and Police and Crime Panel secretariat. iv. Panel terms of reference and rules of procedure set out ways of working. Policing Protocol defines relationship. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 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-iv Panel controls established & working. ii-iv Annual report scrutinised. Deep-dive reports on Police and Crime Plan themes scrutinised. ii-iv Commissioner's internal governance arrangements are in place. | | | 2 | 3 | 9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to develop and review governance processes and documentation (ongoing) Ongoing programme of Panel briefing sessions. Continue to work with Panel, Panel secretariat and monitoring officer to ensure understanding of respective roles and responsibilities and to ensure effective ongoing programme of work to provide appropriate support and scrutiny of PCC Regular updates to Police and Crime Panel on Fire governance which would impact on Panel's remit. Police and Crime Panel to become virtual meetings during Covid19. | | 1 | 3 | 6 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|-------------------|---------|-------------------|---|-----------|--|-----------------|--------|---|----|
| Reference | SR4.4 | Objective | Being Accountable | Status: | Update 03/04/2020 | | | | | | | |
| <p>There is a 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. Covid19 risks including PPE and testing. More limited partnership arrangements to protect the vulnerable during Covid19. | | <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 Equality, Diversity and Inclusion 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. Countywide Community Safety Agreement. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Strategic BCH Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Board ensures the need for relevant action is identified and action plans are progressed. BCH Engagement & Wellbeing Board created ii. Internal Audit ensures independent validation of risk controls. iii. Internal Audit of Equality and Diversity. iv-v Police and Crime Commissioner holds the Chief Constable to account in these key areas with reports to BCB in the public domain vi. Southern Cambridgeshire Police Station Board (CSPS) to manage the project to deliver the Constabulary's operational requirements for custody to replace current facilities at Parkside with a new facility known as the Southern Police Station to meet Home | | | 3 | 4 | 18 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BCH Wellbeing Board – delivery plan linked to Oscar Kilo (best practice) and gap analysis of best practice feeds into local governance for delivery and development of Health & wellbeing delivery plan Increasing numbers of wellbeing champions Continuous improvement to skills through CPD days Custody de-collaboration investigative centre will build on core custody function – safer handling of detainees at heart of duty of care. Re-audit of Health & Safety will provide assurance that Governance is now in place. H&S Audits included in 2020/21 Internal Audit Plan. | | 1 | 4 | 10 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| iii. | Cambs Constabulary H&S meeting chaired by ACC. | Office requirements. | | | | | | |
| ix. | Cambs Force Wellbeing Board chaired by a Chief Superintendent. | x. BCH H&S Board chaired by a DCC. xi. BCH Wellbeing Board chaired by a DCC. | | | | | | |
| x. | BCH People Plan addresses wellbeing as a specific point. | xii. BCH People Board | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|--|---------|-------------------|----------|---|---|-------------|--------------|---|---|
| Reference | SR4.5 | Objective | Being Accountable | Status: | Update 03/04/2020 | | | | | | | |
| <p>There is a 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. Reduced ICV attendance during Covid19. | | | <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"> i. Police and Crime Plan performance framework documented approach to performance monitoring. ii. Ensuring reports on H&S, equality & diversity, safeguarding children, the promotion of child welfare and detention and handling are considered through commissioning processes. iii. Monitoring of the ICV Scheme iv. ICV Scheme Management update v. Monitoring of dog welfare vi. H&S statement of intent signed by Chief Constable and PCC. Joint H&S policy in operation. vii. Sufficient investment to allow activity of training and supervision. viii. Follow up to ensure actions are in place in response to ICV concerns regarding individual detainees. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. JAC review of performance framework. Ability of Police and Crime Panel to scrutinise areas of concern. ii. Ethics, Equality & Inclusion Group with independent input. iii. Effective use of internal audit iv. Quarterly updates to ICVA, quarterly ICV panel meetings. OPCC oversight of children in custody. Actions from Internal Audit are reviewed at BCB. v. Strategic BCH Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Board and Cambs tactical board. vi. Enhanced information sharing of children in custody with Youth Offending Service. Peterborough Childrens Services Inspection in July 2018 rated as 'good and have improved significantly'. | | | 2 | 3 | 9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal Safeguarding mechanisms to ensure staff are effectively trained in safeguarding and are following procedures for Internal Audit in 2020/21. Appropriate attendance at Cambridgeshire Safeguarding Board. BCB during Covid19 will focus on specific essential holding the Chief Constable to account. | | 1 | 3 | 6 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ix. ICVA guidance being followed re telephone calls to detainees. x. Regular records of children in custody sent to Chief Executive of OPCC. | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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 |

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.

PESTELO

Political - local/gov 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

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

Economic - Internal budget pressures

1. Insignificant – Overspend of up to 2% of agreed/notional budget or shortfall of up to 3% of approved target saving
2. Minor – Overspend of 2% to 5% of agreed/notional budget or shortfall of 3-5%
3. Moderate – Overspend of 5-10% of agreed / notional budget or shortfall of 5-10%
4. Significant – Overspend of 10-15% of agreed / notional budget or shortfall of 10-15%
5. Catastrophic – Overspend of more than 15% or shortfall of more than 15%

Technological - Consequences of failure, pay/scale of change

1. Insignificant – Insignificant shortfalls in mandatory reqs and/or other requirements
2. Minor - Minor shortfalls in mandatory reqs and/or other requirements
3. Moderate – Moderate shortfalls in one or more key reqs
4. Significant - Significant shortfalls in mandatory reqs and/or other reqs having direct impact on service delivery

5. Catastrophic - Variability of organisation under threat

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

Organisation - Issues 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

5. Catastrophic - Complete system failure which has a direct impact on service delivery

Legislative - National or European Law

1. Insignificant - No effect - Compliance with legislation
2. Minor - Little affect - Exposure to Local Sanctions e.g. Breach of Local Bye Laws
3. Moderate - Considerable Effect - Exposure to fines/penalties e.g. failure to meet contractual obligations
4. Significant - Serious effect - exposure to prosecution, resulting in serious damage to reputation
5. Catastrophic - Critical - exposure to prosecution, which prevents organisation from continuing to discharge its duties