

Draft Police Authority Board Risk Register

Risk Owner for All Risks: Police Authority Chief Executive (Follows practice in the CoLC where COs are responsible for corporate risks)

[Scoring matrix](#)

No	Risk description	What are we currently doing to mitigate the risk?	Current score	What more do we need to do to mitigate the risk?	Target score
1	<p>Police Funding</p> <p>Cause: 1. CoLP savings plans insufficiently developed for whole medium term. 2. Failure to deliver savings plans. 3. Unplanned pressures arise. 4. Compounded by Action Fraud/NFIB re-procurement risk (2).</p> <p>Risk Event: Police finances are not sustainable over the medium term. Or tactical savings required which adversely impact services.</p> <p>Effects: Insufficient assurance on medium-term savings plans and related service implications mean PA inhibited in its role of securing an efficient and effective police service.</p>	<p>Police funding from Govt and CoLC has increased by c.£20m since 2018/19.</p> <p>CoLP Commissioner is committed to delivering savings to achieve balanced finances in future.</p> <p>Regular reporting from CoLP on progress against in-year savings plans.</p> <p>Review of full savings plans for 21/22 and operational / service implications to follow at March 21 PAB.</p> <p>Greater scrutiny from PAB and involvement from the PA in the Transform programme.</p>	<p>Likely 4 Major 4 Risk score; 16 Red</p>	<p>Receive and review CoLP proposals on savings plans across medium-term, and service implications, aligned to Transform programme.</p> <p>Specific assessment of impact of CT grant reduction once communicated.</p> <p>Clarity from the Home Office on a funding settlement for the next generation Action Fraud/NFIB system post 2021 Spending Review.</p>	<p>12 Amber (by Spring 2022, then review)</p>

2	<p>Action fraud/NFIB re-procurement</p> <p>Cause: Uncertainty on funding pending next Spending Review. Reluctance from the Home Office to commit to additional funding for this service until the outcome of the Spending Review is known, triggering a delay in the re-procurement timetable.</p> <p>Risk Event: No commitment from Home Office to fund procurement, build and run of future system/service (or significant delay on funding decision) pending the outcome of the Spending Review.</p> <p>Effects: Significant impact on CoLP/CoLC finances – or unacceptable level of service reduction for victims. Delays to the procurement timetable.</p>	<p>Financial analysis of future cost projections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current IBM extension • IBM settlement / further extension • Re-procurement, build and run (capital and revenue) <p>Analysis of HO, CoLC, CoLP funding options, including contributions from AF reserve and underspend.</p> <p>Regular engagement with relevant Home Office Ministers and officials.</p>	<p>Possible 3 Major 4 Risk score; 12 Amber</p>	<p>Ensure clear decision made with input from all parties, in coming months.</p> <p>Streamlined governance for the procurement to expedite the introduction of the next generation system.</p>	<p>0 (risk eliminated through decision on MT funding)</p>
3	<p>Maintaining effective working relationships</p> <p>Cause: Lack of integration between the respective roles of the Police Authority and the Force</p> <p>Risk Event: Lack of co-operation and mutual trust between the Police Authority and CoLP</p>	<p>Implementing a clear framework on how the Police Authority will discharge its role.</p> <p>Providing greater clarity on the Police Authority's requirements for CoLP in terms of reporting and information exchange.</p> <p>Providing CoLP with the necessary tools to facilitate appropriate</p>	<p>Possible 3 Major 4 Risk score; 12 Amber</p>	<p>Following through current mitigations should reduce the risk score.</p>	<p>8</p>

	<p>Effects: Inability of the Police Authority to carry out its legal responsibilities of securing efficient and effective police service and holding the Commissioner.</p>	<p>independence and delegation through CoLC governance.</p> <p>Ensure balancing in applying “critical friend” approach to relationship.</p>			
4	<p>Changes to Police Authority Governance</p> <p>Cause: CoLC governance structures inhibit sound and timely decision making on Police matters.</p> <p>Risk Event: Inability to achieve efficient and effective governance of CoLP.</p> <p>Effects: Police Authority not fulfilling its role with delays to critical decisions.</p>	<p>Fully implement current plans for refining Police Authority governance.</p> <p>Make case as appropriate for other changes to Police governance recommended by the Lisvane Review, as part of CoLC’s overall process of implementing the Lisvane Review’s recommendations.</p>	<p>Possible 3 Major 4 Risk score; 12 Amber</p>	<p>Consider scope to streamline CoLC capital programme governance for CoLP.</p>	8
5	<p>Transform</p> <p>Cause: Insufficient clarity on the outcomes of the Transform programme for the Police Authority to obtain robust assurance on whether key objectives are deliverable.</p> <p>Risk event: Police Authority has an uninformed or erroneous view of efficiency and effectiveness of the operating changes being delivered through Transform and/or progress being made to deliver Transform to agreed timelines.</p>	<p>Regular reporting from CoLP into Police Authority Board and relevant sub-committees.</p> <p>New reporting template in place.</p> <p>SIA Member engagement, with appropriate Police Authority officer support, to develop a clearer and more quantified articulation of the Transform programme for Members.</p> <p>Implement Member sessions to deep dive the TOM by workstream.</p>	<p>Possible 3 Major 4 Risk score; 12 Amber</p>	<p>Following through current mitigations should reduce the risk score.</p>	8 (review in 1 year)

	Effects: Leading to an over or under optimistic view of the delivery of the programme. Potential undermining of the Policing Plan, MTFO and working relationships between the Police Authority and CoLP.				
--	---	--	--	--	--

DRAFT