

Committee(s): Police: Performance and Resource Management Sub Committee Police Committee	Date(s): 30 th June 2015 25 th September 2015
Subject: City of London Police: Risk Register	Public
Report of: Commissioner of Police POL 32/15	For Information

Summary

The Force Strategic Risk Register has been reviewed as part of the quarterly assurance process maintained within the Force with notable amendments to the register as follows:

- *SR 04: Underperforming as Lead Force for Economic Crime:* This risk remains scored as Amber. However, there is downward movement in many of the control scores which show the maturity of the Force control measures is increasing. This trend should see an increased improvement in score in time for this risk and it is on the path to being scored as Green.
- *SR 05: Reduction in staff Morale/well-being:* Following a review of this risk at the February Risk Assurance Group, the likelihood of this risk occurring has been reduced to Medium. Overall, this has resulted in this risk now being scored as Green.
- *SR 09: Delivery of new Force Estate:* This risk remains Green reflecting the successful delivery of Guildhall Yard East. As the final decisions on the Force estate is made and plans put in place to carry out the works this risk will be reviewed to reflect the circumstances of the Force. It remains Green at this stage to reflect the success so far and that plans for the completion of the new estate model are now being finalised.
- *SR 17: Continued pressure on funding streams reducing overall Force budget:* The Risk Assurance Group determined that the likelihood of this risk should be raised further to High reflecting the increased certainty that austerity measures would continue and there would be continued pressure for the Force to make savings from its budget.
- *SR 19: Failure in Provision of custody Services:* This risk has been re-assessed over the course of the quarter and reflects the amount of work undertaken to complete identified improvements to the Force's custody suites. The likelihood and control scores for this risk have now been reduced and the risk is now scored as Green overall. This reflects the significant work undertaken by the Force to upgrade existing facilities for use until the new custody suite is

delivered as part of the new estate programme.

- *SR 20: Policy approval and management process leaves Force open to potential litigation:* Strategic Development have been working with Directors to ensure the policy database is up to date and that only policies in date are published externally. A great deal of work has been done by Directors to update documents and close policy gaps. Although there are still some outstanding areas of work to be completed and updates are on-going this risk has been assessed as Green due to decreasing the Likelihood to Medium and assessing our controls as more mature.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Members note the content of this report.

Main Report

BACKGROUND

1. The Force Strategic Risk Register remains monitored on a quarterly basis by the Force Risk Assurance Group currently chaired by the Assistant Commissioner. This report sets out the position of the Force Strategic Risk Register following the Risk Assurance Group held on 20th February 2015 and the meeting held with the Police Committee Risk Lead on the 16th April 2015. The risk register has been amended and updated following these meeting and the position from 15th May 2015 is reflected within this report for members' information.

CURRENT POSITION

2. In accordance with the City of London Corporation's responsibilities as a police authority, it is appropriate that your Committee is made aware of critical risks, which may impact on service delivery or performance, together with any plans to eliminate or mitigate critical risks, and the changing risk profile of the Force.
3. The Force has initiated a risk assurance process to provide oversight to the risk register cascade and to provide a forum for the Assistant Commissioner to actively question all risk registers within the Force and allow Directors to collectively assess their risks and control measures. This aims to provide a top-down and bottom-up approach to the management of risk.
4. The assurance meetings have taken place on a quarterly basis since the 3rd May 2011. The last meeting to be held was chaired by the Commander on the 20th February 2015, where the Force risk profile for 2014/15 was reviewed for the final time within the financial year.
5. The Strategic Risk Register continues to be supported by a cascade of Directorate risk registers that are maintained and reviewed by Directors in support of the delivery of their portfolio business plans. Significant risks from Directors areas that they define as unmanageable by them alone are also discussed at the Risk Assurance Group to add information, where appropriate,

to the Force risk profile. The position of the Force risks as at 8th June 2015 is detailed below:

Current Risk Profile June 2015

FORCE STRATEGIC RISK SUMMARY		Previous				Current				Trend			Control Colour
Ref	Description	I	L	C	RM	I	L	C	RM	I	L	C	
SR 01	Inadequate response to terrorism within the City	M	L	1	2	M	L	1	2	➡	➡	➡	GREEN
SR 02	Reduction in public confidence in the Force as a result of terrorist attack against City	M	L	2	4	M	L	2	4	➡	➡	➡	GREEN
SR 03	Inadequate management of a high profile event	VH	L	2	8	VH	L	2	8	➡	➡	➡	GREEN
SR 04	Underperforming as Lead Force for Economic Crime	VH	M	2	16	VH	M	2	16	➡	➡	➡	AMBER
SR 05	Reduction of staff morale/well-being	H	H	2	18	H	M	2	12	➡	⬇	➡	GREEN
SR 09	Delivery of new Force Estate	H	H	1	12	H	H	1	12	➡	➡	➡	GREEN
SR 11	Delivery of Policing Plan Priorities and Measures	M	M	2	8	M	M	2	8	➡	➡	➡	GREEN
SR 12	Loss of ECD external funding streams	VH	M	2	16	VH	M	2	16	➡	➡	➡	AMBER
SR 14	IT Business Continuity	H	M	3	18	H	M	3	18	➡	➡	➡	AMBER
SR 16	Impact of continued savings on Force Capability	H	H	3	27	H	H	3	27	➡	➡	➡	AMBER
SR 17	Continued pressure on funding streams reducing overall Force budget	H	M	3	18	H	H	3	27	➡	⬆	➡	AMBER
SR 18	Vulnerability of Force IT network security being compromised	VH	M	2	16	VH	M	2	16	➡	➡	➡	AMBER
SR 19	Failure in Provision of Custody Services	VH	M	2	16	VH	L	1	4	➡	⬇	⬇	GREEN
SR 20	Policy approval and management process leaves Force open to potential litigation	H	H	3	27	H	M	2	12	➡	⬇	⬇	GREEN

Key: I: Impact. L: Likelihood. C: Control. RM: Risk Matrix Score (Full criteria contained within Appendix A)

Current Closed Risks June 2015

SR 06	Failure to contain expenditure within agreed budgets	CLOSED 14/08/12
SR 07	Increased dissatisfaction with quality & delivery of service to community.	CLOSED 04/03/13
SR 08	Adverse Impact of Jubilee, Torch Relay, Olympic & Paralympics Policing on Force capability.	CLOSED 21/11/12
SR 10	Delivery of Fraud Academy	CLOSED 28/11/12 To be managed at Directorate level
SR 15	Delivery of IAMM (Information Assurance Maturity Model)	CLOSED 03/12/13 To be managed at Directorate level
SR 13	Department Staff Vacancies affecting ICT Business Continuity	CLOSED 31/07/14 Reflecting SMB decision 16/07/14

6. The Force Risk Assurance Group discussed the risk profile in detail at their last meeting and the register reflects these discussions and updates since this meeting took place in February. All risks were discussed in detail and this is summarised for members information below:
7. *SR 01-SR 03:* these were considered by the group to ascertain if they remained relevant and the scoring was accurate. Following considerations it was determined these risks remain relevant and the scoring currently reflected the current position. SR 01 was amended to reflect work undertaken within Force to safeguard its staff from a terrorist attack and this text is part of the main register.
8. *SR 04: Underperforming as Lead Force for Economic Crime:* This risk remains scored as Amber. However, there is downward movement in many of the control scores which show the maturity of the Force control measures is increasing. This trend should see an increased improvement in score in time for this risk and it is on the path to being scored as Green.
9. *SR 05: Reduction in staff Morale/well-being:* Following a review of this risk at the February Risk Assurance Group, the likelihood of this risk occurring has been reduced to Medium. Overall, this has resulted in this risk now being scored as Green.
10. *SR 09: Delivery of new Force Estate:* This risk remains Green reflecting the successful delivery of Guildhall Yard East. As the final decisions on the Force estate is made and plans put in place to carry out the works this risk will be reviewed to reflect the circumstances of the Force. It remains Green at this stage to reflect the success so far and that plans for the completion of the new estate model are now being finalised.
11. *SR 11: Delivery of Policing Plan Priorities and Measures:* This risk was considered by the Risk Assurance Group and noted that it was still Green. No amendments to the risk were raised and the group was content the scoring remained accurate. The new measures for 2015/16 have been aligned to this

risk and should significant underperformance be noted then information will be presented to allow for a full reassessment of this risk.

12. *SR 12: Loss of ECD external funding streams:* At the time of the risk meeting ECD acknowledged that this risk needed to be updated to reflect loss of OACU and other movements in ECD funding picture. An updated risk assessment will be submitted to the Risk Assurance Group in June. At the time this report was compiled for Committee this assessment had not been completed and ratified by ECD SMT.
13. *SR 14: IT Business Continuity:* This risk remained Amber. The Group accepted that IT were working on a number of programmes to increase resilience within the Force and that once these were delivered our control scores could be reassessed. At this time there was no new information presented that would influence the scoring of this risk.
14. *SR 16: Impact of continued savings on Force capability:* The Risk Assurance Group confirmed that this risk should still be scored as Amber. There was certainty of continued savings pressure but the full impact of these would not be known until the long term budgets were set. This risk will continue to be reviewed in line with the performance of the Policing Plan to determine the impact implementing the savings challenges is having on the performance delivered by the Force.
15. *SR 17: Continued pressure on funding streams reducing overall Force budget:* The Risk Assurance Group determined that the likelihood of this risk should be raised further to High reflecting the increased certainty that austerity measures would continue and there would be continued pressure for the Force to make savings from its budget.
16. *SR 18: Vulnerability of Force IT network security being compromised:* This risk was reviewed and assessed to remain as Amber. The last control measure from the risk was removed as considered as business as usual (Due diligence process being undertaken before signing of Agilysis contract). This risk will remain within the register for review at the next Risk Assurance Group.
17. *SR 19: Failure in Provision of custody Services:* This risk has been re-assessed over the course of the quarter and reflects the amount of work undertaken to complete identified improvements to the Force's custody suites. The likelihood and control scores for this risk have now been reduced and the risk is now scored as Green overall. This reflects the significant work undertaken by the Force to upgrade existing facilities for use until the new custody suite is delivered as part of the new estate programme.
18. *SR 20: Policy approval and management process leaves Force open to potential litigation:* Strategic Development have been working with Directors to ensure the policy database is up to date and that only policies in date are published externally. A great deal of work has been done by Directors to update documents and close policy gaps. Although there are still some outstanding areas of work to be completed and updates are on-going this risk has been

assessed as Green due to decreasing the Likelihood to Medium and assessing our controls as more mature.

19. The next risk assurance Group Meeting will be held in Force on 11th June and this paper does not reflect any amendments as a result of discussions held there due to the timescales of submitting the report for Committee attention.

OTHER SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

20. Robust implementation of risk management ensures the Force can address the barriers and opportunities it faces so that it continues to comply with all of its obligations, statutory and non-statutory.

CONCLUSION

21. The risk profile of the Force is continually reviewed and updated quarterly by the Force Risk Assurance Group. The Police Committee are kept informed of the Force Risk Profile to ensure they are briefed of new and emerging risks and any significant change in existing risk scores as part of the Force's assessment of its own risk profile.

Contact:

Paul Adams

Force Risk Manager

City of London Police

020 7601 2593

paul.adams@cityoflondon.pnn.police.uk

Appendix A: Force Risk Scoring Criteria

FORCE RISK SCORING CRITERIA**IMPACT ASSESSMENT TABLE**

Risk Area	Impact Level			
	Low	Medium	High	Very High
Financial	Can be managed within service budget. Or – Results in a financial loss of £10K or less to the Force.	Can be managed within overall budget. Or – Results in a financial loss of £50K or less to the Force.	Will need major budgetary re-allocations and / or savings. Or – Results in a financial loss of between £50K - £250K to the Force. Or – Up to 10% of budget. (Which ever is smaller)	Will need to borrow - a major financial threat. Or – Results in a financial loss of over £250K to the Force. Or – Up to 25% of budget. (Whichever is smaller)
Health & Safety	Incident resulting in minor cuts and bruises.	Incident resulting in broken limbs.	Incident resulting in hospitalisation.	Incident causing widespread injuries and/or deaths.
Reputation	Cursory mention in local press and/or government / audit reports.	Definite adverse mention in press and/or government / audit reports.	Front page on the Standard, possibly national press.	National and possibly international interest or questions asked in parliament.
Planning/Service Delivery	Minimal impact on service delivery. Or – Minor impact on Divisional plan achievement.	Significant impact on service delivery. Or – Disruption on Divisional plan achievement. Or – Minor impact on Force plan achievement	Major impact on service delivery. Or – Failure of a Divisional plan. Or – Disruption of the Force plan.	Catastrophic impact on service delivery. Or – Failure of the Force plan.
Project	Has the potential to materially affect a stage of the project. Or – Has a minor short-term impact on the delivery of a project stage.	Has the potential to cause weakness to the ability to complete a project stage within identified resources. Or – Has a moderate term or medium term impact on the ability of the project to be completed.	Has the potential to cause the failure of one of the project stages. Or – Has a large short-term or longer-term impact on the delivery of the project. Or – Impacts upon the delivery of associated projects.	Has the potential to cause the failure of the project. Or – Could cause other Force projects to fail.
Business Continuity	Has the potential to materially affect a Divisional output. Or – Minor impact on Force outputs. Or – Minor Impact on the ability of the Force to undertake its statutory duties.	Has the potential to disrupt a Divisional output. Or – Has the potential to materially affect a Force output. Or – Materially affects the ability of the Force to undertake its statutory duties.	Has the potential to cause a Divisional Output to fail. Or – Has the potential to disrupt a Force output. Or – Disrupts the ability for the Force to undertake its statutory duties.	Has the potential to cause the outputs of the Force to fail. Or – Serious disruption/impairment to Force capability/outputs. Or – Could cause the Force to fail to undertake its statutory duties.
Security	Could cause distress to individuals. Or – Loss of Force earning potential.	Has the potential to affect diplomatic relations. Or – Loss of earning potential to the City of London. Or – Prejudice individual security.	Has the potential to threaten life directly. Or – Facilitates the commission of serious crime. Or – Disrupt significant operations. Or – Significant loss of earnings to City of London.	Has the potential to affect the internal stability of the UK. Or – Cause widespread loss of life. Or – Raise international tension. Or – Threaten National finances.

LIKELIHOOD ASSESSMENT TABLE

Likelihood Probability			
Low	Medium	High	Very High
<p>Negligible risk A probability of less than 30% of the risk occurring. Or This risk is a remote risk and it is envisaged that this may occur within a timescale of 4 years or more</p>	<p>Possible risk A probability of between 30-70% of occurring. Or This is a risk that could occur in less than 4 years but in more than 2.</p>	<p>Probable risk A probability of between 70-85% of being realised. Or This risk is likely to occur in a timescale of no more than 2 years.</p>	<p>Certain risk A probability of 85% or more of occurring. Or It is likely that the risk will be realised within a twelve month period</p>

RISK MATRIX TABLE

LIKELIHOOD	VH	7	11	14	16
	H	4	8	12	15
	M	2	5	9	13
	L	1	3	6	10
		L	M	H	VH

Key: L= Low, M=Medium, H= High, VH= Very High

Control Assurance within the Risk Register

The Strategic Risk Register is contains the Corporate risks identified for the Force. Each risk has a suite of identified controls that have been scored individually following the criteria below:

Control levels

- 4) **None:** Although controls are being worked on there are none in place to mitigate the risk at this time.
- 3) **In Place:** Control measures have been introduced for the risk but there is no assurance as to their effectiveness, they remain untested.
- 2) **In Place & Tested:** Control measures have been introduced for the risk and they have undergone assurance testing. Additional measures or improvements have been identified but not implemented.
- 1) **Comprehensive & Tested:** Control measures have been introduced for the risk and they have undergone assurance testing, where appropriate improvements and additional controls have been implemented. There are currently no additional measures identified to mitigate the risk more effectively.

This score is reflected within the document next to each control assessed.

Force Risk Multiplier Numbers

Impact		Likelihood		Control	
Low	1	Low	1	Comprehensive & Tested	1
Medium	2	Medium	2	In Place & Tested	2
High	3	High	3	In Place	3
Very High	4	Very High	4	None	4