

Committee(s): Police: Resource Risk and Estates Committee	Dated: 27 May 2022
Police Authority Board	30 June 2022
Subject: City of London Police Risk Register Update	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1- People are safe and feel safe
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N/A
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N/A
Report of: Commissioner of Police Pol 42-22	For Information
Report author: Paul Adams, Strategic Development	

Summary

This report highlights the work that has been undertaken to refresh the Force risk profile to align it to the revised Policing Plan 22-25 and to ensure links can be made from Force risks to the Police Authority risk register.

The Force risk position has been extensively reviewed since December 2021 with input from the new Chief Officer Team so that the risk profile sets out the risks under the operational and organisational priorities within the Policing Plan 2022-25.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. In accordance with the City of London Corporation's responsibilities as a Police Authority, it is appropriate that this 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.
2. The Force risk register continues to be monitored at Chief Officer level. With the refresh of the Policing Plan and the appointment of a new Commissioner a wholesale review of Force Governance was undertaken to align the management of risk to the delivery of the new Policing Plan which was published on the 1 April 2022.
3. At the Police Authority Board in February 2022, the Police Authority presented their risk register. It was noted that this should be aligned with the Force's albeit there

needed to be separation as mitigations by the Authority may necessarily need to be different to those of the Force. It was also requested at the Resource Risk and Estates Committee in February 2022 for the Risk Register updates to be in the public section of the meeting in future. It was noted that this would require some elements previously presented to be redacted.

Current Position

4. The Assistant Commissioner for Operations & Security chairs a monthly Audit & Assurance meeting which oversees the Force risk profile and since February 2022 has been working to align the Force risks with the new Policing Plan structure with the input of senior managers. The meetings held on the 8 March and 5 April reviewed and finalised the Force risk profile.
5. The risk profile was then signed off by the Chief Officer Team at their meeting held on 20 April. This report highlights the new risk position being monitored within Force.

Changes to Risk Scoring

6. Members will be aware that the Force previously operated its own risk scoring system based on a 4x4x4 matrix (Impact, likelihood & Control Scoring). In order to align the Force risk register with the Police Authority Board risk profile the Force has adopted the matrix utilised by the City of London Corporation as Police Authority, this will score risks using Impact and Likelihood only.
7. Due to the nature of policing, there will be some risks where mitigations by the Force will not influence impact and likelihood assessments. Previously, the Force had been able to show how these were being managed by taking into account the maturity of controls. Now the assessment of risk has aligned with the City of London Corporation format, there may be a number of risks shown as amber or red that would have previously been shown as green due to Force control assessments being considered.

New Risk Register Structure

8. The Force risk register is now split into two sections along Organisational and Operational areas in support of the 6 priorities within the new Policing Plan.
 - Organisational Risk Areas
 - Our People
 - Our Resources
 - Efficiency & Effectiveness
 - Operational Risk Areas
 - Keep People who live, work and visit the City Safe and feeling safe
 - Protect the UK from the threat of Economic & Cyber Crime
 - Putting the victim at the heart of everything we do
9. The current risks within each area are detailed within the following tables for Members' reference.

Organisational Risks	Associated Organisational Priority	Proposed COT Owner	Impact	Likelihood	Score	Traffic Light
Failure to ensure we recruit & retain sufficient staff to meet uplift numbers both locally & fraud uplift with the right skills and to meet our diversity ambitions	Our People	AC OPS (COO)	Major	Possible	12	AMBER
Impact of maintaining Force vacancy factor on police staff workload and morale	Our People	AC OPS (COO)	Serious	Possible	6	AMBER
Force lacks experienced officers due to uplift number and retirement of experienced officers due to changes in pay and conditions	Our People	AC Ops	Serious	Possible	6	AMBER

Organisational Risks	Associated Organisational Priority	Proposed COT Owner	Impact	Likelihood	Score	Traffic Light
Failure to deliver the FCCRAS Programme.	Our Resources	Service Delivery Director	Extreme	Unlikely	16	RED
Police Funding: Failure to maintain a balanced budget	Our Resources	CFO	Major	Possible	12	AMBER
Estate does not meet operational requirements	Our Resources	Commissioner	Extreme	Unlikely	16	RED
Failure to deliver Force Fleet Strategy to replace and maintain vehicle fleet in support of operational activities	Our Resources	Commander Ops (COO)	Serious	Unlikely	4	GREEN
Vulnerability of Force IT network security being compromised. Including data exfiltration, denial of service, ransomware and other malicious activity across the force network and systems that would have a direct impact on operational effectiveness and capability.	Our Resources	AC NLF	Extreme	Possible	16	RED

Organisational Risks	Associated Organisational Priority	Proposed COT Owner	Impact	Likelihood	Score	Traffic Light
Failure to deliver on Change Portfolio Plan	Efficiency & Effectiveness	AC NLF	Extreme	Possible	24	RED
Failure to implement to HMICFRS Inspection and CoL Internal Audit Recommendations	Efficiency & Effectiveness	AC Ops	Major	Possible	12	AMBER
Failure to retain Security of Force network and systems	Efficiency & Effectiveness	AC NLF	Major	Possible	12	AMBER
Failure to deliver Target Operating Model (TOM)	Efficiency & Effectiveness	Commissioner	Serious	Possible	6	AMBER
Loss of public confidence in professionalism and trust with Force	Efficiency & Effectiveness	AC Ops	Major	Possible	12	AMBER

Operational Risks	Associated Policing Plan Priority	Proposed Owner	Impact	Likelihood	Score	Traffic Light
Realisation of a Terrorist Event with inadequate Force response	Keep people who live, work and visit the City Safe	Commander Ops	Extreme	Unlikely	16	RED
Failure to respond to OCG activity	Keep people who live, work and visit the City Safe	Commander Ops & NLF	Serious	Unlikely	4	GREEN
Failure to contain a public order event	Keep people who live, work and visit the City Safe	Commander Ops	Serious	Unlikely	4	GREEN
Inadequate response to a Civil Emergency	Keep people who live, work and visit the City Safe	Commander Ops	Serious	Unlikely	4	GREEN
Failure to respond to CSE within City	Keep people who live, work and visit the City Safe	Commander Ops	Serious	Unlikely	4	GREEN
Rise in Violent Crime	Keep people who live, work and visit the City Safe	Commander Ops	Serious	Possible	6	AMBER
Rise in Acquisitive Crime	Keep people who live, work and visit the City Safe	Commander Ops	Serious	Possible	6	AMBER
Lack of resilience in Force Control room hampers ability to respond	Keep people who live, work and visit the City Safe	Commander Ops	Serious	Unlikely	4	GREEN
Lack of capacity and skills officers hampers ability to investigate homicides	Keep people who live, work and visit the City Safe	Commander Ops	Serious	Possible	6	AMBER

Operational Risks	Associated Policing Plan Priority	Proposed Owner	Impact	Likelihood	Score	Traffic Light
Force Cyber Crime Unit ability to respond to a Cyber Threat impacting City businesses or residents	Protect the UK from the threat of Economic & Cyber Crime	Commander NLF	Serious	Possible	6	AMBER
Failure of performance as National Lead Force	Protect the UK from the threat of Economic & Cyber Crime	Commander NLF	Extreme	Unlikely	16	RED
Failure to utilise Action Fraud reports and Intelligence	Protect the UK from the threat of Economic & Cyber Crime	Commander NLF	Major	Unlikely	8	AMBER
Failure to maintain existing services within Action Fraud System	Protect the UK from the threat of Economic & Cyber Crime	Service Delivery Director	Major	Unlikely	8	AMBER
Failure of High profile/risk Investigation	Protect the UK from the threat of Economic & Cyber Crime	Commander NLF	Serious	Unlikely	4	GREEN
Failure to tackle OCGs operating within the City/Nationally committing economic and/or cyber crime	Protect the UK from the threat of Economic & Cyber Crime	Commander NLF	Serious	Unlikely	4	GREEN

Operational Risks	Associated Policing Plan Priority	Proposed Owner	Impact	Likelihood	Score	Traffic Light
Drop in victim satisfaction with services delivered by the Force	Putting the victim at the heart of everything we do	Commander Ops & NLF	Serious	Possible	6	AMBER
Force positive outcome rate for all crime decreases	Putting the victim at the heart of everything we do	Commander Ops	Serious	Possible	6	AMBER
Force is not able to provide the services required to look after vulnerable victims	Putting the victim at the heart of everything we do	Commander Ops & NLF	Major	Unlikely	8	AMBER
Force unable to respond to victims within City within adequate timescale due to failure in process	Putting the victim at the heart of everything we do	Commander Ops	Serious	Possible	6	AMBER
ECVCU unable to deliver requisite services	Putting the victim at the heart of everything we do	Commander NLF	Serious	Possible	6	AMBER
Drop in victim satisfaction with services delivered by the Force	Putting the victim at the heart of everything we do	Commander Ops & NLF	Serious	Possible	6	AMBER

10. The Police Authority will continue to retain its own risk register which the Force risks will link to, once placed on the City of London Corporation risk management system. Currently there are three active risks monitored by the Police Authority, these are as follows:

- TC PA 01: Police finances are not sustainable over the medium term
- TC PA 04: Inability to achieve efficient and effective governance of CoLP
- TC PA 05: 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 to agreed timelines

11. The Force risks on Police Funding and the Failure to deliver Target Operating Model (TOM) will be linked to the PAB risk profile so that Force actions and mitigations can be reviewed in line with PAB risk concerns.

12. The Force risks will now be placed onto the City of London Corporation risk system and be managed with oversight from the Audit & Assurance Board. A cascade of risk registers will be maintained within the Force meeting structure in support of the Force risk register so that risks will be monitored and managed at appropriate levels within the organisation. Having both risk registers on the Corporation risk software system will enable linked risk profiles, actions and mitigations across the Force and Authority to be considered on an ongoing basis.

Actions to Be Taken

13. Now that the risk profile has been refreshed and agreed by the Chief Officer Team the following actions will be undertaken to ensure the risks are monitored and managed.

- Populate the City of London Corporation risk management system with the Force risk areas.

- Associate actions for mitigating each risk with appropriate owners.
- Monitor the progress of risk management each month within the Audit & Assurance Meeting.
- Report back to Police Authority at the next risk update to show progress in managing and mitigating the refreshed Force risk profile.

Conclusion

14. The risk profile of the Force is continually reviewed and updated within Force to ensure it remains relevant. The Police Authority are kept informed of the Force Risk Profile as part of a bi-annual update 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.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Risk Scoring Criteria

Paul Adams

Head of Governance & Assurance

T: 020 7601 2593

E: paul.adams@cityoflondon.police.uk

Appendix 1: Risk scoring Criteria

(A) Likelihood criteria

	Rare (1)	Unlikely (2)	Possible (3)	Likely (4)
Criteria	Less than 10%	10 – 40%	40 – 75%	More than 75%
Probability	Has happened rarely/never before	Unlikely to occur	Fairly likely to occur	More likely to occur than not
Time period	Unlikely to occur in a 10 year period	Likely to occur within a 10 year period	Likely to occur once within a one year period	Likely to occur once within three months
Numerical	Less than one chance in a hundred thousand (<10-5)	Less than one chance in ten thousand (<10-4)	Less than one chance in a thousand (<10-3)	Less than one chance in a hundred (<10-2)

(B) Impact criteria

Impact title	Definitions
Minor (1)	Service delivery/performance: Minor impact on service, typically up to one day. Financial: financial loss up to 5% of budget. Reputation: Isolated service user/stakeholder complaints contained within business unit/division. Legal/statutory: Litigation claim or find less than £5000. Safety/health: Minor incident including injury to one or more individuals. Objectives: Failure to achieve team plan objectives.
Serious (2)	Service delivery/performance: Service disruption 2 to 5 days. Financial: Financial loss up to 10% of budget. Reputation: Adverse local media coverage/multiple service user/stakeholder complaints. Legal/statutory: Litigation claimable fine between £5000 and £50,000. Safety/health: Significant injury or illness causing short-term disability to one or more persons. Objectives: Failure to achieve one or more service plan objectives.
Major (4)	Service delivery/performance: Service disruption > 1 - 4 weeks. Financial: Financial loss up to 20% of budget. Reputation: Adverse national media coverage 1 to 3 days. Legal/statutory: Litigation claimable fine between £50,000 and £500,000. Safety/health: Major injury or illness/disease causing long-term disability to one or more people. Objectives: Failure to achieve a strategic plan objective.
Extreme (8)	Service delivery/performance: Service disruption > 4 weeks. Financial: Financial loss up to 35% of budget. Reputation: National publicity more than three days. Possible resignation leading member or chief officer. Legal/statutory: Multiple civil or criminal suits. Litigation claim or find in excess of £500,000. Safety/health: Fatality or life-threatening illness/disease (e.g. mesothelioma) to one or more persons. Objectives: Failure to achieve a major corporate objective.

(C) Risk scoring grid

		Impact				
		X	Minor (1)	Serious (2)	Major (4)	Extreme (8)
Likelihood	Likely (4)	4 Green	8 Amber	16 Red	32 Red	
	Possible (3)	3 Green	6 Amber	12 Amber	24 Red	
	Unlikely (2)	2 Green	4 Green	8 Amber	16 Red	
	Rare (1)	1 Green	2 Green	4 Green	8 Amber	

(D) Risk score definitions

RED	Urgent action required to reduce rating
AMBER	Action required to maintain or reduce rating
GREEN	Action required to maintain rating

This is an extract from the City of London Corporate Risk Management Strategy, published in May 2014.

Contact the Corporate Risk Advisor for further information. Ext 1297

October 2015