

BOARD ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK 2015/16 – Strategic Risk Register
Maintaining Local Policing Performance

Risk:	That public confidence in the ability of local police to keep them safe reduces	
Proximity:	9-12 months	
Police and Crime Plan Objective:	Maintaining Local Policing Performance	
HMIC PEEL Domain	Legitimacy and Effectiveness	
Accountability Lead:	Police and Crime Commissioner	
Date of Entry:	01/03/2015	
Date of Review:	01/04/2015	
Risk Rating: <i>Impact x likelihood</i> Current rating is impact of 3 (significant) on Police Legitimacy multiplied by likelihood of 3 (probable)	<p>The chart displays three metrics over a 12-month period from March to March. The Y-axis represents the score, ranging from 0 to 16. The X-axis represents the months. The Risk Score (blue line) is constant at 9. The Risk Appetite (red line) is constant at 6. The Unmitigated Risk Score 2016 (green line) is constant at 12.</p>	
Cause:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further reduction in Police budgets over the next four years are not offset by savings from collaboration and use of IT leading to a reduction in the number of front line officers and insufficient backroom staff support. Even if there is an overall increase in operational effectiveness the public focus on any reduction in police officer numbers. Increased work load or decreased resources mean deployment of police resources has to be further prioritised based on threat, risk and harm. On occasions, there are local issues that do not meet this threshold, yet to neighbourhoods or individual feels they are hugely important. Partnership and Constabulary work to promote resilience and capacity in new and existing communities e.g. through volunteering, is unsuccessful. The move to public police misconduct hearings leads to increased media coverage of national or local high-profile cases of police failings Changes in crime recording lead to a perception of increased levels of crime Increased reporting of CSE and domestic abuse lead to a perception of increasing level of violence in the community. PCC public engagement processes do not identify issues of importance which means they are not reflected in the Police and Crime Plan 	
Impact:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived or actual reduction in visibility of local policing reduces confidence Threat risk and harm model leads to the perception that low level crime will not be dealt with to the standard expected by the community or individuals. Poor engagement with communities means confidence in the Constabulary's ability to respond to their needs decreases. Perceived or actual increases in complaints of poor performance or bad conduct impact on perception of police legitimacy Increased levels of crime recording, e.g. computer enabled crime, lead to a perception that the police are no longer able to keep communities and individuals safe 	
Rationale for Risk Appetite:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The likelihood of public confidence decreasing is set at 3 ("Probable / Possible") The impact of this is set at 3 ("significant") This results in a risk score of 9 The risk appetite of 6 is set on the grounds of maintaining the impact to "significant" (score of 3). The likelihood is "probable" (score of 3). The aim is to reduce the likelihood down to "Possible" (score of 2). 	
Controls: <i>What are we currently doing about the risk?</i>	Mitigating Actions: <i>What more could we do?</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good governance – financial control, Technology - Roll-out of Athena / TuServ / Metis to increase operational hours Ensuring accessibility – 101, Police Contact Points, self service Engagement (incoming) – understanding public priorities. E.g. Outreach work, local crime panels, correspondence Engagement (outgoing) – E.g. explaining threat, risk and harm approach, crime prevention messages Prevent work promoting community cohesion and resilience Adherence to Equality and Diversity legislation Strong volunteering structure that supports community resilience Recruitment and training policies attract and develop the best people Legitimacy - Ensure strong, proactive PSD effectively funded Improved performance monitoring of work to tackle crime and disorder Proactive engagement to explain changes in crime recording Regular updates of the Police and Crime Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with partners to develop Community Resilience Strategy Ensure consistent and effective incoming and outgoing engagement in all areas. Identify and target areas where there are gaps including increased use of social media / E-Cops / Community engagement tools to maintain dialogue with community groups Strengthen resilience of CSPs and their ability to respond to local community safety issues Drive forward and support increased volunteering and building of community capacity Work to ensure the constabulary is representative of the community it serves. 	

Assurances: <i>How do we know if the things we are doing are having an impact?</i>	Gaps in Assurance: <i>What additional assurances should we seek?</i>
<p>External / Independent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HMIC PEEL report • Potential for internal audit through Baker Tilly • Consider task of voluntary sector for peer review • College of Policing collating best practice • Monitoring of Force and OPCC public feedback • Rewiring Public Services Project • Public Service Board <p>Internal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment from the Volunteer co-ordinator • Performance Meeting to assess improvements in quality and quantity • Effectiveness against the engagement strategy • CSP reporting to OPCC • Performance Framework • Engagement Board 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach surveying: What do the public think? • Commission research into effectiveness of local voluntary schemes • Compare against College of Policing’s “what works” foundation as well as academic research. • Constabulary to re-invigorate Engagement Board
Current Performance: <i>With these actions taken, how serious is the problem?</i>	Outstanding Actions Complete By:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With re-elected government committed to maintaining (or possibly increasing) budget reductions this risk is likely to remain high 	<p>01-03-15</p>
<p>Risk RAG Rating: RED</p>	

DRAFT

DRAFT - BOARD ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK 2015/16 – Delivering policing within the available budget

Risk:	Failure to continually drive efficiency and effectiveness in policing leads to the PCC/Force no longer being financially viable	
Proximity:	3 years	
Police and Crime Plan Objective:	Delivering Policing within the available budget (continuous improvement)	
HMIC PEEL Domain	Efficiency and Effectiveness	
Accountability Lead:	Police and Crime Commissioner(s)/Chief Constable(s)	
Date of Entry:	09/04/2015	
Date of Review:	15/06/2015	
Risk Rating: <i>Impact x likelihood</i> Current rating is impact of 4 (major) multiplied by likelihood of 1 (remote)		
Cause:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing reductions in formula grant lead to ever-increasing financial pressures with all the 'easier' savings having already been made Severe financial difficulties of collaboration partner impacts on collaborated functions Benefits of collaboration and other savings not cashable Budget is reduced without effective risk management Upward pressure on wages and inflation in other costs New and emerging cost pressures from changing demand and profile of crime in the county 	
Impact:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance may fall to an unacceptable level with a long-term impact on the financial viability of the PCC and Force Reduced resilience of policing services Reduction in availability and visibility of local policing Decreased public confidence 	
Risk Appetite Rationale:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current risk of not achieving a balanced budget in April 2016: risk is set at impact of 4 (major) multiplied by likelihood of 1 (remote) The aim is to reduce the residual score down to 4 (impact of 4 (major) multiplied by a probability rating of 1 (remote)). 	
Controls: <i>What are we currently doing about the risk?</i>	Mitigating Actions: <i>What more could we do?</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed and proactive medium-term financial planning to 2019/20 Detailed and realistic budgeting with ownership by budget holders in a collaborative and open process Careful capital and estates planning to ensure viability and divestment/leasing out of assets not used or underutilised Collaboration between Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire Cautious approach to recognition and dependence on collaboration savings Rollout of technology (Athena, Metis and tuServ) to achieve new and more efficient ways of working to realise savings and maintain visibility of policing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Link to collaboration agenda and considering each business case in detail to ensure savings are realistic and achievable Treasury management review Partnership working/financial planning Metis – ICT benefits realisation to ensure cashable savings Workforce planning Strategic use of grants to support reductions in demand Use of reserves to balance budget in 2017/18 and 2018/19 	
Assurances: <i>How do we know if the things we are doing are having an impact?</i>	Gaps in Assurance: <i>What additional assurances should we seek?</i>	
<p>External / Independent: HMIC PEEL reviews, use of external and internal audit, Police and Crime Panel</p> <p>Internal: Force Executive Board, Finance Sub-Group, Estates Sub-Group, Business Co-ordination Board, Joint Audit Committee, Performance Framework</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued horizon-scanning for new and emerging cost pressures; for example in short-term this includes comprehensive spending review and emergency budget on 8th July Analysis of allocation of savings and costs in collaborated functions 	
Current Performance: <i>With these actions taken, how serious is the problem?</i>	Outstanding Actions Complete By:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OPCC and Force are used to the new financial reality after several years of austerity, but process is becoming more difficult as ongoing savings are required to achieve financial stability in later years. Risk is likely to become high. 	1.6.2015	
Risk RAG Rating: RED		

BOARD ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK 2015/16 – Strategic Risk Register – Continue to tackle crime and disorder

Risk:	There is the potential that policing resources could be insufficient to tackle crime and disorder	
Proximity:	12 months	
Police and Crime Plan Objective:	Continue to tackle crime and disorder (objective 3)	
HMIC PEEL Domain	Effectiveness	
Accountability Lead:	Police and Crime Commissioner/Chief Constable	
Date of Entry:	01/03/2015	
Date of Review:	01/04/2015	
Risk Rating: <i>Impact x likelihood</i> Current rating is impact of 3 (significant) multiplied by likelihood of 2 (possible)		
Cause:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policing resources are not appropriately targeted. • The focus on vulnerability has the potential to reduce resources available to respond to other types of crime. • Against the backdrop of reducing resources there is the risk that the scale and effectiveness of crime prevention work is insufficient to reduce crime leading to demand outstripping resources leading to further increases in crime. • There is the risk that the lack of a shared strategic vision amongst community safety and criminal justice agencies as to the best way to tackle crime and disorder within the decreased resources available reduces efficiencies that could be achieved through collaboration and partnership working. • Unfettered increases in criminals exploiting technological advances has the potential for demands on policing to outstrip resources available 	
Impact:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If work to reduce crime is ineffective against a backdrop of austerity policing resources could become insufficient to meet demand. 	
Rationale for Risk Appetite:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk appetite is low as this is crucial in achieving a wide range of objectives. 	
Controls: <i>What are we currently doing about the risk?</i>	Mitigating Actions: <i>What more could we do?</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chief Constable and Commissioner work together to ensure the Police and Crime Plan objectives identify and respond to the threat, risks and harms facing the people of Cambridgeshire • The Chief Constable is held to account for efficient and effective policing through a comprehensive performance monitoring framework. • Through the Metis programme and the roll out of tuServ the Chief Constable realises the efficiencies offered by mobile technology. • Partnership work and work funded through crime and disorder reduction grants including; CSPs, youth fund; cadets; drugs; road safety; restorative justice; mental health concordat, community remedy, IOM and alcohol is focused on the reduction of crime. • Maintenance of strategic planning processes : Criminal Justice Board Offender subgroup; Criminal Justice Board integration; BeNCH; Cambridgeshire Countywide Community Safety Strategic Board; linkages with Health and Wellbeing Board; Metis; Policing collaborations • Creation and implementation of new strategies to respond to new threats, e.g. computer enabled crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive PESTLE analysis informs updates of Police and Crime Plan • Review of new performance monitoring framework at end of first year • Strengthen effectiveness and resilience of CSPs in order to create strong local partnerships which learn from good practice in other areas in order to maximise their impact on local crime and disorder issue • Improve strategic planning with Health and Wellbeing Board in order to meet the needs of offenders and reduce crime building on the work of the mental health concordat, DAAT. • Explore the impact of blue light collaboration on local community safety work • Work through the Public Service Board to explore the benefits of devolution • Community resilience • Implementation of BeNCH strategy reducing offending strategy • Implementation and monitoring of new computer enabled crime strategy 	
Assurances: <i>How do we know if the things we are doing are having an impact?</i>	Gaps in Assurance: <i>What additional assurances should we seek?</i>	
External / Independent HMIC PEEL inspection Internal Performance monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant outcome monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership scrutiny of Cambridgeshire wide cross cutting community safety issues 	
Current Performance: <i>With these actions taken, how serious is the problem?</i>	Outstanding Actions Complete By:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future budget uncertainties across the public sector and increasing complexity of cases means that this is likely to remain a significant risk 	1.4.2016	
Risk RAG Rating for 2016/17: RED		

BOARD ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK 2015/16 – Strategic Risk Register – Keeping Vulnerable People Safe

Risk:	That the Constabulary cannot meet the increasing demand for policing services to keep vulnerable people safe.									
Proximity:	12 months									
Police and Crime Plan Objective:	Keeping people safe									
HMIC PEEL Domain	Efficiency and effectiveness									
Accountability Lead:	Police and Crime Commissioner									
Date of Entry:	01/03/2015									
Date of Review:	01/04/2015									
Risk Rating: <i>Impact x likelihood</i> Current rating is impact of 3 (significant) multiplied by likelihood of 3 (probable)	<table border="1"> <caption>Risk Rating Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Metric</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Current Risk Score</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Risk Appetite</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unmitigated Risk Score 2016</td> <td>12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Metric	Score	Current Risk Score	9	Risk Appetite	6	Unmitigated Risk Score 2016	12
Metric	Score									
Current Risk Score	9									
Risk Appetite	6									
Unmitigated Risk Score 2016	12									
Cause:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased trust and confidence in the police leads to an increase in reporting of both crimes and incidents from vulnerable people; this increase in demand puts a strain on police and partnership resources to respond. Agencies (both statutory and non-statutory) retract both upstream preventative work to keep vulnerable people safe and downstream and non-statutory reactive support services as a result of funding cuts. Lack of clarity of each agency's statutory responsibility for vulnerable adults and weak county-wide strategic partnership working impacts on the collective ability to keep people safe. 									
Impact:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That keeping vulnerable people safe becomes the police's responsibility and the policing resource is insufficient to respond to all but the highest risk cases. The focus moves from preventative work to reacting to calls for urgent help. Best practice identified from Serious Case Reviews cannot be implemented and failures in service delivery continue which lead to preventable adverse incidents. Poorly co-ordinated interagency responses to the needs of vulnerable victims = increased cost to the public purse. Reduction in the ability of all agencies to safeguard the public. 									
Rationale for Risk Appetite:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appetite is set low as keeping people safe by preventing crime and disorder is a key Peelian Principle. However, there is a recognition that some level of risk will be inevitable, so an appetite of 6 is deemed to be acceptable. 									
Controls: <i>What are we currently doing about the risk?</i>	Mitigating Actions: <i>What more could we do?</i>									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medium Term Financial Plan – securing spend to keep people safe Close operational partnership working via MAPPA / MARU / MASH Partnership structures - DAAT, Domestic Abuse Governance Structures, Safeguarding Board, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mental Health Crisis Care Concordat Declaration and Delivery Group Implementation of inter-agency Victim Strategy including creation of a Victims' Hub Implementation of findings from Domestic Violence Homicide Reviews and Serious Case Reviews Evidence based (needs assessments) commissioning and co-commissioning TRiM approach to supporting staff dealing with traumatic incidents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Community Safety Agreement through County Strategic Community Safety Board which facilitates the implementation of the staged intervention model. This model promotes primary prevention in schools and communities as well as an effective management of offenders and appropriate response to victims' needs. Qualitative and quantitative evaluation and scrutiny of existing initiatives to explore if partnership structures can be streamlined to release resources for improved needs assessments, strategic and operational planning and performance monitoring. Work on 'Community Resilience Strategy' to reduce demand on services, drive forward increased volunteering and build community capacity. More effective rehabilitation of offenders and initiatives to tackle the root cause of offending (toxic trio). Exploration of restorative justice approaches with perpetrators. Careful allocation of Crime and Disorder Reduction Grants by PCCs to tackle demand management. 									
Assurances: <i>How do we know if the things we are doing are having an impact?</i>	Gaps in Assurance: <i>What additional assurances should we seek?</i>									
<p>External / Independent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DVHRs and Serious Case Reviews to ensure lessons are learnt HMIC Inspections / College of Policing Peer Reviews Independent evaluation (such as CAADA – now Safelives – independent reports) Meeting Restorative Justice Council six quality standards Ofsted <p>Internal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality mark for victims' services (work ongoing to look at these with Northants Institute) That our work aligns with the 'What works' for policing (College of Policing) That our work aligns with the 'What works' for crime reduction (Early Intervention Foundation) 									

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective contract monitoring (outcome-based performance measures - both qualitative and quantitative - and feedback from service users) • Partner engagement and commitment to initiatives • Steering groups for each area of work 	
<p>Current Performance:</p> <p><i>With these actions taken, how serious is the problem? (mitigated longer term risk)</i></p>	<p>Outstanding Actions Complete By:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued budget uncertainties and lack of clarity and ownership of each agency's statutory responsibilities means this is likely to remain high risk even with mitigations in place. 	<p>TBC</p>
<p>Risk RAG Rating: RED</p>	

DRAFT

DRAFT - BOARD ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK 2015/16 – Collaboration

Risk:	Failure to maximise the benefits of collaboration.	
Proximity:	12 months	
Police and Crime Plan Objective:	Delivering Policing with the available budget (strategic collaboration with other Forces and Local Authorities) Resilience of Protective Services	
HMIC PEEL Domain	Efficiency and Effectiveness	
Accountability Lead:	Police and Crime Commissioner(s)/Chief Constable(s)	
Date of Entry:	01/03/2015	
Date of Review:	01/07/2015	
Risk Rating: <i>Impact x likelihood</i> Current rating is impact of 4 (major) multiplied by likelihood of 2 (probable)		
Cause:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for collaboration are not identified and implemented • The approach to collaboration does not maximise the benefits achievable 	
Impact:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If collaboration opportunities are not identified and implemented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Resilience of services is diminished ○ Potential savings are not realised. • If the approach to collaboration does not maximise the benefits achievable this can: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reduce the effectiveness and efficiency of the service which is collaborated ○ Reduce the effectiveness and efficiency of other collaborated services ○ Reduce the effectiveness and efficiency of services which are not collaborated including local policing. 	
Rationale for Risk Appetite:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The aim is to reduce the residual score down to 4 (impact of 4 multiplied by a probability rating of 1 (remote)). 	
Controls: <i>What are we currently doing about the risk?</i>	Mitigating Actions: <i>What more could we do?</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement for detailed Outline and Full Business Cases • Rolling out Program Metis via tuServe promoting transformational IT driven cultural change. • External Gateway Reviews (Concerto) • Reconciliation of saving with MTFP • Fully funded collaboration team in place responsible for effective project management and overall programme management • Externally facilitated “visioning event” • Shared scheme of financial delegation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued refinement of the business case process • Continued refinement of local term savings delivery schedule to enable MTFP planning and correct definition of risk appetite • Improved benefits realisation processes that also consider impact on local policing • Continued work to define future visions of collaboration across policing and wider public sector collaboration with improved • Continued development of governance systems • Continued development of performance management and monitoring arrangements for collaborated function • Ensure section 22s are completed and updated in a timely way 	
Assurances: <i>How do we know if the things we are doing are having an impact?</i>	Gaps in Assurance: <i>What additional assurances should we seek?</i>	
<p>External / Independent Internal audit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deloitte assessment re Contact Management • Concerto Gateway Review <p>Internal Robust governance structures and processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff surveys (both collaboration and local) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct PCCs involvement in lead force / OPCC governance arrangements 	
Current Performance: <i>With these actions taken, how serious is the problem?</i>	Outstanding Actions Complete By:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If all business case come to the required standard and are approved risks will be significantly reduced. 	1.10.2015	
Risk RAG Rating: RED		

BOARD ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK 2015/16 – Strategic Risk Register – meeting statutory duties

Risk:	Potential changes in governance arrangements constrains the capacity of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to carry out its statutory duties	
Proximity:	12 months	
Police and Crime Plan Objective:	(Holding to account)	
HMIC PEEL Domain	Effectiveness, Efficiency, Legitimacy	
Accountability Lead:	Chief Executive	
Date of Entry:	01/03/2015	
Date of Review:	01/04/2015	
Risk Rating: <i>Impact x likelihood</i> Current rating is impact of 3 (significant) multiplied by likelihood of 2 (possible)		
Cause:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evolving governance roles relating to collaborated functions could impact on the effectiveness of governance and decision-making processes • Without effective governance and decision-making processes, if there were a change in Police and Crime Commissioner following elections it could impact on their ability to fulfil their statutory functions effectively • An increase in functions of the Police and Crime Commissioner could impact on their ability to fulfil their statutory functions 	
Impact:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without effective governance and decision-making processes relevant legal duties may not be met. This could also undermine public confidence 	
Rationale for Risk Appetite:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoring is based around an impact of Significant (3) and likelihood at Possible (2). Focus is on reducing the likelihood to remote (1). Appetite is medium as the focus is on resources for the front line but good governance is important in enabling effective policing 	
Controls: <i>What are we currently doing about the risk?</i>	Mitigating Actions: <i>What more could we do?</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive governance and decision making processes ensure that relevant legal duties are met: Scheme of governance; Financial regulations and contract standing orders; Financial planning and budget management processes; Business Coordination Board; Finance Sub Group; Estates Sub Group; ICV meeting; Risk management processes; Performance framework • Development of collaboration governance processes: PSD Governance Board; PSD Alliance Subgroup; Strategic Alliance • Engaging with discussions on potential blue light collaboration and devolution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to develop governance processes to meet needs of collaboration • Post-election planning • Joint Audit Committee to consider paper on OPCC costs 	
Assurances: <i>How do we know if the things we are doing are having an impact?</i>	Gaps in Assurance: <i>What additional assurances should we seek?</i>	
External / Independent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint Audit Committee • Police and Crime Panel Internal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal Audit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Succession planning arrangements 	
Current Performance: <i>With these actions taken, how serious is the problem?</i>	Outstanding Actions Complete By:	
Uncertainty over breadth of functions; the ongoing development of collaboration and Police and Crime Commissioner elections in 2016 mean that this continues to be a risk for the foreseeable future	1.4.2016	
Risk RAG Rating for 2016/17: RED		

BOARD ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK 2015/16 – Strategic Risk Register – Integrity

Risk:	Misconduct within policing undermines public confidence																	
Proximity:	12 months																	
Police and Crime Plan Objective:	(Integrity)																	
HMIC PEEL Domain	Legitimacy																	
Accountability Lead:	Chief Constable																	
Date of Entry:	01/03/2015																	
Date of Review:	01/04/2015																	
Risk Rating: <i>Impact x likelihood</i> Current rating is impact of 3 (significant) multiplied by likelihood of 3 (possible)	<table border="1"> <caption>Risk Rating Data (March to May 2016)</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Month</th> <th>Current Risk Score</th> <th>Risk Appetite</th> <th>Unmitigated Risk Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mar</td> <td>9</td> <td>6</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Apr</td> <td>9</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>May</td> <td>9</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Month	Current Risk Score	Risk Appetite	Unmitigated Risk Score	Mar	9	6	9	Apr	9	3	3	May	9	3	3
Month	Current Risk Score	Risk Appetite	Unmitigated Risk Score															
Mar	9	6	9															
Apr	9	3	3															
May	9	3	3															
Cause:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased reliance on technology and decreased levels of staff supervision increases the reliance on the professional judgement of individuals to do the right thing and make the right decisions Capacity issues in PSD and an increased level of complaints could constrain its ability to proactively identify risks and undertake proactive investigations Serious cases and Misconduct Panels held in public could increase publicity of misconduct issues 																	
Impact:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If there is an increase in cases, or in the severity of cases and/or increased publicity of misconduct issues this could adversely impact on public confidence 																	
Rationale for Risk Appetite:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoring is based around an impact of Significant (3) and likelihood at Probable (3). Focus is on reducing the likelihood, to possible (2) and then down to remote (1). Appetite is medium as the focus is on resources for the front line but the importance of building public confidence is important in enabling effective policing 																	
Controls: <i>What are we currently doing about the risk?</i>	Mitigating Actions: <i>What more could we do?</i>																	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Professional Standards Department (PSD) undertakes proactive and reactive investigations; manages misconduct and complaints against the Constabulary and builds professional capacity through lessons learned reports Increased resources for PSD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that ethical cultural expectations are reinforced alongside changes in working practices Development of customer service unit could assist with demand management Ensure that PSD is able to undertake appropriate proactive work as necessary 																	
Assurances: <i>How do we know if the things we are doing are having an impact?</i>	Gaps in Assurance: <i>What additional assurances should we seek?</i>																	
External / Independent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPCC reports and meetings HMIC PEEL inspection Joint Audit Committee – Integrity Sub-Committee Internal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PSD Governance Board PSD Alliance Subgroup Internal Audit Integrity Advisory Group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of organisational patterns of behaviour 																	
Current Performance: <i>With these actions taken, how serious is the problem?</i>	Outstanding Actions Complete By:																	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Availability of resources could continue to constrain PSD ability to undertake proactive investigations. Serious cases continue to emerge. 	1.4.2016																	
Risk RAG Rating for 2016/17: RED																		