



Cambridgeshire
Police & Crime
Commissioner

To: Joint Audit Committee

From: Chief Executive

Date: 10 December 2015

BOARD ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK UPDATE

1. Purpose

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to provide the Joint Audit Committee (“the Committee”) on the updates to the Board Assurance Framework since its introduction in June 2015.

2. Recommendation

2.1 The Committee is invited to consider the updated Board Assurance Framework.

3. Background

3.1 The management of risk is well embedded in both the Constabulary and the OPCC with visible application at all levels. This includes an understanding and development of risk principles through each layer: from the operational front-end, up to the strategic oversight.

3.2 At the strategic level (which this paper focusses on), a joint risk register is held between the OPCC and the Constabulary. The risk register assesses individual risks and how they are being mitigated. It is increasingly being recognised that there are significant interdependencies between the organisations’ strategic risks and these need to be effectively addressed if the Police and Crime Plan’s (“the Plan”) objectives are to be met.

3.3 The Board Assurance Framework (BAF) provides a method for the effective and focused management of the principal risks to meeting an organisation’s objectives. This better links risk management and work to achieve the organisation’s objectives, and provides increased visibility and assurance that work which needs to be done to achieve objectives and decrease the likelihood of risks materialising is being taken

forward at a sufficient pace. The Framework links the corporate objectives, strategic risks, current mitigating actions and internal and external assurances. It identifies further mitigating actions for each area of risk. A BAF linked to the Plan was developed and presented to the Committee on 29 June 2015.

- 3.4 An assessment has made against each of the five Police and Crime Plan objectives utilising a 4 x 4 matrix of Likelihood and Impact. Each is given a score in line with the existing risk management process (**Impact:** Minor (1), Moderate (2), Significant (3), Major (4). **Likelihood:** Remote (1), possible (2), probable (3), more likely than not (4)).
- 3.5 Where the inherent risk (the risk before any mitigation takes place) is a combination of any of the following, then this is recorded on the Strategic Risk Register:
- Impact 4/Likelihood 4
 - Impact 4/Likelihood 3
 - Impact 4/Likelihood 2
 - Impact 3/Likelihood 4
 - Impact 3/Likelihood 3
 - Impact 2/Likelihood 4

4. Updates to the Board Assurance Framework

- 4.1 The updated Board Assurance Framework document is attached for review at Appendix A. The Framework is regularly reviewed and the changes since the last Committee review in June 2015 are as follows:
- The graph of risk rating has been carried forward to assess risks to January 2017 for all BAF objectives except for objective 2 (delivering policing within the available budget) which has been extended to January 2018 in light of feedback from the Committee at its last review in June 2015.
 - **Objective 1 – maintaining local policing performance:** *Risk that public confidence in the ability of local police to keep them safe reduces*
 - Additional control – Close working between OPCC and Constabulary Communications teams around messaging and public engagement
 - Joint Engagement Strategy added to Engagement Board assurance
 - **Objective 2 – delivering policing within the available budget:** *Failure to continually drive efficiency and effectiveness in policing leads to the PCC/Force no longer being financially viable*
 - Unmitigated risk score 2017/18 reduced from 12 (Impact 4/Likelihood 3) to 8 (Impact 4/Likelihood 2) as a result of the Autumn Statement on 25 November 2015 being more positive than anticipated
 - Cause updated to reflect concern that top-slicing of formula grant compounded by the funding formula review due to be implemented for 2017/18 leads to increasing financial pressures

- Additional controls added:
 - MTFP modelling based on different CSR scenarios
 - Section 22 agreement includes escalation of strategic risks clause to cover, amongst other risks, the financial unviability of a collaboration partner
- Further detail added to partnership working/financial planning mitigating action, to include monitoring for risk of cost pressures on local government leading to increased demand on policing resources (and hence increased cost)
- Additional mitigating action added: devolution progression – maintaining momentum
- Reference to emergency budget removed under gaps in assurance section
- Additional gap in assurance added: Ongoing review of financial health of other partners with escalation if necessary

- **Objective 3 – continue to tackle crime and disorder:** *There is the potential that policing resources could be insufficient to tackle crime and disorder*
 - Mitigating action updated: Improve tactical response (exploration of the use of deferred prosecutions) and 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, Drugs and Alcohol Action Team (DAAT) and Integrated Offender Management (IOM)

- **Objective 4 – keeping vulnerable people safe:** *That the Constabulary cannot meet the increasing demand for policing services to keep vulnerable people safe*
 - Additional causes added:
 - Inefficient criminal justice system leads to increase in discontinuance at court; this in turn affects victims’ ability to cope and recover and all agencies’ ability to effectively manage offenders
 - National frameworks prevent innovative local thinking to tackle demand placed on services by troubled families
 - Further detail added to the impact of ‘focus moves from preventative work to reacting to calls for urgent help:’ *police is often not the right service to provide the right support at that time*
 - Transition planning added to mitigating controls
 - ‘Revised community safety agreement’ removed from mitigating actions and replaced by updated action of ‘Innovation Fund bidding – and implementation if bid successful – of effective management of offenders and appropriate response to victims’ needs’
 - Additional external assurances added:
 - Ofsted

- Victim satisfaction and feedback
 - Offending and re-offending rates
 - Feedback from public on service provided
- Additional gap in assurance added: Implementation of HMIC recommendations within the context of our strategy for keeping vulnerable people safe
- **Objective 5 – collaboration:** *Failure to maximise the benefits of collaboration:*
 - Additional causes added:
 - Financial unviability of one partner threatens entire collaboration
 - Emerging regional collaboration fails to begin on right planning, governance and financial footing
 - Visioning event removed from controls and ‘Careful drafting of section 22 agreements including specific clause to cover escalation of strategic risks where necessary’ added
 - Additional gap in assurance: Link with devolution agenda as it gathers pace to ensure no gaps or conflicts
- **Holding to account: meeting statutory duties:** *Potential changes in governance arrangements constrain the capacity of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to carry out its statutory duties:*
 - Text amended to reflect the fact that the current Commissioner is not standing for re-election
 - Additional and updated controls as follows:
 - Performance working group added to controls
 - Other potential changes to the role of Police and Crime Commissioners added to ‘Engaging with discussions’ control
 - Transition planning to ensure appropriate preparations for the transition to a new Police and Crime Commissioner post-election
 - OPCC costs considered by Joint Audit Committee and Integrity Advisory Group
 - JAC paper on OPCC costs removed from mitigating actions as paper has been considered at meeting on 29 June 2015
 - Post-election planning removed from mitigating actions and added to controls under transition planning as noted above
- **Holding to account: Integrity:** *Misconduct within policing undermines public confidence:*
 - Control updated from ‘increased resources for PSD’ to ‘Monitoring impact of increased resources for PSD’

5. Recommendation

5.1 The Committee is invited to consider the updated Board Assurance Framework.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Source Documents	Risk Management Policy Risk Management Procedure Board Assurance Framework
Contact Officer	Dorothy Gregson, Chief Executive, Cambridgeshire Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner