

Lancashire OPCC - Risk Register

**Risk Mitigation Strategy:**  
**Audit:** Using the risk register as a tool to inform an impact audit.  
**Monitor:** Monitor the likelihood and/or impact of the risk.  
**Transfer:** Outsource, per contract or ensure against through group cover.  
**Accept:** The risk is taken into account.

**Risk Score:** High (Red), Medium (Orange), Low (Yellow), Very Low (Green), Negligible (Blue).  
**Impact:** High (Red), Medium (Orange), Low (Yellow), Very Low (Green), Negligible (Blue).  
**Likelihood:** High (Red), Medium (Orange), Low (Yellow), Very Low (Green), Negligible (Blue).

Risk Ref No	Date Identified and By Whom	Risk Description - Presented in a structured format - There is a risk that... 2. Caused by... 3. Resulting in...	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Score	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Score	Risk Owner & Mitigation Strategy (audit, monitor, transfer, accept).	Outstanding Risk Mitigation Actions	Response Action or Management Approach to be Taken if Risk Occurs	Action Owner(s)	Review Date
TR001	22/12/2015 R/13/10	(1) There is a risk that effective financial control and planning processes are not in place caused by lack of effective control and monitoring procedures • deterioration of performance and inability to safeguard service delivery standards • an inability to achieve objectives in Police and Crime Plan • Negative media coverage / reputational consequences • an impact on resilience • inefficient and ineffective processes leading to a breach of statutory duty • Failure to deliver a legal budget • Loss in public confidence • Failure to control expenditure	4	4	16	4	4	16	• PCC / Constabulary CFO in place • Quarterly Finance Staff in post and all key processes comply with relevant appropriate codes. • Internal / external audit planning / reporting • Joint Audit Committee established • Financial regulations in place • Good intelligence systems and liaison with external agencies • VFM strategy in place incorporating the Sustaining Excellence efficiency programme within the organisational review, force restructuring, systems thinking and collaboration will ensure OPCC / Force best placed to meet the challenge. • Regular discussions with CFO / CE / Commissioner and Chief Constable take place as part of the process, including monitoring reporting • Future Programme in place within work programme delivering reviews and implementation plans. Key issues affecting mitigation: none but needs regular review	Continuing input into the funding formula review lobbying of Home Office Ministers/Government PCC with partners in relation to developing a robust Asset management strategy			
TR002	22/12/2015 R/13/10	(1) There is a risk that austerity measures during this parliament (5 years) and consequential reductions in funding 2015. This may result in: (2) caused by Government policy (3) resulting in: • reduction in level of service provided • reduced customer satisfaction • reputational damage	5	5	25	5	5	25	• Long term financial modelling in place • Regular monitoring of budgets carried out with formal reporting to the PCC on a quarterly basis • Key emerging financial risks are identified and reported throughout the year. • Levels of reserves are monitored to ensure resilience to mitigate against any changes in funding • Involvement at national / regional and local level with regard to Stage 2 transfer arrangements • Clear strategy to deliver savings and OPCC involved in Constabulary organisational reviews through the Futures Programme • Relationships developed and being maintained with Lancashire MPA to enable effective lobbying to take place Key issues affecting mitigation: Level and timing of cuts to funding Demand pressures	Assessment of ongoing budget proposals from local authorities to determine impact on police budget			
TR003	22/12/2015 R/13/10	(1) There is a risk that failure to effectively commission services and work with partners generally to deliver the Commission's key aims and objectives (2) caused by / failure to engage with partners effectively and our partner's ability to deliver due to external pressures (3) resulting in: • Lack of strategic alignment with partners • Failure to focus on the priorities on behalf of local communities • Public confidence in PCC, force and criminal justice partners is undermined • Poor use of resources • Unable to deliver joint objectives and outcomes to the public • Inability to secure VFM in relation to community safety • Conflicting strategic objectives • Ineffective management of interdependencies • Failure of a collaborative arrangement between OPCCs and / or constabularies. • Difficulty managing and maintaining a professional working relationship with the Police and Crime Panel	4	4	16	4	4	16	• Proactive engagement with other agencies, eg local authorities, CSP, Criminal Justice, Fire and Rescue, Health agencies. • Risk management • Performance Management • Governance Framework • Regular, informal and formal meetings at officer / elected member / leader / Commissioner level take place • Commissioning Strategy developed • Funding criteria to support priorities and key outcomes developed and implemented for all funding agreements • Budget monitoring processes established with monthly budget and spend reviews Key issues affecting mitigation quality: reductions in public sector funding pose risk that partners will revert to only delivering their core business. The situation is being closely monitored. A change in personnel at either officer or elected member level could fundamentally alter the relationships. Implementation of the internal audit report recommendations on Commissioning (inside OPCC).				
TR004	22/12/2015 R/13/10	(1) There is a risk that the relationship between the PCC and the Chief Constable breaks down (2) caused by lack of engagement and/or personal differences (3) resulting in: • Tension over achievement of Police and Crime Plan, the budget and operational policing matters and OPCC suffer reputational damage	2	2	4	2	2	4	• Fortnightly one to one meetings between the PCC and CC • Monthly meetings of the Joint Management Board • Both aware of roles and responsibilities.				
TR005	22/12/2015 R/13/10	(1) There is a risk that Grants (CSF & CAF) awarded by the PCC do not achieve intended outcomes (2) caused by ineffective monitoring and common framework (3) resulting in: • Reputational risk to the PCC and Grant recipients • Police and Crime Plan priorities not achieved	2	2	4	2	2	4	• Quarterly and Year End monitoring/outcome reports have been developed • Outcomes reported to PCC and appropriate Community Safety Partnership				
TR006	22/12/2015 R/13/10	There is a risk that failure to recognise or implement the reforms set out in the Police and Crime Bill may result in reputational damage, staff wellbeing an inefficient/ineffective police service	2	2	4	2	2	4	Collaborative arrangements are being reviewed/ options for future delivery are being developed/ consultation with networks to identify best practice/ engagement with national organisations for latest guidance	Monitor the progression of the Bill through Parliament. Put plans in place at the appropriate time to enable police and crime commissioner and chief constable to understand and take appropriate action.			
TR007	22/12/2015 R/13/10	(1) There is a risk that the relationship between the PCC and local partners and stakeholder organisations breaks down caused by lack of engagement and/or personal politics and/or lack of understanding of the role • Reputational risk to both bodies • Failure of organisations to deliver their respective functions effectively • Loss of public confidence	4	4	16	4	4	16	Maintenance of effective working relationships/Openness and transparency in processes				