

For Information	
Public/Non Public*	Public
Report to:	Joint Audit & Scrutiny Panel
Date of Meeting:	23 September 2014
Report of:	DCC & Chief Executive
Report Author:	Paul White, Strategic Support Officer
E-mail:	paul.white@nottinghamshire.pnn.police.uk
Other Contacts:	Paul Steeples, Interim Head of Business & Finance Julie Mair, Acting Organisational Development Manager
Agenda Item:	6

STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER REPORT (2014/15 QUARTER 1)

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To provide the Joint Audit and Scrutiny Panel with an updated picture of strategic risk across Nottinghamshire Police (the Force) and the Nottinghamshire Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (NOPCC).

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Panel notes the current level of strategic risk and receives assurance as to the effectiveness of corporate risk management within the Force and the NOPCC.


3. Reasons for Recommendations


- 3.1 A Strategic Risk Register Report is provided to the Joint Audit and Scrutiny Panel every six months to enable the Panel to evaluate the effectiveness of risk management within the Force and NOPCC, as part of their scrutiny of corporate governance arrangements.

4. Summary of Key Points


- 4.1 The format of this report has been updated to reflect recent changes to the Force's and NOPCC's risk management processes and adoption of the Office of Government Commerce (OGC) Management of Risk (M_o_R) approach.
- 4.2 The current level of risk exposure within the Force and NOPCC has been evaluated in terms of the following types or categories of risk:
- Crime and community safety
 - Operational efficiency & effectiveness
 - Judicial process
 - Reputation
 - Finances
 - Compliance
 - Health, safety and wellbeing
 - Environment


- 4.3 In the absence of a formal risk management strategy for the FEB and NOPCC an assumption has been made that only High and Very high risks will be reported to the Panel.
- 4.4 The tables below summarise the level of risk exposure within the Force and NOPCC in each of those categories, including reference to those specific risks (both threats and opportunities) which are currently assessed as having a High or Very high risk rating and the planned to response to those risks:


Risk type	Finances		
Overall risk exposure	Very high	Trend	
Current top risks		Risk response plans	
Reserves are required to balance the budget for 2014/15	VH	Governance of efficiency savings plan 2014/15	
Reserves are required to balance the budget for 2015-16	VH	Governance of Target Operating Model (TOM) & efficiency savings plan 2015/16	
Failure of appeal against A19 tribunal decision	H	Appeal process; contingent liability in accounts	
Opportunity for successful Police Innovation Fund bids	H	Business partner preparation of Force bids	


Risk type	Operational efficiency & effectiveness		
Overall risk exposure	High	Trend	
Current top risks		Risk response plans	
Implementation of the CRIM project results in contact management teams out-growing existing accommodation	VH	Business case to explore options for relocation of contact management	
Mechanical or electrical failure at the Bridewell forces closure & temporary loss of custody provision	H	Business case for replacement / upgrade; business continuity plan in place	
Incremental loss of mobile data capability as Blackberry stocks run out	H	Recommended option is to upgrade existing BEAT system to be "device agnostic"	


Changes to the probation service result in increased demand for Force offender management	H	Governance of offender management through Joint Local Policing & Specialist Services Board
---	---	--


Risk type	Compliance		
Overall risk exposure	Medium	Trend	
Current top risks		Risk response plans	
Unauthorised access to Force information by an employee	H	Protective monitoring; develop role based access through East Midlands Strategic Infrastructure Services (EMSIS) project	
Unauthorised third party access to Force information	H	Protective monitoring; develop policies and processes for managing and monitoring third party access	

Risk type	Reputation		
Overall risk exposure	Medium	Trend	
Current top risks		Risk response plans	
The Force reports a year on year increase in recorded crime & ASB at the end of 2014/15	H	Force performance media strategy	

Risk type	Judicial process		
Overall risk exposure	Medium	Trend	
Current top risks		Risk response plans	
Loss of information from Digital Imaging Evidence Unit (DIEU) systems	H	Temporary repairs by DIEU; review & governance through Force Information Assurance Board (FIAB)	

Risk type	Crime & community safety		
Overall risk exposure	Medium	Trend	
Current top risks		Risk response plans	
No risks currently rated High or Very high		N/A	

Risk type	Health, safety & wellbeing		
Overall risk exposure	Low	Trend	
Current top risks		Risk response plans	
No risks currently rated High or Very high		N/A	

Risk type	Environment		
Overall risk exposure	Very low	Trend	
Current top risks		Risk response plans	
No risks currently rated High or Very high		N/A	

4.4 **Appendices I-V** to this report show the current risk registers for each strategic portfolio:

- Local Policing
- Specialist Services
- Corporate Services
- Information
- NOPCC

4.5 The following risks have been closed since the previous report:

Risk description	Reason for closure
Breach of FHQ security through unattended main gate resulting in harm to individuals or damage to property	Risk accepted – no evidence of current threat (monitor through security incident reporting procedure)
Loss of access to information if Mansfield servers overheat following air-con failure	Risk accepted – air-con replaced & ICT business continuity plans in place (monitor through security incident reporting procedure)

4.6 A formal Information Risk Management Strategy has been developed by the Force Information Assurance Board (FIAB). This document describes the main risk management activities that are carried out in relation to information assurance, the process and methodology that is used to assess and manage individual risks, and the risk appetite and tolerance levels that have been set by the DCC as Senior Information Risk Owner (SIRO).

- 4.7 Risk management strategies for the other portfolios and also for the FEB and NOPCC are still in development. Consequently, the risk registers attached as Appendices I-V have been compiled from available evidence and have not been formally reviewed by the respective management boards.

5 Financial Implications and Budget Provision

- 5.1 The annual maintenance cost for the Orchid Risk Management System in 2014/15 is £5,700, with an additional £1,833.33 paid to Leicestershire Police for hosting the system. Budget provision of a further £2,000 is also made to cover the cost of a security penetration test of the system, which is only carried out and charged for if it is deemed necessary by Leicestershire Police. No test is planned for this year.
- 5.2 As the Force no longer uses the Orchid system as its risk register, from 2015/16 the contract with Orchidsoft has been cancelled and the Memorandum of Understanding with Leicestershire Police will no longer apply. Consequently, no specific budget provision will be required to support risk management beyond the current year. This has been recorded as a saving in the 2015/16 efficiency plan.

6 Human Resources Implications

- 6.1 Professional support for risk management is provided by one Strategic Support Officer within the Planning and Policy team (Business and Finance department), who is trained as an M_o_R Registered Risk Practitioner and who is also responsible for advising on business continuity management.
- 6.2 General responsibility for risk management forms an integral part of the job descriptions of individuals throughout the Force.

7 Equality Implications

- 7.1 There are no known equality implications associated with the implementation of the Corporate Risk Management Policy.
- 7.2 Where a particular risk is identified that could have an impact on the Force's or NOPCC's equality objectives that risk will be managed in line with the Policy.

8 Risk Management

- 8.1 If the Force and NOPCC do not practice effective risk management there is risk of non-compliance with the principles of corporate governance. More specifically, ineffective risk management is likely to result in decisions being made that do not support the Force and the Commissioner in achieving their objectives. However, it is not considered that this is a risk that requires active management at this time.

9 Policy Implications and links to the Police and Crime Plan Priorities

- 9.1 In order to implement the M_o_R approach the Force risk practitioner will be updating the existing Corporate Risk Management Policy and process.
- 9.2 Good risk management within decision making is generally accepted as more cost effective than a reactive approach to issues and can therefore have a positive impact on the Police and Crime Plan priority of 'Spending your money wisely'.

10 Changes in Legislation or other Legal Considerations

- 10.1 The preparation and publication of an annual governance statement in accordance with the CIPFA/SOLACE Framework 'Delivering Good Governance in Local Government' is necessary to meet the statutory requirement set out in Regulation 4(2) of the Accounts and Audit (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2006 for authorities to prepare a statement of internal control. This includes the requirement to have "effective risk management systems in place".
- 10.1 Where potential changes in legislation or other legal considerations represent a significant threat or opportunity for the Force or the NOPCC these are evaluated and managed in line with the Corporate Risk Management Policy.

11 Details of outcome of consultation

- 11.1 No consultation was required in preparing this report, as it is based on the risk management processes which form an integral part of the PCC's and Force's governance arrangements.

12. Appendices

- 12.1 **Appendix I** – Strategic Local Policing Risk Register, Quarter 1 2014/15
- 12.2 **Appendix II** – Strategic Specialist Services Risk Register, Quarter 1 2014/15
- 12.3 **Appendix III** – Strategic Corporate Services Risk Register, Quarter 1 2014/15
- 12.4 **Appendix IV** – Strategic Information Risk Register, Quarter 1 2014/15
- 12.5 **Appendix V** – Strategic NOPCC Risk Register, Quarter 1 2014/15



Strategic Risk Register

Business area	Local Policing
Responsible officer	ACC Simon Torr
Period	Quarter 1, 2014/15

-NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED-
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE POLICE



Identifier	Function	Risk description	Owner	Proximity	Probability	Impact	Rating	Trend	Response plan	Risk rating confidence
LOC 013	Contact management	Implementation of the CRIM project results in contact management teams out-growing existing accommodation	ACC Torr	Apr 2015	Very high (5)	High (4)	Very high (20)	NEW	Business case to explore options for relocation of contact management	Substantial
LOC 001	Corporate communication	The Force reports a year on year increase in crime at the end of the 2014/15 financial year, which damages its reputation	DCC Fish	April / May 2015	High (4)	Med (3)	High (12)	↑	Force performance media strategy	Reasonable
LOC 009	Corporate communication	The Force reports a year on year increase in ASB at the end of the 2014/15 financial year, which damages its reputation	DCC Fish	April / May 2015	High (4)	Med (3)	High (12)	↑	Force performance media strategy	Reasonable
LOC 006	Contact management	Changes to crime decision making by the CRIM project result in an increase in recorded crime, damaging reputation	ACC Torr	Oct 2014 – Sep 2015	Med (3)	Med (3)	Med (9)	NEW	Develop a project media strategy	Limited
LOC 003	County Division	County Council budget reductions result in increased demand for police services	ACC Torr	2014-17	Med (3)	Med (3)	Med (9)	↔	Further research to understand the implications of this risk	Limited

-NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED-
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE POLICE



Identifier	Function	Risk description	Owner	Proximity	Probability	Impact	Rating	Trend	Response plan	Risk rating confidence
LOC 005	City Division	City Council budget reductions result in increased demand for police services	ACC Torr	2014-17	Med (3)	Med (3)	Med (9)	↔	Further research to understand the implications of this risk	Limited
LOC 014	Contact management	Increased in time taken to resolve calls leads to a reduction in call handling performance	ACC Torr	Next 12 months	High (4)	Low (2)	Med (8)	NEW	Assisted implementation using newly formed Contact Resolution Team	Reasonable
LOC 015	Contact management	Closure of front counters results in increased volume of calls to the control room	ACC Torr	Next 12 months	High (4)	Low (2)	Med (8)	NEW	Front counter project is installing virtual front counter facilities as well as an online service	Reasonable
LOC 011	Project management	Introduction of new Prisoner Handling Team results in increased number of arrests	ACC Torr	Next 12 months	Low (2)	High (4)	Med (8)	NEW	Necessity test for arrest to be applied rigorously by divisional supervisors and custody	Limited
LOC 012	Project management	Introduction of new Prisoner Handling Team results in drop in quality of initial investigations	ACC Torr	Next 12 months	Low (2)	High (4)	Med (8)	NEW	Quality control by line managers & evidence review sergeants	Limited



Identifier	Function	Risk description	Owner	Proximity	Probability	Impact	Rating	Trend	Response plan	Risk rating confidence
LOC 010	Project management	A victim of crime does not make use of Track My Crime system, resulting in lost opportunity to realise business benefits	ACC Torr	Next 3 months	High (4)	Low (2)	Med (8)	↔	System changes; appointment of divisional SPOCs and communications plan	Substantial



Closed risks				
Identifier	Risk description	Reason for closure	Date closed	Closed by



Appendix – explanatory note

The following definitions and criteria have been used to describe and assess the risks recorded in this risk register:

Probability	Score	Definition
Very high	5	Almost certainly will occur (>75% chance)
High	4	More likely to occur than not 51-75% chance)
Medium	3	Fairly likely to occur (26-50% chance)
Low	2	Unlikely to occur (6-25% chance)
Very low	1	Extremely unlikely or virtually impossible (0-5% chance)

Impact	Score	Definition
Very high	5	Significant, lasting or permanent impact on objectives
High	4	Significant, temporary or noticeable, lasting impact on objectives
Medium	3	Noticeable, temporary or minor, lasting impact on objectives
Low	2	Minor, temporary or minimal, lasting impact on objectives
Very low	1	Minimal, temporary impact on objectives



Probability is multiplied by Impact to give the overall Rating, which is colour coded, dependent upon whether the risk represents a threat (negative impact) or opportunity (positive impact) using the matrices below:

Impact	V high (5)	5	10	15	20	25
	High (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Medium (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	Low (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	V low (1)	1	2	3	4	5
		V low (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)	V high (5)
Probability						

Threat scoring matrix

Impact	V high (5)	5	10	15	20	25
	High (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Medium (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	Low (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	V low (1)	1	2	3	4	5
		V low (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)	V high (5)
Probability						

Opportunity scoring matrix

The Confidence rating that is applied to each risk represents an evaluation of the source information used to assess the risk, as follows:

- Substantial – risk scoring is based on substantial, reliable data and / or intelligence
- Reasonable – risk scoring is based on some data and / or intelligence, but there are gaps or issues with reliability
- Limited – risk scoring is based on professional judgement alone



Strategic Risk Register

Business area	Specialist Services
Responsible officer	ACC Steve Jupp
Period	Quarter 1, 2014/15

-NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED-
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE POLICE



Identifier	Function	Risk description	Owner	Proximity	Probability	Impact	Rating	Trend	Response plan	Risk rating confidence
C&J 009	Custody	Closure of Bridewell custody following mechanical or electrical failure resulting in reduced custody provision	ACC Jupp	Next 2 years	Med (3)	High (4)	High (12)		Explore options for replacing ageing equipment; update Custody business continuity plan	Substantial
C&J 004	Offender management	Changes to the probation service resulting in increased demand for offender management	ACC Jupp	2014/15	Med (3)	High (4)	High (12)		Governance of offender management through Joint Local Policing & Specialist Services Board	Limited
SPS 011	Criminal justice	Opportunity to obtain a conviction in the Crown Court (currently 88%)	ACC Jupp	Next 3 months	High (4)	Med (3)	High (12)		Governance of criminal justice through Joint Performance Board; East Midlands Criminal Justice project	Substantial
SPS 012	Criminal justice	Opportunity to obtain a conviction in the Magistrates Court (currently 84%)	ACC Jupp	Next 3 months	High (4)	Med (3)	High (12)		Governance of criminal justice through Joint Performance Board; East Midlands Criminal Justice project	Substantial
SPS 003	Custody	A fire at the Bridewell puts officers, staff and the public at risk of serious harm	ACC Jupp	Next 2 years	Low (2)	Very high (5)	Medium (10)		Business case to explore options for replacing ageing equipment	Limited

-NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED-
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE POLICE



Identifier	Function	Risk description	Owner	Proximity	Probability	Impact	Rating	Trend	Response plan	Risk rating confidence
SPS 005	Youth offending	A young offender in the City goes on to re-offend (32.5% in 2012/13)	ACC Jupp	Next 12 months	Med (3)	Med (3)	Med (9)	↔	Governance of offender management through Joint Performance Board	Reasonable
SPS 007	Criminal justice	A Crown Court trial is ineffective (currently 54%)	ACC Jupp	Next 3 months	High (4)	Low (2)	Med (8)	↔	Governance of criminal justice through Joint Performance Board; East Midland Criminal Justice project	Substantial
SPS 008	Criminal justice	A Magistrates Court trial is ineffective (currently 60%)	ACC Jupp	Next 3 months	High (4)	Low (2)	Med (8)	↔	Governance of criminal justice through Joint Performance Board; East Midland Criminal Justice project	Substantial
SPS 010	Criminal justice	Opportunity to obtain an early guilt plea in the Magistrates Court (currently 69%)	ACC Jupp	Next 3 months	High (4)	Low (2)	Med (8)	↔	Governance of criminal justice through Joint Performance Board; East Midland Criminal Justice project	Substantial
SPS 017	Criminal investigation	Opportunity to “detect” a crime	ACC Jupp	Next 3 months	Med (3)	Med (3)	Med (9)	↓	Governance of crime through Joint Performance Board; Improving Investigations project	Substantial



Identifier	Function	Risk description	Owner	Proximity	Probability	Impact	Rating	Trend	Response plan	Risk rating confidence
SPS 009	Criminal justice	Opportunity to obtain an early guilt plea in the Crown Court (currently 34%)	ACC Jupp	Next 3 months	Med (3)	Med (3)	Med (9)	↔	Governance of criminal justice through Joint Performance Board; East Midland Criminal Justice project	



Closed risks				
Identifier	Risk description	Reason for closure	Date closed	Closed by



Appendix – explanatory note

The following definitions and criteria have been used to describe and assess the risks recorded in this risk register:

Probability	Score	Definition
Very high	5	Almost certainly will occur (>75% chance)
High	4	More likely to occur than not 51-75% chance)
Medium	3	Fairly likely to occur (26-50% chance)
Low	2	Unlikely to occur (6-25% chance)
Very low	1	Extremely unlikely or virtually impossible (0-5% chance)

Impact	Score	Definition
Very high	5	Significant, lasting or permanent impact on objectives
High	4	Significant, temporary or noticeable, lasting impact on objectives
Medium	3	Noticeable, temporary or minor, lasting impact on objectives
Low	2	Minor, temporary or minimal, lasting impact on objectives
Very low	1	Minimal, temporary impact on objectives



Probability is multiplied by Impact to give the overall Rating, which is colour coded, dependent upon whether the risk represents a threat (negative impact) or opportunity (positive impact) using the matrices below:

Impact	V high (5)	5	10	15	20	25
	High (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Medium (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	Low (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	V low (1)	1	2	3	4	5
		V low (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)	V high (5)
Probability						

Threat scoring matrix

Impact	V high (5)	5	10	15	20	25
	High (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Medium (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	Low (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	V low (1)	1	2	3	4	5
		V low (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)	V high (5)
Probability						

Opportunity scoring matrix

The Confidence rating that is applied to each risk represents an evaluation of the source information used to assess the risk, as follows:

- Substantial – risk scoring is based on substantial, reliable data and / or intelligence
- Reasonable – risk scoring is based on some data and / or intelligence, but there are gaps or issues with reliability
- Limited – risk scoring is based on professional judgement alone



Strategic Risk Register

Business area	Corporate Services
Responsible officer	ACO Margaret Monckton
Period	Quarter 1, 2014/15

-NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED-
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE POLICE



Identifier	Function	Risk description	Owner	Proximity	Probability	Impact	Rating	Trend	Response plan	Risk rating confidence
COS 001	Finance	The Force is unable to reduce expenditure by £12.7m and so has to use reserves to balance the budget for 2014/15 (current forecast £1.5-3.5m at risk)	ACO Monckton	June 2015	High (4)	Very high (5)	Very high (20)	↓	Reduce the probability & impact through budget monitoring & CSB governance of the efficiency savings plan	Reasonable
COS 004	Finance	The Force is unable to reduce expenditure by around £10m and so has to use reserves to balance the budget for 2015/16	ACO Monckton	June 2016	High (4)	Very high (5)	Very high (20)	↔	Reduce the probability & impact through development & delivery of an efficiency savings plan for 2015/16	Limited
INS 002	Information assets	Incremental loss of mobile data capability as Blackberry stocks run out, impacting on operational efficiency & control room demand	ACO Monckton	Aug 2015	High (4)	High (4)	High (16)	NEW	Recommended option is to upgrade existing BEAT system to be "device agnostic"	Reasonable
COS 003	Finance	The Force's appeal against the employment tribunal ruling on use of Reg A19 fails, resulting in payment of compensation to c100 former officers	ACO Monckton	tbc	Med (3)	Very high (5)	High (15)	↔	Appeal process; contingent liability of £3.5m in accounts for 2014/15	Limited

-NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED-
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE POLICE



Identifier	Function	Risk description	Owner	Proximity	Probability	Impact	Rating	Trend	Response plan	Risk rating confidence
COS 002	Finance	Opportunity to successfully bid for in excess of £1m from the Police Innovation Fund in 2015/16	ACO Monckton	Apr – Jul 2015	Med (3)	Very high (5)	High (15)	↔	Coordinate annual bids through finance business partners	Reasonable
INS 001	Infrastructure services	Failure of Force telephony resulting in loss of internal & external communications capability	ACO Monckton	2016/17	Med (3)	Med (3)	Med (9)	↓	Replace Force-wide & control room telephony (£1.5m); Information Services & Contact Management BC plans in place	Reasonable
COS 005	Health, safety & wellbeing	An officer or member of staff is assaulted whilst at work (forecast 270 in 2014/15, or 7% chance)	ACO Monckton	Next 12 months	Low (2)	High (4)	Med (8)	↑	Health & safety policy & related guidance in place; monitor through Corporate Services Board & Force H&S meeting	Substantial
SCU 003	Procurement	Savings are not realised because EMSCU are not involved at an early stage in the business case process	ACO Monckton	June 2015	Low (2)	High (4)	Med (8)	↓	Engagement with stakeholders & involvement in senior management meetings; communication plan rolled out	Limited
SCU 007	Procurement	Commercial challenge and reputation damage in the event of major supplier failure	ACO Monckton	Next 12 months	Low (2)	High (4)	Med (8)	↓	Implementation of Supplier Relationship management & stakeholder engagement by procurement business partners	Limited



Closed risks				
Identifier	Risk description	Reason for closure	Date closed	Closed by
B&F 001	The Force successfully bids for in excess of £1m from the Police Innovation Fund in 2015/16	The risk (opportunity) was exploited successfully	August 2014	ACO Monckton



Appendix – explanatory note

The following definitions and criteria have been used to describe and assess the risks recorded in this risk register:

Probability	Score	Definition
Very high	5	Almost certainly will occur (>75% chance)
High	4	More likely to occur than not 51-75% chance)
Medium	3	Fairly likely to occur (26-50% chance)
Low	2	Unlikely to occur (6-25% chance)
Very low	1	Extremely unlikely or virtually impossible (0-5% chance)

Impact	Score	Definition
Very high	5	Significant, lasting or permanent impact on objectives
High	4	Significant, temporary or noticeable, lasting impact on objectives
Medium	3	Noticeable, temporary or minor, lasting impact on objectives
Low	2	Minor, temporary or minimal, lasting impact on objectives
Very low	1	Minimal, temporary impact on objectives



Probability is multiplied by Impact to give the overall Rating, which is colour coded, dependent upon whether the risk represents a threat (negative impact) or opportunity (positive impact) using the matrices below:

Impact	V high (5)	5	10	15	20	25
	High (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Medium (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	Low (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	V low (1)	1	2	3	4	5
		V low (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)	V high (5)
Probability						

Threat scoring matrix

Impact	V high (5)	5	10	15	20	25
	High (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Medium (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	Low (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	V low (1)	1	2	3	4	5
		V low (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)	V high (5)
Probability						

Opportunity scoring matrix

The Confidence rating that is applied to each risk represents an evaluation of the source information used to assess the risk, as follows:

- Substantial – risk scoring is based on substantial, reliable data and / or intelligence
- Reasonable – risk scoring is based on some data and / or intelligence, but there are gaps or issues with reliability
- Limited – risk scoring is based on professional judgement alone



Strategic Risk Register

Business area	Information
Responsible officer	DCC Sue Fish
Period	Quarter 1, 2014/15



Identifier	Function	Risk description	Owner	Proximity	Probability	Impact	Rating	Trend	Response plan	Risk rating confidence
C&J 007	Digital Imaging Evidence Unit (DIEU)	Critical failure of DIEU stand alone ICT equipment resulting in permanent loss of information	ACC Jupp	Next 12 months	High (4)	High (4)	High (16)	↔	Temporary repairs by DIEU; DCC to review with Information Services & Crime & Justice	Reasonable
INF 017	Varies by information asset	Unauthorised access to Force information by an officer, member of staff or volunteer (probability unknown)	IAOs	Next 3 months	Med (3)	High (4)	High (12)	↔	Protective monitoring; develop role based access through East Midlands Strategic Infrastructure Services (EMSIS)	Limited
INF 010	Varies by information asset	Unauthorised third party access to Force information (probability unknown)	IAOs	Next 3 months	Med (3)	High (4)	High (12)	↔	Protective monitoring; develop policies and processes for managing and monitoring third party access (ICO 45; IAT&F 46, 65, 67 & 98)	Limited
INF 019	Digital Investigation Unit (DIU)	Power outage results in loss of evidential data from Digital Investigation Unit (DIU), due to limited back-up at Holmes House	ACC Jupp	Next 12 months	Low (2)	Very high (5)	Med (10)	↔	Prepare business case to relocate DIU to FHQ	Reasonable
INF 008	Infrastructure services	Breach of network security following end of Windows XP support resulting in theft or alteration of information	ACO Monckton	Next 3 months	Low (2)	Very high (5)	Med (10)	↔	Existing network security; extra 12 months XP support from Microsoft; Windows 7 project to upgrade operating system	Limited

-NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED-
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE POLICE



Identifier	Function	Risk description	Owner	Proximity	Probability	Impact	Rating	Trend	Response plan	Risk rating confidence
INF 016	Criminal justice	Information contained on discs and in documents is provided to the CPS and subsequently lost or misplaced within their offices (regular occurrence)	Jane Dean	Next 3 months	Very high (5)	Low (2)	Med (10)	↔	Liaise with CPS to resolve the procedural issues causing this risk	Reasonable
INF 001	Crime recording	A sexual offence is reported but is not recorded as a crime, resulting in the Force being unable to provide victim services (currently 9%)	ACC Jupp	Next 3 months	Low (2)	Very high (5)	Med (10)	↓	CAIDQ Board sexual offences action plan to reduce probability	Substantial
INF 002	Crime recording	A robbery offence is reported but is not recorded as a crime, resulting in the Force being unable to provide victim services (currently 7%)	ACC Jupp	Next 3 months	Low (2)	Very high (5)	Med (10)	↓	NCRS audit monitored through CAIDQ Board & CMB review of incidents to reduce probability	Substantial
INF 031	Infrastructure services	The Force is unable to connect to the national Public Services Network (PSN): incomplete preparation (Windows upgrade; home working as BYOD)	ACO Monckton	Summer 2015	Low (2)	High (4)	Med (8)	↔	Regional PSN project led by Northants; procurement of 100 laptops for essential users	Reasonable
INF 003	Crime recording	Force activities lead to an increase in the number of recorded sexual offences, resulting in criticism & damage to reputation	ACC Jupp	June 2015	Low (2)	High (4)	Med (8)	↓	Seek Home Office assurance to assess probability and develop sexual offences media strategy to mitigate impact	Reasonable



Closed risks				
Identifier	Risk description	Reason for closure	Date closed	Closed by
INF 030	Breach of FHQ security through unattended main gate resulting in harm to individuals or damage to property	Risk accepted – no evidence of current threat (monitor through security incident reporting procedure)	August 2014	FIAB
INF 020	Loss of access to information if Mansfield servers overheat following air-con failure	Risk accepted – air-con replaced & ICT business continuity plans in place (monitor through security incident reporting procedure)	August 2014	FIAB



Appendix – explanatory note

The following definitions and criteria have been used to describe and assess the risks recorded in this risk register:

Probability	Score	Definition
Very high	5	Almost certainly will occur (>75% chance)
High	4	More likely to occur than not 51-75% chance)
Medium	3	Fairly likely to occur (26-50% chance)
Low	2	Unlikely to occur (6-25% chance)
Very low	1	Extremely unlikely or virtually impossible (0-5% chance)

Impact	Score	Definition
Very high	5	Significant, lasting or permanent impact on objectives
High	4	Significant, temporary or noticeable, lasting impact on objectives
Medium	3	Noticeable, temporary or minor, lasting impact on objectives
Low	2	Minor, temporary or minimal, lasting impact on objectives
Very low	1	Minimal, temporary impact on objectives



Probability is multiplied by Impact to give the overall Rating, which is colour coded, dependent upon whether the risk represents a threat (negative impact) or opportunity (positive impact) using the matrices below:

Impact	V high (5)	5	10	15	20	25
	High (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Medium (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	Low (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	V low (1)	1	2	3	4	5
		V low (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)	V high (5)
Probability						

Threat scoring matrix

Impact	V high (5)	5	10	15	20	25
	High (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Medium (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	Low (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	V low (1)	1	2	3	4	5
		V low (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)	V high (5)
Probability						

Opportunity scoring matrix

The Confidence rating that is applied to each risk represents an evaluation of the source information used to assess the risk, as follows:

- Substantial – risk scoring is based on substantial, reliable data and / or intelligence
- Reasonable – risk scoring is based on some data and / or intelligence, but there are gaps or issues with reliability
- Limited – risk scoring is based on professional judgement alone



Strategic Risk Register

Business area	Nottinghamshire Office of the PCC (NOPCC)
Responsible officer	Chief Executive Kevin Dennis
Period	Quarter 1, 2014/15



Strategic Risk Register

Identifier	Function	Risk description	Owner	Proximity	Probability	Impact	Rating	Trend	Response plan	Risk rating confidence
PCC 001	Strategy & assurance	Government funding cuts reduce the budget that can be made available to the Chief Constable, resulting in an increase in crime in 2015/16	Phil Gilbert	Jun 2016	Low (2)	Very High (5)	Med (10)		Police & Crime Plan priorities for prevention & early intervention; PCC's Alcohol Strategy	Limited
PCC 002	Strategy & assurance	Government funding cuts reduce the budget that can be made available to the Chief Constable, resulting in a reduced quality of service in 2015/16	Phil Gilbert	Jun 2016	Low (2)	Very high (5)	Med (10)		Police & Crime Plan priorities for victims, witnesses & vulnerable people; PCC's Victim Strategy	Limited
PCC 008	Finance	The Home Office review of Police & Crime funding results in Nottinghamshire Police receiving a smaller settlement than it does at present	CFO Charlie Radford	tbc	Low (2)	High (4)	Med (8)		PCC CFO is involved through PaCCTS; Lobbying Government for a better deal on funding formula, police grant, precept and community safety fund	Limited



Strategic Risk Register

Closed risks				
Identifier	Risk description	Reason for closure	Date closed	Closed by



Strategic Risk Register

Appendix – explanatory note

The following definitions and criteria have been used to describe and assess the risks recorded in this risk register:

Probability	Score	Definition
Very high	5	Almost certainly will occur (>75% chance)
High	4	More likely to occur than not 51-75% chance)
Medium	3	Fairly likely to occur (26-50% chance)
Low	2	Unlikely to occur (6-25% chance)
Very low	1	Extremely unlikely or virtually impossible (0-5% chance)

Impact	Score	Definition
Very high	5	Significant, lasting or permanent impact on objectives
High	4	Significant, temporary or noticeable, lasting impact on objectives
Medium	3	Noticeable, temporary or minor, lasting impact on objectives
Low	2	Minor, temporary or minimal, lasting impact on objectives
Very low	1	Minimal, temporary impact on objectives



Strategic Risk Register

Probability is multiplied by Impact to give the overall Rating, which is colour coded, dependent upon whether the risk represents a threat (negative impact) or opportunity (positive impact) using the matrices below:

Impact	V high (5)	5	10	15	20	25
	High (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Medium (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	Low (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	V low (1)	1	2	3	4	5
		V low (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)	V high (5)
Probability						

Threat scoring matrix

Impact	V high (5)	5	10	15	20	25
	High (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Medium (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	Low (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	V low (1)	1	2	3	4	5
		V low (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)	V high (5)
Probability						

Opportunity scoring matrix

The Confidence rating that is applied to each risk represents an evaluation of the source information used to assess the risk, as follows:

- Substantial – risk scoring is based on substantial, reliable data and / or intelligence
- Reasonable – risk scoring is based on some data and / or intelligence, but there are gaps or issues with reliability
- Limited – risk scoring is based on professional judgement alone