

RISK REGISTER

RISK EVALUATION

Likelihood of Risk Occurring

| Score | Indicator |
|-------|-------------------------|
| 1. | Not Expected to happen. |
| 2. | May happen. |
| 3. | Is expected to happen. |
| 4. | Certain to happen. |

Impact should Risk Occur

| Impact | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| Effect on Objectives | Minor impact – loss of objective should not prejudice other objectives | Minor impact – loss of objective could prejudice other objectives | Significant impact – loss of objective may impact on overall programme | Complete failure to achieve objective - major consequences for other objectives and the entire programme. |
| Effect on Performance | Minor impact on service delivery – not noticeable by stakeholders | Minor impact on service delivery – affect noticed by stakeholders | Major impact on service delivery | Complete failure to deliver service |
| Effect on Service | Short term loss in service | Significant loss of a service | Complete loss of a service | Significant county wide disruption |
| Effect on Finance | Ability to work within tolerance Budget overspend of less than 2% | Significant injection from reserves Budget overspend between 2% & 5% | Significant impact on other budgets Budget overspend 5% & 10% | Potential loss of other budget allocations Budget overspend 10% or more |
| Effect on Security | Nil or minor compromise of unclassified information | Restricted & Confidential information compromised | Secret information compromised | Top Secret information compromised |
| Effect on Reputation / Confidence | Short term adverse local publicity Breach of local policy or guidance | Short term negative reaction in media Non serious prosecution | Adverse and persistent media reaction Integrity of Authority questioned | Major front page story |

RISK CLASSIFICATION

Scoring Matrix to determine Level of Risk

| LEVEL | | | |
|-------|---|--------------------|---|
| 12-16 | H | High Risk | Detailed research required. Senior management to manage via detailed plan |
| 6-11 | M | Medium Risk | Senior management attention is required and management responsibility specified |
| 1-5 | L | Low Risk | Manage by specific monitoring or response procedures These items would not normally be included on the Strategic Risk Register |

Approved by PCC



1 March 2014

Any queries upon the Risk Register should be directed to Christopher Jackson, Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Suffolk

Tel: 01473 782770
 Mobile: 07921 938100
 Fax: 01473 611580
 Email: christopher.jackson@suffolk.pnn.police.uk

| No. | Risk Type | Risk | Like- lihood | Impact | Risk Classification | Risk Owner | Action Plan | Review Date |
|-----|--|---|-----------------|--------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-------------|
| 1. | Strategic Financial Planning | Longer Term – There is uncertainty over Government funding constraints and precepting strategy and which may impact upon service delivery and require deeper cuts in expenditure than anticipated. Managing the additional demands of successfully identifying and delivering further cuts in expenditure will be challenging. | 4 | 3 | 12 High | Police and Crime Commissioner | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The position will be kept under continuous review by the PCC and PCC's Chief Finance Officer. Financial Monitoring will be undertaken by the PCC at each bi-monthly Accountability and Performance Panel. The PCC will consider proposals to help address funding reductions through further collaboration with Norfolk and other initiatives at the Collaboration Panel (next scheduled for early April). | 1 May 2014 |
| 2. | Strategic Financial/ Services Planning | That there is slippage on the delivery of the Estates Programme against the expected timescales and/or a failure to realise the necessary level of capital receipts which may impact upon service delivery and/or realisation of planned savings. | 2 | 3 | 6 Medium | Police and Crime Commissioner | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The PCC will undertake regular reviews of the Estates Programme through the Estates Programme Board. | 1 May 2014 |
| 3. | Strategic Service Planning | Significant reductions in overall funding and workforce levels may have a negative impact upon staff morale, and motivation, cause a loss of key skills/experience, productivity and ultimately impact on satisfaction and confidence of our staff, partners and stakeholders. | 2 | 3 | 6 Medium | Police and Crime Commissioner | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> This will be reviewed through consideration at the Accountability and Performance Panel and the Collaboration Panel. | 1 May 2014 |
| 4. | Strategic Service Planning | Implementation of Victims Commissioning – there is a risk to the delivery of victims services if (i) a regional referral solution or suitable alternative arrangements are not in place by 1 April 2015 and | 2 | 3 | 6 Medium | Police and Crime Commissioner | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The regional referral solution will be monitored at the regional Police and Crime Commissioner meeting and locally in Suffolk by the Police and Crime Commissioner's Senior Management Team. The local delivery of services will be | 1 May 2014 |

| No. | Risk Type | Risk | Like- lihood | Impact | Risk Classification | Risk Owner | Action Plan | Review Date |
|-----|-----------|---|-----------------|--------|------------------------|------------|--|-------------|
| | | (ii) the delivery of local victims services are not properly introduced and managed by the PCC. | | | | | progressed and monitored through the Police and Crime Commissioner's Senior Management Team. | |