

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

Tina Parry

9 July 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-likelihood	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. A Paper is under preparation by the Chief Constable for consideration by the PCC and which will set out the direction to be taken to address savings required to meet the projected funding deficit. This will include the steps being progressed, governance and methodology. 	1 September 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 September 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 September 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 and progress of Tonic Consultants 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. 	1 September 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.					2. The local delivery of services will be progressed and monitored through the Police and Crime Commissioner's Senior Management Team.	

