Draft

MPA Top Ten Strategic Risks

The **mission** of the Authority is to:

Equip the MPS with the capacity and capability to deliver reduced crime and criminality, increased public confidence and better value for money, and to hold the Commissioner to account publicly.

The key risks to the Authority in delivering its mission are:

1. Inability to provide clearly defined strategic direction and strong leadership to the MPS in a transparent environment that promotes public accountability.

2. Failure to identify and reflect local priorities and concerns of all Londoners in plans for service delivery going forward.

3. Ineffective scrutiny of MPS performance and inadequate response to areas of concern resulting in a lack of confidence in the role of the Authority.

4. Inability to secure and embed organisational learning within the MPS.

5. Failure to focus on core role of the Authority and effectively manage new events in times of significant change and challenge.

6. Inability to develop and maintain effective working relationships with key strategic partners.

7. Ineffective management of the budget - failure to respond appropriately to the economic climate and budget pressures and inability to maximise the resources available to policing.

8. Failure to ensure risk and internal controls are managed effectively within the MPA and MPS.

9. Failure to achieve effectively and to the benefit of Londoners our national role in policing (CT, Olympics).

10. Ineffective development and use of MPA skills and resources to support delivery of mission/corporate objectives and oversight of major initiatives, such as Race and Faith Inquiry.

Communication

Effective internal and external communication is an integral part of the planning, performance and risk management framework of the Authority and is key to achieving the required level of service delivery.

METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE

DESCRIPTION	IMPACT	MITIGATION	OWNER	[1]SCORE
Inability to provide clearly defined strategic direction and strong leadership to the MPS in a transparent environment that promotes public accountability.	Policing priorities not met Met forward work strands not met Lack of public confidence in the role of the Authority Lack of Public confidence in policing	• Agreed policing priorities - Policing Plan • MPA Clearly defined mission/vision Met Forward supported by clearly defined strategies and policies • Effective Committee structure and process that promotes transparency and public accountability • Robust and cohesive leadership MPA Chair, MPA Vice Chair and MPA Chief Executive • Effective working relationship between MPA Chair, MPA Vice Chair and MPA Chief Executive and the Commissioner and MPS Management Board • MPA appointment of ACPO rank officers • Promoting and supporting succession planning in the MPS, focusing on identifying effective leaders of the future	MPA Chair MPA Vice Chair MPA Chief Executive	Impact 5 Likelihood 3 Total 15
Failure to identify and reflect local priorities and concerns of all Londoners in plans for service delivery going forward.	Policing priorities not met Lack of public confidence in the role of the Authority	• Effective consultation and community engagement with all representative groups • Effective partnerships within the community	MPA Assistant Chief Executive	Impact 4 Likelihood 4 Total 16

[1] Scale of 1 to 5 - where 5 represents the greatest impact and increased likelihood of the risk materialising

Reviewed May 2009

DESCRIPTION	IMPACT	MITIGATION	OWNER	[1]SCORE
	Lack of Public confidence in policing	• Use results of consultation effectively to inform policing priorities and plans • Demonstrate/promote how consultation has influenced priorities and plans		
Ineffective scrutiny of MPS performance and inadequate response to areas of concern resulting in a lack of confidence in the role of the Authority.	Policing priorities not met Waste of resources Lack of public confidence in the role of the Authority/Damage to the Authority's reputation/credibility Lack of Public confidence in policing	• Effective Committee structure and process that promotes transparency and public accountability • Clearly defined performance management framework • Appropriate reporting on performance to public committees • Clear direction and appropriate support from the MPA to address areas of poor performance • Effective Member led scrutinies focusing on key areas for improvement • Prompt and appropriate MPA response to concerns raised by the public, inspection and review bodies, independent oversight bodies • Effective media/public communication	MPA Assistant Chief Executive	Impact 4 Likelihood 3 Total 12
Inability to secure and embed organisational learning within the MPS.	Lack of public confidence in the role of the Authority Lack of Public confidence in policing	• Encourage a culture that promotes organisational learning in the MPS • Identify and create a common understanding between the MPA and MPS on areas of learning • Agree and define action to be	MPA Chief Executive	Impact 4 Likelihood 4 Total 16

Reviewed May 2009

DESCRIPTION	IMPACT	MITIGATION	OWNER	[1]SCORE
		• taken to address areas of learning • Proactive MPA oversight of areas identified • Recognise and communicate effectively improvements achieved		
Failure to focus on core role of the Authority in times of significant change and challenge.	Lack of public confidence in the role of the Authority Corporate objectives not met Policing priorities not met	• Clear strategy and vision - Met Forward • Robust and cohesive leadership MPA Chair, MPA Vice Chair and MPA Chief Executive • Effective and resilient MPA SMT • Effective MPA performance management framework	MPA Chief Executive/MPA SMT	Impact 4 Likelihood 3 Total 12
Inability to develop and maintain effective working relationships with key strategic partners; MPS Home Office GLA family GOL Local Authorities APA LCJB NPIA	Policing priorities not met Lack of credibility and damage to reputation Duplication of work/inefficient use of resources	• Identify all key strategic partners • Develop effective communication strategy and plan for engaging with all key strategic partners for the MPA • Open and effective communication between all parties facilitated by the MPA communication strategy and plan • Establish protocols governing the exchange of data/statistics between the MPA and key strategic partners • Appropriate MPA representation at regular meetings with key strategic partners providing influential input and giving effective feedback	MPA Chief Executive	Impact 4 Likelihood 4 Total 16
Ineffective management of the budget – failure to respond appropriately to the economic	Policing priorities not met MPA corporate objectives	• Aligning strategic and financial planning effectively • Realistic and accurate budget	MPA Chief Executive/ MPA Treasurer	Impact 5 Likelihood 4

DESCRIPTION	IMPACT	MITIGATION	OWNER	[1]SCORE
climate and budget pressures and inability to maximise the resources available to policing.	not met. Waste of resources	submission • Identifying opportunities for additional funding and effective lobbying for resources • Economic and efficient use of resources particularly in key areas such as estates, procurement, capital programme • Influential MPA input to and scrutiny of the productivity agenda and Service Improvement Programme • Effective MPA scrutiny of the budget – Treasurer, Finance and Resources Committee, Resources Sub Committee, including star chamber process • Effective budgetary control framework • Effective budget contingency planning – adequate reserve provision		Total 20
Failure to ensure risk and internal control are managed effectively within the MPA and MPS.	Policing priorities not met Damage to reputation Inefficient use of resources Potential key risks not identified and subsequently materialise	• Clearly defined MPA and MPS risk management strategies supported by effective risk management processes • MPA SMT and MPS Management Board buy in to risk management approach • Embedding risk management in corporate planning and performance management • Effective MPA oversight of MPS	MPA Chief Executive/MPA SMT	Impact 4 Likelihood 4 Total 16

DESCRIPTION	IMPACT	MITIGATION	OWNER	[1]SCORE
		risk management • Effective Corporate Governance Framework • Effective MPA Corporate Governance Committee • Effective Internal Audit Service		
Failure to achieve effectively and to the benefit of Londoners our national role in policing (CT, Olympics)	Loss of prestige, lack of future ability to influence Damage to reputation Adverse affect on policing role/priorities in London	• Working with MPS and Home Office to define clearly national role and responsibilities • Clearly define strategy and objectives for national role and responsibilities • Secure adequate resources to fulfil national role and responsibilities • Effective performance management framework governing national role in policing • Effective MPA oversight - CT and Olympics sub committees • Effective community engagement and consultation with Londoners	MPA Chief Executive/MPA Treasurer	Impact 4 Likelihood 4 Total 16
Ineffective development and use of MPA expertise, skills, resources and work plans to support delivery of mission/corporate objectives.	Inadequately skilled members and workforce Low morale Failure to deliver strategy and meet performance targets Disproportionate number of staff grievances and ETs	• Clearly defined recruitment and retention policy – aiming for a highly skilled and diverse workforce whilst recognising the limited career progression opportunities in the policy area of the business • Favourable terms and conditions • Dynamic training and development strategy for staff and members involving a leadership and development programme	MPA Chief Executive/ MPA SMT	Impact 5 Likelihood 3 Total 15

DESCRIPTION	IMPACT	MITIGATION	OWNER	[1]SCORE
	Damage to reputation and credibility	- Clearly defined HR strategy and policies supported by effective processes that are consistently applied - Clearly defined objectives and work plans designed to meet corporate strategy and vision - Effective performance management framework - Clearly defined personal objectives linked to unit and corporate objectives - Effective performance appraisal system for members and staff - Effective internal communication - Effective staff representation and consultation - Effective handling of staff grievances		

Reviewed May 2009