

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
<p>1. Provide clearly defined strategic direction to the MPS in a transparent environment that promotes public accountability.</p>	<p>Lack of clarity around aims, objectives and priorities of MPA.</p> <p>Lack of clarity and agreement of policing priorities.</p> <p>Ineffective leadership.</p> <p>Ineffective public committee meeting structure and process.</p> <p>Ineffective implementation of new governance arrangements for policing.</p> <p>Loss of MPA members before the new arrangements come into effect.</p> <p><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive.</p>	<p>MPA strategic aims and policing priorities not met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ineffective in fighting crime and reducing criminality;</li> <li>failure to provide value for money; and</li> <li>lack of confidence in policing.</li> </ul> <p>Lack of public confidence in the role of the MPA.</p> <p>Lack of public confidence in the role of the MOPC going forward.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MPA strategic mission statement Met Forward supporting the delivery of the London Policing Business Plan.</li> <li>MetForward Programme management and monitoring framework.</li> <li>MPA unit work plans drawn up to deliver MetForward monitored by MPA SMT, Business Management Group (BMG) and relevant committees.</li> <li>Robust and cohesive leadership by MPA Chair and MPA Chief Executive.</li> <li>Regular and effective meetings between MPA Chair, MPA Chief Executive and the Commissioner and MPS Management Board.</li> <li>Effective committee structure and process that promotes transparency and public accountability.</li> <li>MPA appointment of ACPO rank officers.</li> <li>Promoting and supporting succession planning in the MPS, focusing on identifying effective leaders of the future.</li> <li>MOPC implementation programme, including management of risk (and 'what if' scenario planning) and key stakeholder relationships.</li> <li>MPA committee meetings scheduled</li> </ul>	<p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p align="center">↑</p> <p align="center">A</p>	<p>The second iteration of Met Forward has been integrated into the draft 2011/12 Policing London Business Plan.</p> <p>Framework to be reviewed in light of the Met Forward refresh, looking at incorporating the MPS policing plan and MPA business plan objectives and review of PIDs.</p> <p>MPA work plans reviewed to ensure that areas of work reflect which area of Met Forward is supported. Monitored regularly by BMG.</p> <p>To change as part of MOPC implementation.</p> <p>MOPC implementation programme developed with key risks identified and action underway to manage the key relationships.</p> <p>Review how much MPA</p>	<p align="center">A</p>

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
			<p>post October 2011 in parallel with MOPC implementation plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MPA to play a full part in shaping of memorandum of understanding and other national initiatives.</li> </ul>		<p>business can be undertaken under urgency if meetings are not quorate.</p>	
<p>2. To preserve appropriate public accountability and governance in policing.</p>	<p>Ineffective implementation of new policing governance arrangements.</p> <p>Loss of partner and/ or MPS engagement due to the abolition of the MPA.</p> <p>Inadequate segregation of responsibility.</p> <p>Ill defined governance structure.</p> <p>Inappropriate elected representation.</p> <p>Ineffective oversight and management of police finances.</p> <p>Conflict in agreement on policing priorities.</p> <p>Lack of senior management capacity in MPA and MPS to deliver both business as usual and the change resulting from MOPC Implementation.</p> <p><u>Risk Owner</u></p>	<p>Lack of confidence in policing.</p> <p>Lack of focus on public priorities.</p> <p>Not meeting public expectations.</p> <p>Inefficient use of resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitor and influence the shaping of the Bill as it passes through Parliament.</li> <li>MOPC implementation programme, including management of risk (and 'what if' scenario planning) and key stakeholder relationships.</li> <li>Tracking of Localism Bill and taking action as necessary as part of MOPC implementation.</li> <li>Clearly defined governance framework with appropriate checks and balances for public accountability.</li> <li>Clearly defined purpose and role of governing body.</li> <li>Appropriate staff and resources to support governance structure.</li> </ul>	<p>Impact: H Likel'hd: H</p> <p align="center">↔</p> <p align="center"><b>R</b></p>	<p>Formal responses to consultation have been submitted. Officers are monitoring passage of the Bill and briefings to ministers are provided as appropriate.</p> <p>Senior management meetings with Home Office officials are ongoing.</p> <p>Close working relationship with and input to APACE and PATS submissions.</p> <p>MOPC implementation programme developed with key risks identified and action underway to manage the key relationships.</p> <p>Key impacts of Localism Bill being identified.</p>	<p align="center"><b>A</b></p>

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
	MPA Chief Executive.					
3. Identify and reflect local priorities and concerns of all Londoners in plans for service delivery going forward.	<p>Ineffective consultation.</p> <p>Inadequate consideration of Londoners concerns.</p> <p>Ineffective planning process.</p> <p>Ineffective governance systems in place to challenge equalities performance across all MPA community engagement activities (e.g. CPEGs/CMGs).</p> <p>Lack of representation of diverse communities in the work of CPEGs.</p> <p>Lack of provision for effective consultation with all community groups under new PCC structure.</p> <p><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Deputy Chief Executive.</p>	<p>Concerns and local priorities of Londoners are not addressed.</p> <p>Lack of public confidence in policing.</p> <p>Lack of public confidence in the role of the MPA.</p> <p>Lack of awareness of MPA role in diverse communities.</p> <p>BME/white satisfaction gap.</p> <p>Under-reporting of crime, e.g. hate crime.</p> <p>Cross cutting diversity issues are not identified and addressed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities reflected in Met Forward.</li> <li>• Regular and effective consultation and community engagement with all representative groups – Community Engagement Strategy.</li> <li>• Ensure all consultative groups are representative and functioning effectively. Undertaking of annual review of diversity within groups (as part of funding process).</li> <li>• Effective engagement with Community stakeholders and partnerships.</li> <li>• Use results of consultation effectively to inform policing priorities and plans.</li> <li>• Demonstrate/promote in the plan how consultation has influenced priorities and plans.</li> <li>• Conduct wider consultation, particularly within business community.</li> <li>• Transition plan for new policing governance arrangements including provision for effective consultation with all community groups.</li> </ul>	<p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇔</p> <p style="text-align: center;">A</p>	<p>Second iteration of Met Forward produced, to reflect current public and Mayoral priorities.</p> <p>Ongoing implementation of the MPA Community Engagement Strategy.</p> <p>The results of the CPEG review, to refocus towards targeted engagement with under-represented groups, are being implemented.</p> <p>CMG review being undertaken to ensure stop/search community monitoring role is more visible. Action plan currently being implemented.</p> <p>Annual consultation informs MPA/MPS Policing London Business Plan priorities and referred to in document.</p> <p>Businesses were encouraged to take part in the consultation exercise.</p> <p>Implementation plans are being developed to ensure continuity of functions and implementation of new areas. There is oversight of equality and diversity issues within all strands of MOPC implementation.</p>	G

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
<p>4. Principles of equalities and diversity underpin MPA strategic plan, and policing plan objectives and activities.</p>	<p>Ineffective consultation.</p> <p>Lack of impetus and commitment to drive change.</p> <p>Lack of awareness and understanding.</p> <p>Failure to implement new legislation including the duties specified under the new Equalities Act.</p> <p>Loss of momentum as partners and the MPS know the MPA will be abolished.</p> <p>Lack of effective governance systems in place to monitor and challenge equalities performance at a strategic level.</p> <p>Failure to implement the recommendations of the race and faith inquiry report.</p> <p><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive.</p>	<p>Lack of confidence in policing.</p> <p>Lack of confidence in the MPA.</p> <p>Disproportionality.</p> <p>Grievances/ETs.</p> <p>Legal action.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Embed equalities and diversity within planning and performance framework.</li> <li>• Conduct effective equality impact assessments in all areas of MPA business.</li> <li>• Training and briefings for members and staff.</li> <li>• Effective scrutiny and oversight of MPS EIAs.</li> <li>• Equalities impact properly evaluated as part of Committee decision making process.</li> <li>• Appointment of MPA Head of Equalities and Engagement.</li> <li>• Development of strategic equalities risk register and process to monitor and integration where appropriate into corporate risk register.</li> <li>• Development of a diversity strategy and action plan to be used as a tool to drive performance and monitor continuous improvement over time.</li> <li>• Implementation of Race and Faith Inquiry recommendations.</li> <li>• Equalities a standing agenda item at SMT, BMT and BMG meetings.</li> <li>• All policies, procedures and, business cases to address equalities implications and risks.</li> <li>• Equalities and Engagement portfolio.</li> <li>• Equalities criteria in all person specifications for recruitment.</li> <li>• Information on equalities issues to be</li> </ul>	<p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↔</p> <p style="text-align: center;">A</p>	<p>Guidance on EIA development and oversight has been produced.</p> <p>Equality Act training provided to all staff in February 2011 and a session arranged for Members.</p> <p>Guidance on EIA development and oversight produced.</p> <p>Committee report template revised to ensure fit for purpose regarding equalities impact .</p> <p>New Head of Equalities joined at end of September 2010.</p> <p>Strategic equalities risk register in place and reviewed regularly.</p> <p>Diversity strategy and action plan currently under development.</p> <p>Race and Faith Delivery group to be set up.</p>	<p>A</p>

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
			<p>gathered from staff survey (internal consultation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equality Standard.</li> <li>Effective governance of equalities work within the MPA including SMT management, programme tracking and performance reports.</li> </ul>			
<p>5. Londoners have confidence in the role of the MPA in effectively Holding the MPS to account for performance and ensuring an adequate response to areas of concern.</p>	<p>Failure to define and agree policing priorities.</p> <p>Ineffective MPA oversight and scrutiny of policing performance.</p> <p>Ineffective response to areas of concern for Londoners.</p> <p><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Deputy Chief Executive.</p>	<p>MPA strategic plan and policing priorities not met.</p> <p>Lack of public confidence in policing.</p> <p>Lack of public confidence in the role of the MPA.</p> <p>Damage to the MPA's reputation / credibility.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met Forward and policing plan supported by an effective performance management framework.</li> <li>Met Forward Programme management and monitoring.</li> <li>Effective committee structure and process that promotes transparency and public accountability.</li> <li>Appropriate reporting to and scrutiny of performance at public committees.</li> <li>Clear direction and appropriate support from the MPA to address areas of poor performance.</li> <li>Effective member led scrutiny programme, focusing on key areas for improvement.</li> </ul>	<p>Impact: M</p> <p>Likel'hd: L</p> <p>↔</p> <p>G</p>	<p>Second iteration of Met Forward produced. Performance management framework to be developed in partnership with the PPPI team reflecting KPIs outlined in the policing plan and internal MPA business plan.</p> <p>Framework to be reviewed in light of the second draft, looking at incorporating MPS policing plan and MPA business plan objectives and review of PIDs.</p> <p>Metstandards work and Joint Engagement Meetings assist boroughs by identifying areas for improvement, helping develop solutions and supporting boroughs in delivery.</p> <p>MPA Safer Neighbourhoods scrutiny is being finalised. CLP scrutiny of G20 complete. DNA database and use of DNA in policing</p>	<p>G</p>

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**


Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prompt and appropriate MPA response to concerns raised by the public, inspection and review bodies, independent oversight bodies e.g. Civil Liberties Panel.</li> <li>Effective media/public communication – dedicated MPA Communications Team.</li> </ul>		<p>scrutiny report being drafted.</p> <p>Met Forward Stateholder Management Strategy and delivery plan continues to be implemented. Ongoing monitoring through bi weekly communications meetings.</p>	
<p>6. Secure and embed organisational learning within the MPS.</p>	<p>Ineffective identification of areas of learning.</p> <p>Perceived 'blame culture'.</p> <p>Inappropriate response to areas of learning identified.</p> <p>Lack of accountability.</p> <p>MOPC Implementation results in lack of engagement of the MPS and/ or lack of priority given to organisational learning.</p> <p><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Deputy Chief Executive.</p>	<p>Standards not met and incidents re-occur.</p> <p>Complaints from the public.</p> <p>Reputational damage.</p> <p>Lack of public confidence in policing.</p> <p>Lack of public confidence in the role of the MPA.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Give direction at a senior level that encourages a culture that promotes organisational learning in the MPS.</li> <li>Identify and create a common understanding between the MPA and MPS on areas of learning.</li> <li>Agree and define action to be taken to address areas of learning.</li> <li>Representation on MPS Professional Standards Strategic Committee.</li> <li>Effective policy development that takes account of lessons learnt.</li> <li>Proactive MPA oversight of areas identified.</li> <li>Recognise and communicate effectively improvements achieved through committee process.</li> <li>MOPC implementation plans ensure continued delivery of business as</li> </ul>	<p>Impact: H Likel'hd: M ↔</p> <p>A</p>	<p>MPA participate in MPS Organisational Learning Forum. Quarterly reports on organisational learning go to SOP committee.</p> <p>Regular contact with IPCC and follow up of IPCC recommendations by SOP committee.</p>	<p>A</p>

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
			usual.			
7. Continue to focus on core business of the Authority in times of significant change and challenge.	Challenge to role and purpose of the MPA.	MPA strategic plan, Met Forward and policing priorities not delivered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Robust and cohesive leadership MPA Chair and MPA Chief Executive.</li> </ul>	Impact: M Likel'hd: M  ↑  A		G
	Lack of strategic direction and focus on priorities.	Lack of confidence in policing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear strategy and vision – Met Forward.</li> </ul>		The second iteration of Met Forward has been developed and embedded within the 2011/12 Policing Plan.	
	Ineffective leadership.	Lack of public confidence in the role of the authority.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective and resilient MPA SMT.</li> <li>MPA performance management framework – quarterly strategic reviews.</li> </ul>			
	Ineffective communication.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monthly review of Met Forward Programme by Business Management Group.</li> </ul>		Regularly reviewed at BMG. Updates communicated to all staff on a monthly basis and through bulletins.	
	Ineffective implementation of the new governance arrangements for policing.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Embedding cultural change and new ways of working within the MPA – developing new values and behaviours.</li> </ul>		A set of MPA Standards was developed and launched in February 2011, alongside an action plan resulting from the Staff Survey that is being implemented.	
	<u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective MPA communication strategy, including regular staff meetings and briefings.</li> </ul>		Police reform update for staff circulated regularly.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MOPC implementation plans ensure continued delivery of business as usual.</li> </ul>		Business as usual is considered in all PIDs developed as part of the MOPC implementation programme.	
8. Develop and maintain effective working relationships with key strategic partners in policing: MPS,	Ineffective representation.	MPA strategic plan, Met Forward and policing priorities not delivered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify all key strategic partners.</li> </ul>	Impact: M Likel'hd: M  ↑	Stakeholder engagement mapping to be reviewed now that the second iteration of Met Forward has been agreed.	
	Ineffective lobbying.	Lack of credibility and damage to MPA reputation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop effective communication strategy and plan for engaging with all key strategic partners for the MPA.</li> </ul>			
	Ineffective communication.	Duplication of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open and effective communication</li> </ul>			
	Lack of clarity around					



**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**


Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
Home Office, GLA family, Local authorities, APA, LCJB, NPIA.	respective roles and responsibilities.	work/inefficient use of resources.	between all parties facilitated by the MPA communication strategy and plan.	A		A
	Lack of engagement by partners due to MPA abolition.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish protocols governing the exchange of data / statistics between the MPA and key strategic partners.</li> </ul>			
	<u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate and effective MPA representation at meetings with key strategic partners providing influential input and giving effective feedback.</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MOPC implementation programme includes a stakeholder management and communication strategy.</li> </ul>		Communication to take place with stakeholders to ensure they understand that the functions of the MPA will continue under the new MOPC governance arrangements.	
9. Effective management of the budget, responding appropriately to the economic climate and budget pressures maximising the resources available to policing.	Failure to secure adequate level of funding, particularly due to Comprehensive Spending Review.	MPA strategic plan and policing priorities not met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aligning strategic and financial planning effectively.</li> </ul>	Impact: M Likel'hd: M 		A
	Not aligning the budget to meet agreed priorities.	Poor value for money.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Realistic and accurate MPA budget submission.</li> </ul>			
	Not identifying and/or realising budget efficiencies and savings.	Inefficient/waste use of resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify deliverable savings and monitoring impact on the budget.</li> </ul>		Savings proposals for 2011/12 are being finalised. Savings for subsequent years are yet to be identified.	
	Ineffective scrutiny and monitoring of the budget.	Reputational damage to the MPA and MPS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying opportunities for additional funding and effective lobbying for resources.</li> </ul>		Discussions with the Home Office are ongoing to secure necessary additional Olympics funding.	
	<u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Treasurer.	Lack of sufficient resources for equalities and engagement work, leading to criticism/ challenge from community and/ or employee groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic and efficient use of resources particularly in key areas such as estates, procurement, IS/IT capital programme – Met Support.</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Influential MPA input to and scrutiny of the productivity agenda and Service Improvement Programme.</li> </ul>		Productivity working group meets regularly to progress work in this area.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective MPA scrutiny of the MPS budget – Treasurer, Finance and Resources Committee, Resources</li> </ul>		The 2011/12 budget is being finalised after formal scrutiny by members and officers.	



**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
			and Productivity Sub Committee.		Equality impact assessments are being developed for both MPS and MPA budgets.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective budgetary control framework.</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective budget contingency planning – adequate reserve provision.</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal review activity reports on opportunities for better value for money and increased efficiencies.</li> </ul>		A value for money strategy is being progressed.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunities for collaboration and shared services with partners including GLA, MPS and GLA maximised.</li> </ul>		MPA DARA planned to undertake GLA internal audit function from 1 April 2011 – negotiations being finalised. Other shared service arrangements within the GLA family being explored..	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective management of change programme and clear communication to staff, highlighting need to save money.</li> </ul>			
10. Effective management of risk within the MPA and the MPS.	<p>Ineffective MPA oversight and review of risk management and the internal control framework within the MPS.</p> <p>Lack of strategic direction on risk management.</p> <p>Inadequate policy and procedures supporting the embedding of risk management.</p> <p>Inadequate internal</p>	<p>MPA strategic plan and policing priorities not met.</p> <p>Ineffective decision making.</p> <p>Inefficient use of resources.</p> <p>Potential key risks not identified and subsequently materialise.</p> <p>Damage to reputation and credibility.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective MPA Corporate Governance Committee responsible for the oversight of risk management.</li> </ul>	<p>Impact: M</p> <p>Likel'hd: M</p> <p>↔</p> <p>A</p>	The MPS corporate and business risk registers have informed DARA's overall assessment of risk in informing its 2011/12 work programme.	G
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective internal audit service.</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective MPA Corporate Governance Framework.</li> </ul>		Further review of MPA risk register and evaluation of key control measures.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly defined MPA and MPS risk management strategies supported by effective risk management process.</li> </ul>		DARA review of MPS risk maturity model starts 28/2/11.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MPA SMT, BMG and MPS</li> </ul>			

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
	control framework.  <u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance.	Possibility of legal action against MPA/MPS.  Loss of resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Management Board buy-in to risk management approach.</li> <li>Embedding risk management in MPA/MPS corporate planning and performance management framework.</li> <li>Early identification and escalation of emerging risks through MPA SMT and BMG.</li> <li>BMG review and monitoring of action taken to mitigate and manage corporate and emerging risks.</li> <li>Training for staff/members.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further integration of risk management into MPA planning and performance framework.</li> <li>Met Forward reports to BMG key emerging risks for action. The emerging issues and risks log is updated regularly and presented to BMG.</li> <li>A regular agenda item at BMT meetings.</li> <li>Training for Business Management Team to be organised.</li> </ul>	
11. National role in policing delivered effectively and to the benefit of Londoners (CT, Olympics /Paralympics).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of clarity and definition of national responsibilities.</li> <li>Ineffective governance.</li> <li>Ineffective management of relationships.</li> <li>Inadequate resources.</li> <li>Inadequate oversight.</li> </ul> <u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Deputy Chief Executive.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inability to deliver operational policing requirements effectively.</li> <li>Adverse effect on policing role/priorities in London.</li> <li>Loss of prestige, lack of future ability to influence Damage to reputation.</li> <li>Negative impact of Olympics legacy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working with the MPS and Home Office to clearly define national role and responsibilities.</li> <li>Clearly define strategy and objectives for national role and responsibilities.</li> <li>Develop a defined and effective governance framework for national responsibilities.</li> <li>Secure adequate resources to fulfil national role and responsibilities.</li> <li>Effective performance management framework governing national role in policing.</li> <li>Effective MPA oversight – CT and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact: M</li> <li>Likelihood: M</li> <li></li> <li>A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Olympics role well in hand. Refining MPA CT role and responsibilities as Govt changes to CT national governance materialise. National review of Prevent is complete and Contest due by April 2011.</li> <li>DARA advising on the development of ACPOTAM governance framework.</li> <li>Discussions with the Home Office are ongoing to secure necessary additional Olympics funding.</li> <li>CTPS continues to undertake</li> </ul>	A

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
			<p>Olympics sub committees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective community engagement and consultation with Londoners.</li> </ul>		<p>oversight of all CONTEST strands on a rolling basis.</p> <p>DARA review of Olympics budgetary control framework is in progress.</p>	
<p>12. Effective development and use of MPA expertise, skills, resources and work plans to support delivery of the MPA strategic mission Met Forward.</p>	<p>Lack of clarity around role and purpose of the MPA.</p> <p>Ineffective performance monitoring framework.</p> <p>Inadequately skilled members and workforce.</p> <p>Low morale.</p> <p>Inappropriate staff structure.</p> <p>Inadequate resources, including loss of resources due to maternity leave.</p> <p>Inadequate experience and skills in diversity and overreliance on key individuals to champion change.</p> <p>Lack of succession planning.</p>	<p>Failure to deliver strategy and meet performance targets.</p> <p>Disproportionate number of staff grievances and ETs and grievance culture perception.</p> <p>Damage to reputation and credibility.</p> <p>Workforce not adapting to future needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Favourable employment terms and conditions.</li> <li>Dynamic training and development strategy for staff and members involving a leadership and development programme covering leadership in diversity.</li> <li>Clearly defined HR strategy and policies supported by effective processes that are consistently applied.</li> <li>Clearly defined objectives and work plans designed to meet strategic aims of Met Forward.</li> <li>Met Forward programme management framework.</li> <li>Effective performance management framework.</li> <li>Clearly defined personal objectives linked to unit and corporate objectives.</li> </ul>	<p>Impact: M Likel'hd: L</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↑↑</p> <p style="text-align: center;">A</p>	<p>A statement regarding career progression is being developed as part of Standards work.</p> <p>Project management toolkit developed. Staff training arranged/ support given to embed principles. Met Forward project support available to all project leads.</p> <p>This is being continually developed.</p>	<p>A</p>

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
	<p>Ineffective management and communication to staff of new policing governance arrangements results in above risk causes.</p> <p><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective performance appraisal system for members and staff.</li> <li>• MPA internal communication strategy.</li> <li>• Effective staff representation and consultation.</li> <li>• Effective handling of staff grievances, supported by clearly communicated standards of behaviour expected and training and support for managers in dealing with staff who do not comply.</li> <li>• Clearly defined and tested business continuity plan.</li> <li>• Effective health and safety policies and procedures.</li> <li>• Organisation structure to support delivery of Met Forward and to mainstream equalities within this.</li> <li>• Skills audit of staff and utilisation opportunities maximised.</li> <li>• Mentoring of staff.</li> <li>• Effective MOPC implementation and communication plans, with staff in the MPA and MPS.</li> </ul>		<p>Staff survey conducted summer 2010. Action plan developed and being implemented.</p> <p>Grievance procedure is being reviewed in light of staff survey results. Values and behaviours work lead to new set of MPA standards that were launched in February 2011.</p> <p>A business continuity plan training event was held in January 2011. The plan is to be reviewed following this session.</p> <p>This is a quarterly agenda item at SMT.</p> <p>A review of the work within the equalities and engagement team to be undertaken to encourage mainstreaming of equalities and to ensure the best use of available resources.</p> <p>A skills audit is underway. Team building events and opportunities to utilise and cross fertilise skills will then be sought.</p> <p>Mentoring programme has been launched.</p>	

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
13. High profile MPA initiatives are delivered in line with requirements and expectations.	Inadequate skills and/or resources.	Lack of confidence in policing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly defined objectives and deliverables.</li> </ul>	Impact: M		A
	Ineffective oversight and management.	Reputational damage to the MPA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriately skilled officer support.</li> </ul>	Likel'hd: M		
	Ill defined objectives.	Lack of credibility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dedicating adequate resources to initiative.</li> </ul>	↔		
	Unrealistic expectations.	Inefficient use of resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Setting a reasonable and achievable timescale.</li> </ul>	A	A regular highlight report on delivery progress of high profile initiatives presented to BMG to agree action.	
	Ineffective communication.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective management and oversight and intervention by BMG when required.</li> </ul>			
	<u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective media/public communication strategy.</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Publicly reporting progress and output of high profile reviews.</li> </ul>		Race and Faith review reported to Full Authority and recommendations are being progressed. A multi point entry seminar was held in January 2011. Second iteration of Civil Liberties Panel G20 report was published.	