

**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><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive.</p> | <p>MPA strategic aims and policing priorities not met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ineffective in fighting crime and reducing criminality; failure to provide value for money; and lack of confidence in policing. <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"> MPA strategic mission statement Met Forward supporting the delivery of the London Policing Business Plan and integration of Met Forward 2 into the 2011/12 Policing London Business Plan. MetForward Programme management and monitoring framework. MPA unit work plans drawn up to deliver MetForward monitored by MPA SMT, Business Management Group (BMG) and relevant committees. Robust and cohesive leadership by MPA Chair and MPA Chief Executive. Regular and effective meetings between MPA Chair, MPA Chief Executive and the Commissioner and MPS Management Board. Effective committee structure and process that promotes transparency and public accountability. MPA appointment of ACPO rank officers. | <p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↑</p> <p style="text-align: center;">A</p> | <p>To change as part of MOPC implementation. A joint work strand with the MPS has been initiated to progress. (AJ December 2011)</p> | A |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting and supporting succession planning in the MPS, focusing on identifying effective leaders of the future. | | <p>Ongoing work to progress the MPS response to the MPA scrutiny of succession planning and talent management. (AJ March 2012)</p> <p>Implementation of multi point entry 'proof of concept' exercise to trial new approach to succession planning with UKBA and HMRC (AJ March 2012)</p> | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | | <p>MOPC implementation</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"> MPA to play a full part in shaping of memorandum of understanding and other national initiatives. | | <p>programme being delivered. Key risks identified and action underway to manage the key relationships. (JH January 2012)</p> <p>Continue to work with APACE, APA and Home Office to influence national changes in policing governance. (CC/ JH ongoing)</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</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"> Ensure secondary legislation is developed to cover all areas of policing governance MOPC implementation programme, including management of risk (and 'what if' scenario planning) and key stakeholder relationships. Tracking of Localism Bill and taking action as necessary as part of MOPC implementation. Clearly defined governance framework with appropriate checks and balances for public accountability. Clearly defined purpose and role of governing body. | <p>Impact: H Likel'hd: H</p> <p align="center">↔</p> <p align="center">R</p> | <p>Continue to meet with Home Office officials to ensure secondary legislation covers all gaps (CC/ JH January 2012).</p> <p>MOPC implementation programme being delivered. Key risks identified and action underway to manage the key relationships. (JH January 2012)</p> <p>Continue to monitor progress of Localism Bill and identify and manage risks/ issues for MPA/ MOPC (NP/ FA ongoing)</p> <p>Discussion with Centre for Public Scrutiny ongoing. (FA ongoing)</p> <p>Develop Police and Crime Plan and MoU for MOPC and MPS (CC/ JH January 2012)</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>as usual and the change resulting from MOPC Implementation.</p> <p><u>Risk Owner</u> MPA Chief Executive.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>3. Identify and reflect local priorities and concerns of all Londoners in plans for service delivery going forward.</p> | <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"> Priorities reflected in Met Forward Two. Regular and effective consultation and community engagement with all representative groups – Community Engagement Strategy. All consultative groups are representative, undertaking activities aligned to MPA priorities, performance managed and functioning effectively. Undertaking of annual review of diversity within groups (as part of funding process). Effective engagement with Community stakeholders and partnerships. | <p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇔</p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: 2em;">A</p> | <p>Further work to develop the MOPC engagement model and ensure it is sufficiently diverse is underway. To include a community consultation exercise to inform the development of that model. The implications of the recent disturbances are also being considered in relation to future community engagement plans. (NP December 2011)</p> <p>Review being undertaken to ensure stop/search community monitoring role is more visible. Action plan currently being implemented, including further work will to continue to raise the profile. (NP January 2012)</p> <p>A review of hate crime oversight is being conducted as part of the plans for MOPC implementation. This</p> | G |

**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"> Use results of consultation effectively to inform policing priorities and plans. Demonstrate/promote in the plan how consultation has influenced priorities and plans. Conduct wide consultation, including the business community. Transition plan for new policing governance arrangements including provision for effective consultation with all community groups. | | <p>includes stakeholder consultation and consideration of how to manage this policy area within a new organisational structure. (NP November 2011)</p> <p>Develop Police and Crime Plan for MOPC and MPS (JH January 2012)</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. (FS/ NP January 2011)</p> | |
| 4. Principles of equalities and diversity underpin MPA strategic plan, and policing plan objectives and activities. | Ineffective consultation. | Lack of confidence in policing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Embed equalities and diversity within planning and performance framework. | Impact: M | | A |
| | Lack of impetus and commitment to drive change. | Lack of confidence in the MPA. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct effective equality impact assessments in all areas of MPA and committee business. Guidance on EIA development and oversight is in place. | Likel'hd: M | Met Forward EIA being refreshed in light of publication of Met Forward Two (NN October 2011) | |
| | Lack of awareness and understanding. | Disproportionality. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training and briefings for members and staff. Equality Act training provided to staff and members in spring 2011. | | | |
| | Failure to implement new legislation including the duties specified under the new Equalities Act. | Grievances/ETs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective scrutiny and oversight of MPS EIAs. Guidance on EIA development and oversight is in place. | ↔ | | |
| | | Legal action. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Head of Equalities and Engagement and Equalities and Engagement portfolio in place. | A | | |

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

| Risk Area | Risk Causes | Impact | Control Measures | Current Risk | Further Action | Residual Risk | |
|--|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|---------------|--|
| | <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> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic equalities risk register and process to monitor and integrate where appropriate into corporate risk register in place. Development of a diversity strategy and action plan to be used as a tool to drive performance and monitor continuous improvement over time. Implementation of Race and Faith Inquiry recommendations, via MPS strategic action plan, embedded into the wider change programme. Equalities a standing agenda item at SMT, BMT and BMG meetings. All policies, procedures and, business cases to address equalities implications and risks. Equalities criteria in all person specifications for recruitment. Information on equalities issues to be gathered from staff survey (internal consultation). Equality Standard. Effective governance of equalities work within the MPA including SMT management, programme tracking and performance reports. | <p>Impact: M</p> <p>Likel'hd: H</p> | <p>A draft Strategy has been produced. Corporate priorities for MOPC to be developed, which will feed into the strategy. (FS February 2012).</p> <p>The MPS have made slow but steady progress and we continue to monitor performance in this area. (FS ongoing)</p> | | |
| <p>5. Londoners have confidence in the role of the MPA in effectively Holding the MPS to</p> | <p>Failure to define and agree policing priorities.</p> <p>Ineffective MPA oversight and scrutiny of policing performance.</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> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met Forward Two and policing plan supported by an effective performance management framework. Effective committee structure and process that promotes transparency and public accountability. Appropriate reporting to and scrutiny of | | | | |





**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

| Risk Area | Risk Causes | Impact | Control Measures | Current Risk | Further Action | Residual Risk |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---------------|
| account for performance and ensuring an adequate response to areas of concern. | <p>Ineffective response to areas of concern for Londoners.</p> <p><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Deputy Chief Executive.</p> | Damage to the MPA's reputation / credibility. | performance at public committees. | R | <p>Implementation of Metstandards (JN January 2012)</p> <p>Anti corruption scrutiny in progress with a draft report due by December 2011(SC)</p> | R |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear direction and appropriate support from the MPA to address areas of poor performance. Supported by the Joint Engagement Meetings and Mestandards processes. | | | |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective member led scrutiny programme, focusing on key areas for improvement. | | | |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prompt and appropriate MPA response to concerns raised by the public, inspection and review bodies, independent oversight bodies e.g. Civil Liberties Panel. | | | |
| 6. Secure and embed organisational learning within the MPS. | <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>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"> Give direction at a senior level that encourages a culture that promotes organisational learning in the MPS. MPA participate in MPS Organisational Learning Forum. Quarterly reports on organisational learning go to SOP committee. Regular contact with IPCC and follow up of IPCC recommendations by SOP committee. | <p>Impact: H Likel'hd: M ↔</p> <p>A</p> | | A |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and create a common understanding between the MPA and MPS on areas of learning. | | | |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree and define action to be taken to address areas of learning. | | | |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation on MPS Professional Standards Strategic Committee. | | | |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective policy development that takes | | | |

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

| Risk Area | Risk Causes | Impact | Control Measures | Current Risk | Further Action | Residual Risk |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|---------------|
| | <u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Deputy Chief Executive. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> account of lessons learnt. Proactive MPA oversight of areas identified. Recognise and communicate effectively improvements achieved through committee process. MOPC implementation plans ensure continued delivery of business as usual. | | | |
| 7. Continue to focus on core business of the Authority in times of significant change and challenge. | <p>Challenge to role and purpose of the MPA.</p> <p>Lack of strategic direction and focus on priorities.</p> <p>Ineffective leadership.</p> <p>Ineffective communication.</p> <p>Ineffective implementation of the new governance arrangements for policing.</p> <p><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive.</p> | <p>MPA strategic plan, Met Forward and policing priorities not delivered.</p> <p>Lack of confidence in policing.</p> <p>Lack of public confidence in the role of the authority.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robust and cohesive leadership MPA Chair and MPA Chief Executive. Clear strategy and vision – Met Forward Two, embedded in 2011/12 Policing London Business Plan. Effective and resilient MPA SMT. MPA performance management framework – quarterly strategic reviews. Bi-monthly review of Met Forward Programme by Business Management Group. Embedding cultural change and new ways of working within the MPA – MPA Standards launched in February 2011, Effective MPA communication strategy, including regular staff meetings and briefings and regular police reform update emails. MOPC implementation plans ensure continued delivery of business as usual and smooth transition. | <p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p align="center">↑</p> <p align="center">A</p> | <p>A follow up staff survey has been conducted. The results will be published along with an action plan in October (KD October 2011)</p> <p>Deliver MOPC implementation programme (CC/ JH January 2012)</p> | G |
| 8. Develop and maintain effective working | <p>Ineffective representation.</p> <p>Ineffective lobbying.</p> | MPA strategic plan, Met Forward and policing priorities not delivered. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All key strategic partners identified. Effective communication strategy and plan for engaging openly with all key strategic partners for the MPA in place. | <p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> | | |

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

| Risk Area | Risk Causes | Impact | Control Measures | Current Risk | Further Action | Residual Risk |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|---------------|
| relationships with key strategic partners in policing: MPS, Home Office, GLA family, Local authorities, APA, LCJB, NPIA. | Ineffective communication. | Lack of credibility and damage to MPA reputation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish protocols governing the exchange of data / statistics between the MPA and key strategic partners. |  A | An operating framework to be developed with MPS for MOPC arrangements. To include provision of information to MOPC. (JH January 2012) | A |
| | Lack of clarity around respective roles and responsibilities. | Duplication of work/inefficient use of resources. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate and effective MPA representation at meetings with key strategic partners providing influential input and giving effective feedback. | | | |
| | Lack of engagement by partners due to MPA abolition. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MOPC implementation programme includes a stakeholder management and communication strategy. | | | |
| 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. | MPA strategic plan and policing priorities not met. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic and financial planning effectively aligned. | Impact: M Likel'hd: M  A | | A |
| | Not aligning the budget to meet agreed priorities. | Poor value for money. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realistic and accurate MPA budget submission. | | | |
| | Not identifying and/or realising budget efficiencies and savings. | Inefficient/waste use of resources. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify deliverable savings and monitoring impact on the budget. | | | |
| | Ineffective scrutiny and monitoring of the budget. | Reputational damage to the MPA and MPS. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying opportunities for additional funding and effective lobbying for resources. | | | |
| | | Lack of sufficient resources for equalities and engagement work, leading to criticism/ challenge from community and/ or employee groups. | | | Savings proposals for 2012/13 are being developed. (BA November 2011) Discussions with the Home Office are ongoing to lobby for additional protest policing funding. (BA March 2012) A process has been agreed with Members and the MPS for dealing with claims under the Riot Damages Act. Discussions are ongoing with the Home office to recover costs of additional policing for the disorder in August 2011 and the liabilities under the RDA. The MPA is looking for 100% recovery of all additional costs. (BA | |
| | <u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive. | | | | | |
| | <u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Treasurer. | | | | | |


**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"> Economic and efficient use of resources particularly in key areas such as estates, procurement, IS/IT capital programme – Met Support. Influential MPA input to and scrutiny of the productivity agenda and Service Improvement Programme. Effective MPA scrutiny of the MPS budget – Treasurer, Finance and Resources Committee, Resources and Productivity Sub Committee – including equality impact assessments. Effective budgetary control framework. Effective budget contingency planning – adequate reserve provision. Internal review activity reports on opportunities for better value for money and increased efficiencies. Opportunities for collaboration and shared services with partners including GLA, MPS and GLA maximised. Internal audit shared service arrangement for London Fire Brigade in place. | | <p>November 2011)</p> <p>A value for money strategy is being progressed. (AA March 2012)</p> <p>Shared services programme to explore feasibility will start in October 2011 and conclude in December 2011. (JN December 2011)</p> | |
| <p>10. Effective management of risk within the MPA and the MPS.</p> | <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</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</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective MPA Corporate Governance Committee responsible for the oversight of risk management. Effective internal audit service. Effective MPA Corporate Governance Framework. Clearly defined MPA and MPS risk management strategies supported by effective risk management process. MPA SMT, BMG and MPS Management Board buy-in to risk | <p>Impact: M</p> <p>Likel'hd: M</p> <p>↔</p> | <p>DARA review of MPS risk maturity model. (JN November 2011)</p> | |

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

| Risk Area | Risk Causes | Impact | Control Measures | Current Risk | Further Action | Residual Risk |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|---------------|
| | <p>procedures supporting the embedding of risk management.</p> <p>Inadequate internal control framework.</p> <p><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance.</p> | <p>subsequently materialise.</p> <p>Damage to reputation and credibility.</p> <p>Possibility of legal action against MPA/MPS.</p> <p>Loss of resources.</p> | <p>management approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embedded risk management in MPA/MPS corporate planning and performance management framework. • Early identification and escalation of emerging risks through MPA SMT and BMG. • BMG review and monitoring of action taken to mitigate and manage corporate and emerging risks. • Risk training for staff/members. | A | <p>Risk training for staff to be implemented following review of MOPC risk management approach (JN & KD January 2011)</p> | G |
| <p>11. National role in policing delivered effectively and to the benefit of Londoners (CT, Olympics /Paralympics).</p> | <p>Lack of clarity and definition of national responsibilities.</p> <p>Ineffective governance.</p> <p>Ineffective management of relationships.</p> <p>Inadequate resources.</p> <p>Inadequate oversight.</p> <p>MOPC implementation results in loss of lead members in areas such as CT.</p> <p>Lack of clarity regarding role of NCA.</p> <p><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Deputy Chief</p> | <p>Inability to deliver operational policing requirements effectively.</p> <p>Adverse effect on policing role/priorities in London.</p> <p>Loss of prestige, lack of future ability to influence Damage to reputation.</p> <p>Negative impact of Olympics legacy.</p> <p>Loss of knowledge regarding key areas such as CT.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly defined national Olympics and CT role and responsibilities • Clearly defined strategy and objectives for national role and responsibilities. • Develop a defined and effective governance framework for national responsibilities. • Secure adequate resources to fulfil national role and responsibilities. Necessary additional Olympics | <p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p>↔</p> <p>A</p> | <p>Refining MPA CT role and responsibilities as Govt changes to CT national governance materialise. National review of Prevent is complete and Contest due by July 2011. National reviews of Prevent and Contest have been undertaken and CTPS is scrutinising any strategic change arising as a result of the revised strategies. Their next report is due in Nov 2011 (SC).</p> <p>DARA review of ACPO TAM governance framework due to conclude December 2011. (JN December 2011)</p> | A |

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

| Risk Area | Risk Causes | Impact | Control Measures | Current Risk | Further Action | Residual Risk |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|---------------|
| | Executive. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> funding secured. Effective performance management framework governing national role in policing. Effective MPA oversight – CT and Olympics sub committees. CTPS oversight of all CONTEST strands. Effective budgetary control framework for Olympics in place. | | | |
| 12. Effective development and use of MPA expertise, skills, resources and work plans to support delivery of the MPA strategic mission Met Forward. | Lack of clarity around role and purpose of the MPA. | Failure to deliver strategy and meet performance targets. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. | Impact: M Likel'hd: L  A | | A |
| | Ineffective performance monitoring framework. | Disproportionate number of staff grievances and ETs and grievance culture perception. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Favourable employment terms and conditions. | | | |
| | Inadequately skilled members and workforce. | Damage to reputation and credibility. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dynamic training and development strategy for staff and members involving a leadership and development programme covering leadership in diversity. MPA skills audit and associated training delivered to all staff. | | Follow up work to the MPA skills audit is being incorporated into interview skills training being delivered in September 2011. Further plans are to embed this into performance appraisal process and cross working. KD will meet with Unit Heads over the next couple of months to take this forward. (KD November 2011) | |
| | Low morale. | Workforce not adapting to future needs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly defined HR strategy and policies supported by effective processes that are consistently applied. | | | |
| | Inappropriate staff structure. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly defined objectives and work plans designed to meet strategic aims of Met Forward. Project management toolkit developed. Staff training arranged/ support given to embed | | | |
| | Inadequate resources, including loss of resources due to maternity leave. | | | | | |
| Inadequate experience and skills in diversity and overreliance on key individuals to champion change. | | | | | | |
| Lack of succession planning. | | | | | | |

**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> | | <p>principles. Met Forward project support available to all project leads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective performance management framework with clearly defined personal objectives linked to unit and corporate objectives and effective performance appraisal system for members and staff.. • MPA internal communication strategy. • Effective staff representation and consultation. • 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. • Clearly defined and tested business continuity plan (BCP). • Effective health and safety policies and procedures. Reviewed quarterly by SMT. • Organisation structure to support delivery of Met Forward and equalities mainstreamed within this. • Mentoring of staff. • Appropriately skilled officer support. • Dedicating adequate resources to | | <p>Grievance procedure is being reviewed and updated in light of staff survey results. (KD December 2011)</p> <p>The BCP has been updated and will be exercised on 7 October 2011, with a view to ensuring that an effective BCP is in place for the creation of the MOPC. (BA December 2011)</p> <p>Mentoring programme has been launched then put on hold due to changes at Safer London Foundation. This will resume sometime in October. (KD December 2011)</p> | |

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

| Risk Area | Risk Causes | Impact | Control Measures | Current Risk | Further Action | Residual Risk |
|-----------|-------------|--------|---|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| | | | initiative. • Setting a reasonable and achievable timescale. • Effective management and oversight and intervention by BMG when required. • Effective media/public communication strategy. • Publicly reporting progress and output of high profile reviews. | | | |

Further Action Owner

CC – Catherine Crawford, Chief Executive
 AA – Annabel Adams, Deputy Treasurer
 AJ – Alan Johnson, Met HR Officer
 NP – Natasha Plummer, EPU Manager
 FA – Fauzia Ashraf-Malik, Policy Development Officer

JH – Jane Harwood, Deputy Chief Executive
 NN – Nishi Nathwani, Met Forward Project Officer
 FS – Fay Scott, Head of Equalities and Engagement
 HS- Helen Sargeant, Head of Professional Standards

BA – Bob Atkins, Treasurer
 JN – Julie Norgrove, Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance,
 SC – Siobhan Coldwell Head of Policing, Policy, Scrutiny & Review
 KD – Kerry Dee, HR Business Partner