

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
1. Provide clearly defined strategic direction to the MPS in a transparent environment that promotes public accountability	Lack of clarity around aims, objectives and priorities of MPA	MPA strategic aims and policing priorities not met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ineffective in fighting crime and reducing criminality failure to provide value for money lack of confidence in policing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPA strategic mission statement Met Forward supporting the delivery of the London Policing Business Plan 	Impact: M Likelihood: M ↓	Comments from members on the draft iteration of 'Driving the Met Forward' have been received. Discussions taking place with MPS about integrating the two documents. To be presented to November BMG for comment.	A
	Lack of clarity and agreement of policing priorities		Lack of public confidence in the role of the MPA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MetForward Programme management and monitoring framework 	
	Ineffective leadership		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPA unit work plans drawn up to deliver MetForward monitored by MPA SMT, Business Management Group (BMG) and relevant committees. 	A	MPA work plans reviewed to ensure that areas of work reflect which area of Met Forward is supported.	
	Ineffective public committee meeting structure and process		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robust and cohesive leadership by MPA Chair and MPA Chief Executive 			
	<u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular and effective meetings between MPA Chair, MPA Chief Executive and the Commissioner and MPS Management Board 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective committee structure and process that promotes transparency and public accountability 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPA appointment of ACPO rank officers 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting and supporting succession planning in the MPS, focusing on identifying effective leaders of the future 			

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

<p>2. To preserve appropriate public accountability and governance in policing</p>	<p>Government legislation and proposed changes outlined in 21st Century Policing document, including abolition of MPA</p> <p>Loss of partner and/ or MPS engagement because of the proposed 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><u>Risk Owner</u> MPA Chief Executive</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"> Engage with and influence consultation on proposed changes in accountability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly defined governance framework with appropriate checks and balances for public accountability Clearly defined purpose and role of governing body Appropriate staff and resources to support governance structure 	<p>Impact: H Likel'hd: H</p> <p>↔</p> <p>R</p> <p>R</p>	<p>MPA submitted response to the consultation paper 'Policing in the 21st Century' in September 2010.</p> <p>Senior management meetings with Home Office officials are ongoing.</p> <p>Senior Management input to APACE and PATS submissions.</p> <p>Await framework to support the Home Office proposals.</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A</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>Concerns and local priorities of Londoners are not addressed</p> <p>Lack of public confidence in policing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities reflected in Met Forward 	<p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p>↔</p>	<p>Draft second iteration of Met Forward produced, to reflect current public and Mayoral priorities. Board agreement of approach by members at away session on the 29 October. Additional strategic drivers added.</p>	<p></p>

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

	<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>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"> Regular and effective consultation and community engagement with all representative groups – Community Engagement Strategy Ensure all consultative groups are representative and functioning effectively. Undertaking of annual review of diversity within groups (as part of funding process). Effective engagement with Community stakeholders and partnerships Use results of consultation effectively to inform policing priorities and plans Demonstrate/promote in the plan how consultation has influenced priorities and plans Conduct wider consultation, particularly within business community Transition plan for new PCC structure including provision for effective consultation with all community groups 	<p align="center">A</p>	<p>Implementation of Community Engagement Strategy signed off by Full Authority in July 2010.</p> <p>CPEG review is being undertaken to refocus towards targeted engagement with under-represented groups. Action plan currently 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>Relevant stakeholders are encouraging businesses to take part in the current consultation exercise.</p>	<p align="center">G</p>
<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</p>	<p>Lack of confidence in policing</p> <p>Lack of confidence in the MPA</p> <p>Disproportionality</p> <p>Grievances/ETs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Embed equalities and diversity within planning and performance framework Conduct effective equality impact assessments in all areas of MPA business Training and briefings for members and staff 	<p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p align="center">↑</p>	<p>Guidance to be produced on SMT's responsibilities to improve quality of EIAs</p> <p>Quarterly Equality Act Briefings Update to be implemented</p>	

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

	<p>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>Legal action</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective scrutiny and oversight of MPS EIAs • Equalities impact properly evaluated as part of Committee decision making process • Appointment of MPA Head of Equalities and Engagement • Development of strategic equalities risk register and process to monitor and integration where appropriate into corporate risk register • 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 • Equalities a standing agenda item at SMT, BMT and BMG meetings • All policies, procedures and, business cases to address equalities implications and risks • Equalities and Engagement portfolio • 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>A</p>	<p>Committee report template currently being 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 under development</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>
<p>5. Londoners have confidence in the role of the</p>	<p>Failure to define and agree policing priorities</p> <p>Ineffective MPA</p>	<p>MPA strategic plan and policing priorities not met</p> <p>Lack of public confidence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met Forward and policing plan supported by an effective performance management framework 	<p>Impact: M</p>	<p>Draft iteration of Met Forward produced. Performance management framework to be produced in partnership</p>	

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

<p>MPA in effectively Holding the MPS to account for performance and ensuring an adequate response to areas of concern</p>	<p>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>in policing</p> <p>Lack of public confidence in the role of the MPA</p> <p>Damage to the MPA's reputation / credibility</p>		<p>Likelihood: L</p> <p align="center">↔</p> <p align="center">G</p>	<p>with the PPPI team reflecting KPIs outlined in the policing plan and internal MPA business plan.</p>	<p align="center">G</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met Forward Programme management and monitoring 		<p>To be reviewed in light of the refresh – looking at incorporating MPS policing plan and MPA business plan objectives and review of PIDs</p>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective committee structure and process that promotes transparency and public accountability 		<p>Better promotion of what the committees are doing to be considered</p>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate reporting to and scrutiny of performance at public committees 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear direction and appropriate support from the MPA to address areas of poor performance 		<p>Metstandards work and Joint Engagement Meetings assist boroughs by identifying areas for improvement, helping develop solutions and supporting boroughs in delivery</p>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective member led scrutiny programme, focusing on key areas for improvement 		<p>MPA Safer Neighbourhoods scrutiny is progressing. CLP scrutiny of G20 complete. DNA database and use of DNA in policing scrutiny underway.</p>	
			<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 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective media/public communication – dedicated MPA Communications Team 		<p>Met Forward Stateholder Management Strategy and delivery plan produced and agreed by BMG / SMT. Ongoing monitoring through bi weekly communications meetings</p>	

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

<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><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"> Give direction at a senior level that encourages a culture that promotes organisational learning in the MPS <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and create a common understanding between the MPA and MPS on areas of learning Agree and define action to be taken to address areas of learning Representation on MPS Professional Standards Strategic Committee Effective policy development that takes account of lessons learnt Proactive MPA oversight of areas identified Recognise and communicate effectively improvements achieved through committee process 	<p>Impact: H Likel'hd: M</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↔</p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: 2em;">A</p>	<p>MPA participate in MPS Organisational Learning Forum. Quarterly reports on organisational learning go to committee</p> <p>Regular contact with IPCC and follow up of IPCC recommendations by SOP committee</p>	A
<p>7. Continue to focus on core business of the Authority in times of significant change and challenge.</p>	<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><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 <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective and resilient MPA SMT MPA performance management framework – quarterly strategic reviews Monthly review of Met Forward Programme by Business Management 	<p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↑</p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: 2em;">A</p>	<p>Comments from members on the draft iteration of 'Driving the Met Forward'. Discussions taking place with MPS about integrating the two documents. To be presented to November BMG for comment.</p> <p>Specific reporting template developed. Ongoing</p>	G

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

			Group		reporting since February 2010. Updates communicated to all staff on a monthly basis and through notice board bulletins.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Embedding cultural change and new ways of working within the MPA – developing new values and behaviours 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement new structure to support the delivery of corporate priorities 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective MPA communication strategy, including regular staff meetings and briefings 		New police reform update for staff being circulated.	
8. Develop and maintain effective working relationships with key strategic partners in policing: MPS, Home Office, GLA family, Local authorities, APA, LCJB, NPIA	<p>Ineffective representation</p> <p>Ineffective lobbying</p> <p>Ineffective communication</p> <p>Lack of clarity around respective roles and responsibilities</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 credibility and damage to MPA reputation</p> <p>Duplication of work/inefficient use of resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify all key strategic partners 	<p>Impact: M Likel'hd: L</p> <p align="center">↔</p> <p align="center">G</p>	Stakeholder engagement mapping completed in May in relation to Met Forward. Delivery plan produced to publicise Met Forward; both internally and to external stakeholders. To be reviewed in light of the next iteration of Met Forward.	G
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop effective communication strategy and plan for engaging with all key strategic partners for the MPA 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open and effective communication between all parties facilitated by the MPA communication strategy and plan 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish protocols governing the exchange of data / statistics between the MPA and key strategic partners 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate and effective MPA representation at meetings with key strategic partners providing influential input and giving effective feedback 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective lobbying, demonstrate publicly the need for and benefits of the MPA 			

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

<p>9. Effective management of the budget, responding appropriately to the economic climate and budget pressures maximising the resources available to policing</p>	<p>Failure to secure adequate level of funding, particularly due to Comprehensive Spending Review</p> <p>Not aligning the budget to meet agreed priorities</p> <p>Not identifying and/or realising budget efficiencies and savings</p> <p>Ineffective scrutiny and monitoring of the budget</p> <p><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Treasurer</p>	<p>MPA strategic plan and policing priorities not met</p> <p>Poor value for money</p> <p>Inefficient/waste use of resources</p> <p>Reputational damage to the MPA and MPS</p> <p>Lack of sufficient resources for equalities and engagement work, leading to criticism/ challenge from community and/ or employee groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligning strategic and financial planning effectively 	<p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p>↔</p> <p>A</p>		<p>A</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realistic and accurate MPA budget submission 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify deliverable savings and monitoring impact on the budget 		<p>Savings proposals for 2011/12 are being finalised. CPEG/CDRP performance is being benchmarked to use best practice to manage costs</p>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying opportunities for additional funding and effective lobbying for resources 			
			<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 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Influential MPA input to and scrutiny of the productivity agenda and Service Improvement Programme 		<p>Productivity working group meets regularly to progress work in this area.</p>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective MPA scrutiny of the MPS budget – Treasurer, Finance and Resources Committee, Resources and Productivity Sub Committee 		<p>Informal budget scrutiny complete. Formal scrutiny currently being carried out. Equality impact assessments to be undertaken on both MPS and MPA budgets</p>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective budgetary control framework 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective budget contingency planning – adequate reserve provision 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal review activity reports on opportunities for better value for money and increased efficiencies 		<p>A value for money strategy is under development</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunities for collaboration and shared services with partners including GLA, MPS and GLA maximised 	<p>Shared services opportunities currently being explored.</p>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective management of change 						

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

			programme and clear communication to staff, highlighting need to save money			
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 control framework</p> <p><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance</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> <p>Possibility of legal action against MPA/MPS</p> <p>Loss of resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective MPA Corporate Governance Committee responsible for the oversight of risk management. 	<p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p>↔</p> <p>A</p>		G
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective Internal Audit Service 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective MPA Corporate Governance Framework 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly defined MPA and MPS risk management strategies supported by effective risk management process 		Further review of MPA risk register and evaluation of key control measures.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPA SMT, BMG and MPS Management Board buy-in to risk management approach 		DARA review of MPS risk maturity model.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Embedding risk management in MPA/MPS corporate planning and performance management framework 		Further integration of risk management into MPA planning and performance framework.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early identification and escalation of emerging risks through MPA SMT and BMG 		Met Forward reports to BMG key emerging risks for action. The emerging issues and risks log is updated regularly and presented to BMG.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BMG review and monitoring of action taken to mitigate and manage corporate and emerging risks. 		A regular agenda item at BMT meetings.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training for staff/members 		Training for Business Management Team to be organised.	
11. National role in policing delivered effectively and to the benefit of Londoners (CT, Olympics)	<p>Lack of clarity and definition of national responsibilities</p> <p>Ineffective governance</p> <p>Ineffective</p>	<p>Inability to deliver operational policing requirements effectively</p> <p>Adverse effect on policing role/priorities in London</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working with the MPS and Home Office to clearly define national role and responsibilities 	<p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p>↔</p>	<p>Olympics role well in hand. Refining MPA CT role and responsibilities as Govt changes to CT national governance materialise. National review of Prevent due to be completed by</p>	

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

/Paralympics)	management of relationships	Loss of prestige, lack of future ability to influence Damage to reputation		A	January 2011 and Contest by April 2011. MPA to submit contribution to Prevent review.	A
	Inadequate resources		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly define strategy and objectives for national role and responsibilities 			
	Inadequate oversight	Negative impact of Olympics legacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a defined and effective governance framework for national responsibilities 		DARA advising on the development of ACPOTAM governance framework.	
	<u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Deputy Chief Executive		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure adequate resources to fulfil national role and responsibilities 		Await impact of spending review.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective performance management framework governing national role in policing 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective MPA oversight – CT and Olympics sub committees 		CTPS continues to undertake oversight of all CONTEST strands on a rolling basis.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective community engagement and consultation with Londoners 		DARA review of Olympics budgetary control framework.	
12. Effective development and use of MPA expertise, skills, resources and work plans to support delivery of the MPA strategic mission MetForward	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 Likelihood: L ↑ A	A statement regarding career progression is being developed as part of Standards work.	G
	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 			
	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 		Project management toolkit	
	Inadequate resources, including loss of					

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

<p>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><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive</p>		plans designed to meet strategic aims of MetForward		developed. Staff training arranged/support given to embed principles. Met Forward project support available to all project leads.	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met Forward Programme management framework 		This is being continually developed.	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective performance management framework 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly defined personal objectives linked to unit and corporate objectives 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective performance appraisal system for members and staff 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPA internal communication strategy 			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective staff representation and consultation 		Staff survey conducted summer 2010. Results to be discussed with unions and action plan developed.	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 		Grievance procedure to be reviewed in light of staff survey results. Values and behaviours work has lead to new set of MPA standards which will be communicated shortly.	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly defined and tested business continuity plan 		A business continuity plan training event is scheduled.	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective health and safety policies and procedures 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisation structure to support delivery of Met Forward and to mainstream equalities within this, 	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.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills audit of staff and utilisation opportunities maximised 	A skills audit is underway. Team building events and opportunities to utilise and				

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mentoring of staff 		<p>cross fertilise skills will then be sought.</p> <p>Mentoring programme has been launched</p>	
13. High profile MPA initiatives are delivered in line with requirements and expectations	<p>Inadequate skills and/or resources</p> <p>Ineffective oversight and management</p> <p>Ill defined objectives</p> <p>Unrealistic expectations</p> <p>Ineffective communication</p> <p><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive</p>	<p>Lack of confidence in policing</p> <p>Reputational damage to the MPA</p> <p>Lack of credibility</p> <p>Inefficient use of resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly defined objectives and deliverables 	<p>Impact: M</p> <p>Likel'hd: M</p> <p>↔</p> <p>A</p>		<p>A</p> <p>A regular highlight report on delivery progress of high profile initiatives to be presented to BMG, after discussion with BMT or SMT where appropriate. Clear recommendations for action to be taken by BMG to be presented when required.</p> <p>Race and Faith review reported to Full Authority. Recommendations are going to CEP in December 2010. Response reports from MPA and MPS to go to Full Authority in November 2010. Race and Faith Delivery Group to be set up.</p> <p>Second iteration of Civil Liberties Panel G20 report will be published by the end of November 2010.</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriately skilled officer support 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dedicating adequate resources to initiative 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting a reasonable and achievable timescale 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective management and oversight and intervention by BMG when required 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective media/public communication strategy 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publicly reporting progress and output of high profile reviews 						