



**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
	and management of police finances  Conflict in agreement on policing priorities  <u>Risk Owner</u> MPA Chief Executive		for public accountability  • Clearly defined purpose and role of governing body  • Appropriate staff and resources to support governance structure	<b>R</b>	submissions.  Await framework to support the Home Office proposals.	<b>A</b>
Identify and reflect local priorities and concerns of all Londoners in plans for service delivery going forward	Ineffective consultation  Inadequate consideration of Londoners concerns  Ineffective planning process  <u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Deputy Chief Executive	Concerns and local priorities of Londoners are not addressed  Lack of public confidence in policing  Lack of public confidence in the role of the MPA	<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>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> </ul>	Impact: M Likel'hd: M ⇔  A	Review of Met Forward.  Implementation of Community Engagement Strategy signed off by Full Authority in July 2010.     Relevant stakeholders are encouraging businesses to take part in the current consultation exercise.	<b>G</b>
Principles of equalities and diversity underpin MPA strategic plan, and policing plan objectives and activities.	Ineffective consultation  Lack of commitment  Lack of awareness and understanding  Failure to implement new legislation  <u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive	Lack of confidence in policing  Lack of confidence in the MPA  Disproportionality  Grievances/ETs  Legal action	<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 for members and staff</li> <li>Monitoring and delivery of Generic Equalities Scheme</li> <li>Effective scrutiny and oversight of MPS EIAs</li> <li>Equalities impact properly evaluated as part of Committee decision making process</li> </ul>	Impact: M Likel'hd: L ⇔  G		<b>G</b>

**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>Appointment of MPA Head of Equalities and Engagement</li> </ul>	G	New Head of Equalities taking up post end of September 2010.	G	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equalities and Engagement portfolio</li> </ul>				
Londoners have confidence in the role of the MPA in effectively scrutinising MPS performance and ensuring an adequate response to areas of concern	<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> </ul>	<p>Impact: M</p> <p>Likel'hd: L</p> <p align="center">↔</p> <p align="center">G</p>		<p>More robust performance monitoring arrangements to be implemented by October 2010.</p> <p>MPA Safer Neighbourhoods scrutiny at planning stage. CLP scrutiny of G20 complete. DNA database and use of DNA in policing scrutiny underway.</p> <p>Publicity of Met Forward in progress.</p>	<p align="center">G</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met Forward Programme management and monitoring</li> </ul>				
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective committee structure and process that promotes transparency and public accountability</li> </ul>				
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate reporting to and scrutiny of performance at public committees</li> </ul>				
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear direction and appropriate support from the MPA to address areas of poor performance</li> </ul>				
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective member led scrutiny programme, focusing on key areas for improvement</li> </ul>				
			<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> </ul>				
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective media/public communication – dedicated MPA Communications Team</li> </ul>				
Secure and embed organisational	Ineffective identification of areas of learning	Standards not met and incidents re-occur	<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> </ul>	<p>Impact: H</p> <p>Likel'hd:</p>			

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
learning within the MPS.	Perceived 'blame culture'  Inappropriate response to areas of learning identified  Lack of accountability  <u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Deputy Chief Executive	Complaints from the public  Reputational damage  Lack of public confidence in policing  Lack of public confidence in the role of the MPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify and create a common understanding between the MPA and MPS on areas of learning</li> </ul>	M ↔  A		A
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree and define action to be taken to address areas of learning</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Representation on MPS Professional Standards Strategic Committee</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective policy development that takes account of lessons learnt</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proactive MPA oversight of areas identified</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognise and communicate effectively improvements achieved through committee process</li> </ul>			
Continue to focus on core business of the Authority in times of significant change and challenge.	Challenge to role and purpose of the MPA  Lack of strategic direction and focus on priorities  Ineffective leadership  Ineffective communication  <u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive	MPA strategic plan, Met Forward and policing priorities not delivered  Lack of confidence in policing  Lack of public confidence in the role of the authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Robust and cohesive leadership MPA Chair and MPA Chief Executive</li> </ul>	Impact: M Likel'hd: L ↔  G		G
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear strategy and vision – Met Forward</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective and resilient MPA SMT</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MPA performance management framework – quarterly strategic reviews</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monthly review of Met Forward Programme by Business Management Group</li> </ul>			
			<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>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement new structure to support the delivery of corporate priorities</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective MPA communication strategy, including regular staff meetings and briefings</li> </ul>		New police reform update for staff.	
Develop and maintain effective	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:		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop effective communication strategy and plan for engaging with all</li> </ul>			

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
working relationships with key strategic partners in policing: MPS, Home Office, GLA family, Local authorities, APA, LCJB, NPJA	Ineffective lobbying	Lack of credibility and damage to MPA reputation  Duplication of work/inefficient use of resources	key strategic partners for the MPA	L ↔  G		G
	Ineffective communication		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open and effective communication between all parties facilitated by the MPA communication strategy and plan</li> </ul>			
	Lack of clarity around respective roles and responsibilities		<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>Effective lobbying, demonstrate publicly the need for and benefits of the MPA</li> </ul>			
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"> <li>Aligning strategic and financial planning effectively</li> </ul>	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"> <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>			
	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>			
	<u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Treasurer		<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>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective MPA scrutiny of the budget – Treasurer, Finance and Resources Committee, Resources and Productivity Sub Committee</li> </ul>			
			<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>			


**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>Internal review activity reports on opportunities for better value for money and increased efficiencies</li> </ul>			
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>	MPA strategic plan and policing priorities not met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective MPA Corporate Governance Committee responsible for the oversight of risk management.</li> </ul>	<p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p>↔</p> <p>A</p>		G
		Ineffective decision making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective Internal Audit Service</li> </ul>			
		Inefficient use of resources	<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.	
		Potential key risks not identified and subsequently materialise	<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.	
		Damage to reputation and credibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MPA SMT, BMG and MPS Management Board buy-in to risk management approach</li> </ul>			
		Possibility of legal action against MPA/MPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Embedding risk management in MPA/MPS corporate planning and performance management framework</li> </ul>		Further integration of risk management into MPA planning and performance framework.	
		Loss of resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Early identification and escalation of emerging risks through MPA SMT and BMG</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BMG review and monitoring of action taken to mitigate and manage corporate and emerging risks.</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training for staff/members</li> </ul>		Training for Business Management Team planned for October 2010.	
National role in policing delivered effectively and to the benefit of Londoners	<p>Lack of clarity and definition of national responsibilities</p> <p>Ineffective governance</p>	Inability to deliver operational policing requirements effectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working with the MPS and Home Office to clearly define national role and responsibilities</li> </ul>	<p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p> <p>↔</p>	Olympics role well in hand. Refining MPA CT role and responsibilities as Govt changes to CT national governance materialise.	
		Adverse effect on policing role/priorities in London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly define strategy and objectives</li> </ul>			

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
(CT, Olympics /Paralympics)	Ineffective management of relationships	Loss of prestige, lack of future ability to influence Damage to reputation	for national role and responsibilities	A	DARA advising on the development of ACPOTAM governance framework.	A
	Inadequate resources	Negative impact of Olympics legacy	• Develop a defined and effective governance framework for national responsibilities		Await impact of spending review.	
	Inadequate oversight		• Secure adequate resources to fulfil national role and responsibilities			
	Risk Owner: MPA Deputy Chief Executive		• Effective performance management framework governing national role in policing		CTPS continues to undertake oversight of all CONTEST strands on a rolling basis.	
			• Effective MPA oversight – CT and Olympics sub committees		DARA review of Olympics budgetary control framework.	
			• Effective community engagement and consultation with Londoners			
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	• 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 ↔  G		G
	Ineffective performance monitoring framework	Disproportionate number of staff grievances and ETs	• Favourable employment terms and conditions			
	Inadequately skilled members and workforce	Damage to reputation and credibility	• Dynamic training and development strategy for staff and members involving a leadership and development programme			
	Low morale	Workforce not adapting to future needs	• Clearly defined HR strategy and policies supported by effective processes that are consistently applied			
	Inappropriate staff structure		• Clearly defined objectives and work plans designed to meet strategic aims of MetForward		Project management toolkit developed. Staff training arranged/support given to embed principles.	
	Inadequate resources					

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY  
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
	<u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <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</li> <li>Clearly defined and tested business continuity plan</li> <li>Effective health and safety policies and procedures</li> </ul>		     Analyse output of MPA staff survey.  A business continuity plan training event is scheduled.	
High profile MPA initiatives are delivered in line with requirements and expectations	Inadequate skills and/or resources  Ineffective oversight and management  Ill defined objectives  Unrealistic expectations  Ineffective communication  <u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive	Lack of confidence in policing  Reputational damage to the MPA  Lack of credibility  Inefficient use of resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly defined objectives and deliverables</li> <li>Appropriately skilled officer support</li> <li>Dedicating adequate resources to initiative</li> <li>Setting a reasonable and achievable timescale</li> <li>Effective management and oversight</li> <li>Effective media/public communication strategy</li> <li>Publicly reporting progress and output of high profile reviews</li> </ul>	Impact: M Likelihood: M   A	     Race and Faith review reported to Full Authority. Recommendations are going to CEP in November 2010.	A