


**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"> 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. 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. Promoting and supporting succession planning in the MPS, focusing on identifying effective leaders of the future. MOPC implementation programme, including management of risk (and 'what if' scenario planning) and key stakeholder relationships. MPA committee meetings scheduled post October 2011 in parallel with MOPC implementation plans. 	<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>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. A joint work strand with the MPS has been initiated to progress.</p> <p>MOPC implementation programme developed with key risks identified and action underway to manage the key relationships.</p> <p>Review how much MPA business can be undertaken under urgency if meetings</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
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPA to play a full part in shaping of memorandum of understanding and other national initiatives. 		are not quorate. Work is ongoing to shape national changes in policing governance.	
2. To preserve appropriate public accountability and governance in policing.	<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"> Monitor and influence the shaping of the Bill as it passes through Parliament. 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. Appropriate staff and resources to support governance structure. 	<p>Impact: H Likel'hd: H</p> <p align="center">↔</p> <p align="center">R</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>Discussion with Centre for Public Scrutiny ongoing.</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	
	MPA Chief Executive.						
3. Identify and reflect local priorities and concerns of all Londoners in plans for service delivery going forward.	Ineffective consultation.	Concerns and local priorities of Londoners are not addressed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities reflected in Met Forward. 	Impact: M Likelihood: M  A	Second iteration of Met Forward produced, to reflect current public and Mayoral priorities.	G	
	Inadequate consideration of Londoners concerns.	Lack of public confidence in policing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular and effective consultation and community engagement with all representative groups – Community Engagement Strategy. 		Ongoing implementation of the MPA/MPS Community Engagement Strategy.		
	Ineffective planning process.	Lack of public confidence in the role of the MPA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure all consultative groups are representative and functioning effectively. Undertaking of annual review of diversity within groups (as part of funding process). 		The results of the CPEG review, to refocus towards targeted engagement with under-represented groups, are being implemented.		
	Ineffective governance systems in place to challenge equalities performance across all MPA community engagement activities (e.g. CPEGs/CMGs).	Lack of awareness of MPA role in diverse communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective engagement with Community stakeholders and partnerships. 		Review being undertaken to ensure stop/search community monitoring role is more visible. Action plan currently being implemented.		
	Lack of representation of diverse communities in the work of CPEGs.	BME/white satisfaction gap.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use results of consultation effectively to inform policing priorities and plans. 				
	Lack of provision for effective consultation with all community groups under new PCC structure.	Under-reporting of crime, e.g. hate crime.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate/promote in the plan how consultation has influenced priorities and plans. 		Annual consultation informs MPA/MPS Policing London Business Plan priorities and referred to in document.		
		Cross cutting diversity issues are not identified and addressed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct wider consultation, particularly within business community. 		Businesses are encouraged to take part in the consultation exercise.		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transition plan for new policing governance arrangements including provision for effective consultation with all community groups. 		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.		
		<u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Deputy Chief Executive.					

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
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 Likel'hd: M ↔ A		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 business. 		Guidance on EIA development and oversight has been produced.	
	Lack of awareness and understanding.	Disproportionality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training and briefings for members and staff. 		Equality Act training provided to all staff and members in spring 2011. One to one briefings are being offered to members who were unable to attend the session.	
	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 produced.	
	Loss of momentum as partners and the MPS know the MPA will be abolished.	Legal action.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equalities impact properly evaluated as part of Committee decision making process. 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appointment of MPA Head of Equalities and Engagement. 			
	Lack of effective governance systems in place to monitor and challenge equalities performance at a strategic level.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of strategic equalities risk register and process to monitor and integration where appropriate into corporate risk register. 		Strategic equalities risk register in place and reviewed regularly.	
	Failure to implement the recommendations of the race and faith inquiry report.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of a diversity strategy and action plan to be used as a tool to drive performance and monitor continuous improvement over time. 		Diversity strategy and action plan currently under development.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of Race and Faith Inquiry recommendations. 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equalities a standing agenda item at SMT, BMT and BMG meetings. 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All policies, procedures and, business cases to address equalities implications and risks. 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equalities and Engagement portfolio. 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equalities criteria in all person 			

**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"> 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. 			
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>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"> Met Forward and policing plan supported by an effective performance management framework. 	<p>Impact: M</p> <p>Likel'hd: L</p> <p>↔</p> <p>G</p>	Second iteration of Met Forward produced.	G
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met Forward Programme management and monitoring. 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective committee structure and process that promotes transparency and public accountability. 			
			<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. 		Metstandards work and Joint Engagement Meetings assist boroughs by identifying areas for improvement, helping develop solutions and supporting boroughs in delivery.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective member led scrutiny programme, focusing on key areas for improvement. 		MPA Safer Neighbourhoods scrutiny is being finalised. CLP scrutiny of G20 complete. DNA database and use of DNA in policing scrutiny report being drafted.	
			<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. 			

**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"> Effective media/public communication – dedicated MPA Communications Team. 		Met Forward Stateholder Management Strategy and delivery plan continues to be implemented. Ongoing monitoring through bi weekly communications meetings.	
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><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. 	<p>Impact: H Likel'hd: M ↔</p> <p>A</p>	MPA participate in MPS Organisational Learning Forum. Quarterly reports on organisational learning go to SOP committee.	A
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and create a common understanding between the MPA and MPS on areas of learning. 		Regular contact with IPCC and follow up of IPCC recommendations by SOP committee.	
			<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 account of lessons learnt. 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proactive MPA oversight of areas identified. 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognise and communicate effectively improvements achieved through committee process. 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MOPC implementation plans ensure continued delivery of business as usual. 			
7. Continue to focus on core business of the Authority in	<p>Challenge to role and purpose of the MPA.</p> <p>Lack of strategic</p>	<p>MPA strategic plan, Met Forward and policing priorities not delivered.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robust and cohesive leadership MPA Chair and MPA Chief Executive. 	<p>Impact: M Likel'hd: M</p>		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear strategy and vision – Met 		The second iteration of Met	

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk	
times of significant change and challenge.	direction and focus on priorities.	Lack of confidence in policing.	Forward.	↑ A	Forward has been developed and embedded within the 2011/12 Policing Plan.	G	
	Ineffective leadership.	Lack of public confidence in the role of the authority.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective and resilient MPA SMT. MPA performance management framework – quarterly strategic reviews. 				
	Ineffective communication.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly review of Met Forward Programme by Business Management Group. 		Regularly reviewed at BMG. Updates communicated to all staff on a bi-monthly basis and through bulletins.		
	Ineffective implementation of the new governance arrangements for policing.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Embedding cultural change and new ways of working within the MPA – developing new values and behaviours. 				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"> Effective MPA communication strategy, including regular staff meetings and briefings. 				Police reform update for staff circulated regularly.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MOPC implementation plans ensure continued delivery of business as usual. 				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, Home Office, GLA family, Local	Ineffective representation.	MPA strategic plan, Met Forward and policing priorities not delivered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify all key strategic partners. 	Impact: M Likel'hd: M ↑ A	Stakeholder engagement mapping to be reviewed now that the second iteration of Met Forward has been agreed.	A	
	Ineffective lobbying.	Lack of credibility and damage to MPA reputation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop effective communication strategy and plan for engaging with all key strategic partners for the MPA. 				
	Ineffective communication.	Duplication of work/inefficient use of resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open and effective communication between all parties facilitated by the MPA communication strategy and plan. 				
	Lack of clarity around respective roles and responsibilities.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish protocols governing the 		An operating framework to		

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
authorities, APA, LCJB, NPIA.	Lack of engagement by partners due to MPA abolition. <u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive.		exchange of data / statistics between the MPA and key strategic partners.		de developed with MPS for MOPC arrangements. To include provision of information to MOPC.	
			<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"> MOPC implementation programme includes a stakeholder management and communication strategy. 		Communication to take place with stakeholders to ensure they understand the functions that 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. Not aligning the budget to meet agreed priorities. Not identifying and/or realising budget efficiencies and savings. Ineffective scrutiny and monitoring of the budget. <u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Treasurer.	MPA strategic plan and policing priorities not met. Poor value for money. Inefficient/waste use of resources. Reputational damage to the MPA and MPS. 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"> Aligning strategic and financial planning effectively. 	Impact: M Likel'hd: M ↔ A		A
			<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. 		Savings proposals for 2012/13 are being developed.	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying opportunities for additional funding and effective lobbying for resources. 		Discussions with the Home Office are ongoing to lobby for additional protest policing funding.	
			<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. 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective MPA scrutiny of the MPS budget – Treasurer, Finance and Resources Committee, Resources and Productivity Sub Committee. 		Equality impact assessments for MPA budget to be submitted for SMT approval shortly.	

**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"> 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. Effective management of change programme and clear communication to staff, highlighting need to save money. 		A value for money strategy is being progressed.	
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></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>	<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 management approach. Embedding risk management in MPA/MPS corporate planning and performance management framework. Early identification and escalation of 	<p>Impact: M</p> <p>Likel'hd: M</p> <p>↔</p> <p>A</p>	<p>Further review of MPA risk register and evaluation of key control measures.</p> <p>DARA review of MPS risk maturity model.</p> <p>Further integration of risk management into MPA planning and performance framework.</p> <p>Met Forward reports to BMG</p>	G

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
	MPA Director of Audit, Risk and Assurance.	Loss of resources.	<p>emerging risks through MPA SMT and BMG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BMG review and monitoring of action taken to mitigate and manage corporate and emerging risks. Training for staff/members. 		<p>key emerging risks for action. The emerging issues and risks log is updated regularly and presented to BMG.</p> <p>A regular agenda item at BMG meetings.</p>	
11. National role in policing delivered effectively and to the benefit of Londoners (CT, Olympics /Paralympics).	Lack of clarity and definition of national responsibilities.	Inability to deliver operational policing requirements effectively.	<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>A</p>	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 July 2011.	A
	Ineffective governance.	Adverse effect on policing role/priorities in London.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly define strategy and objectives for national role and responsibilities. 		DARA advising on the development of ACPO TAM governance framework.	
	Ineffective management of relationships.	Loss of prestige, lack of future ability to influence Damage to reputation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a defined and effective governance framework for national responsibilities. 		Discussions with the Home Office are ongoing to secure necessary additional Olympics funding.	
	Inadequate resources.	Negative impact of Olympics legacy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure adequate resources to fulfil national role and responsibilities. 			
	Inadequate oversight.	Loss of knowledge regarding key areas such as CT.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective performance management framework governing national role in policing. 		CTPS continues to undertake oversight of all CONTEST strands on a rolling basis.	
	MOPC implementation results in loss of lead members in areas such as CT.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective MPA oversight – CT and Olympics sub committees. 		DARA review of Olympics budgetary control framework.	
	Lack of clarity regarding role of NCA.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective community engagement and consultation with Londoners. 			
	<u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Deputy Chief Executive.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly defined recruitment and 			
12. Effective	Lack of clarity around	Failure to deliver strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly defined recruitment and 	Impact:	A statement regarding career	

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
development and use of MPA expertise, skills, resources and work plans to support delivery of the MPA strategic mission Met Forward.	role and purpose of the MPA.	and meet performance targets.	retention policy – aiming for a highly skilled and diverse workforce whilst recognising the limited career progression opportunities in the policy area of the business.	M Likel'hd: L ↑ A	progression is being developed as part of the MPA Standards work.	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. 		An MPA skills audit and associated training is being delivered to all staff.	
	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 plans designed to meet strategic aims of Met Forward. 		Project management toolkit developed. Staff training arranged/ support given to embed principles. Met Forward project support available to all project leads.	
	Inadequate resources, including loss of resources due to maternity leave.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met Forward programme management framework. 			
	Inadequate experience and skills in diversity and overreliance on key individuals to champion change.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective performance management framework. 			
	Lack of succession planning.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly defined personal objectives linked to unit and corporate objectives. 			
	Ineffective management and communication to staff of new policing governance arrangements results in above risk causes.		<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. 			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective handling of staff grievances, supported by clearly communicated standards of behaviour expected and 		Grievance procedure is being reviewed in light of staff survey results.	

**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.		<p>training and support for managers in dealing with staff who do not comply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly defined and tested business continuity plan. Effective health and safety policies and procedures. Organisation structure to support delivery of Met Forward and to mainstream equalities within this. Skills audit of staff and utilisation opportunities maximised. Mentoring of staff. Effective MOPC implementation and communication plans, with staff in the MPA and MPS. 		<p>Values and behaviours work lead to new set of MPA standards that were launched in February 2011.</p> <p>The business continuity plan is under review.</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>	
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</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. Appropriately skilled officer support. Dedicating adequate resources to initiative. Setting a reasonable and achievable timescale. Effective management and oversight and intervention by BMG when required. Effective media/public communication 	<p>Impact: M</p> <p>Likel'hd: M</p> <p>↔</p> <p>A</p>	<p>A regular highlight report on delivery progress of high profile initiatives presented to BMG to agree action.</p>	A

**METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY
CORPORATE RISK PROFILE**

Risk Area	Risk Causes	Impact	Control Measures	Current Risk	Further Action	Residual Risk
	<p>communication.</p> <p><u>Risk Owner:</u> MPA Chief Executive.</p>		<p>strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publicly reporting progress and output of high profile reviews. 		<p>Race and Faith review reported to Full Authority and recommendations are being progressed. A multi point entry seminar was held in January 2011.</p> <p>Second iteration of Civil Liberties Panel G20 report was published.</p>	