

DEVON AND CORNWALL POLICE AUTHORITY AND CONSTABULARY
JOINT INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT POLICY

Draft Version 11

POLICY STATEMENT & INTENTION

- 1.1 This policy outlines the Force's approach to managing risk.
- 1.2 The intention of the policy is to highlight the processes, the roles and responsibilities, the governance and the monitoring arrangements for managing risk throughout the Force and seeks to define an organisational risk tolerance level.

POLICY & AUDIT DECLARATION

- 2.1 This policy has been drafted and audited in accordance with the principles of Human Rights legislation, the Race Relations (Amendment Act) 2000, Disability Discrimination Act 1995, the Policing Bureaucracy Gateway and Freedom of Information Act 2000. Under the Freedom of Information Act the document is classified as 'OPEN'

INDEX OF CONTENTS

1. Policy Statement & Intention
2. Policy & Audit Declaration
3. Index of Contents
4. Introduction
5. Implications of Policy
6. Procedures
7. Monitoring
8. Ownership & Review

INTRODUCTION

- 4.1 Devon and Cornwall Police Authority and Constabulary (hereinafter referred to jointly as the Police) are required to deliver a range of essential services within the context of human rights and public scrutiny. Risk management, as defined within this policy, is fundamental to every aspect of the corporate business and to every individual. Furthermore it supports the concept of corporate governance and provides a firm foundation for a process of internal control.
- 4.2 The contents of this policy have been prepared in line with best practice produced by the Institute of Risk Management, The Office of Government Commerce (OGC), HM Treasury, Management of Risk – Principles and Concepts (The Orange Book), Devon Audit Services, the contents of the Turnbull report on Internal Control and the McCartney report for HM Cabinet Office on "Modernising Government in Action".
- 4.3 In operational policing dynamic, generic and specific risk assessments are undertaken, dependent upon the circumstances, to manage risk. Codes of practice incorporating risk management, already exist in many areas, e.g. the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act and the Recording & Dissemination of Intelligence Material.
- 4.4 The policy will support and not replace existing policies. In the above examples only the Force authority/authorising officer, e.g. Director of Intelligence, or the chairs of

the various Force User Groups/Committees would refer those risks they assess necessary, for the attention of the Executive Board.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE POLICY

5.1 The adoption of this policy will have the following implications for the Police within the specified areas:

a) Records Management

The Police together with each BCU and Department will be responsible for maintaining an appropriate Risk Register within a defined format (Appendix B). Each risk defined within that register will be further identified with a unique risk index card (Appendix C).

b) Force/ BCU/ Dept Plans

Each BCU and Department will ensure that their individual risk registers are displayed alongside their respective BCU/ Departmental plans and are cognisant of their contents.

c) Diversity

In the application of this policy the Police will not discriminate against any persons regardless of sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, associated with national minority, property, birth, or other status as defined under article 14, European Convention Human Rights (ECHR) and Race Relations (Amendment) Act.

d) Internal Policy links

Risks will be identified across the organisation, at all levels, in all areas of our business. Our existing policies and procedures deal with the vast majority of identified risks. The principle policies in these areas are :

- i) PPS D155 Contingency Planning
- ii) PPS D197 Health & Safety Management Policy
- iii) PPS D255 Force Insurance Policies
- iv) PPS D260 Information Security
- v) PPS D314 Managing Business Change

e) Programmes/ Projects

The risk registers relating to the area of Programmes and Projects will follow industry best practice and be the responsibility of the respective Programme Senior Responsible Owners and Project Executives, as defined in policy document D314. The contents of these risk registers will however assist the Police in identifying where the resources of the Force Strategic Programme should be most effectively directed.

f) Consultation

Consultation on this policy has been conducted through a wide variety of risk workshops within the Force. Consultation activity has also included The Police Authority, Devon Audit Services and the Institute of Risk Management.

PROCEDURES

Evaluation

6.1 In areas outside those referred to above, where a risk is identified it needs to be evaluated before any further decision can be taken. The identification of the evaluator will depend on where the risk originates.

DRAFT

- 6.2 The evaluation of risk will be conducted in accordance with the Devon & Cornwall Constabulary model for risk evaluation. This is further defined in Appendix A to this policy.
- 6.3 Once a risk has been identified and evaluated the options for an appropriate response should be considered. This would involve either:
- a). Tolerating the risk by deciding that it is acceptable within the normal manner in which that particular part of the organisation operates and does not need referring on. Such a decision must be recorded by the individual making it.
 - b). Treating or terminating the risk by addressing and resolving it so that it is no longer an issue.
 - c). Adopting the risk, where it represents an opportunity, e.g. as an example of best practice. This would involve reference to the line manager to ensure that, if appropriate, it is shared throughout the rest of the organisation.
 - d). Transferring the risk elsewhere for another area of the organisation to address. This could be to other units or areas, if appropriate, e.g. Health & Safety matters are referred to the local representative, who refers the issue in accordance with existing Health & Safety policy & procedures.

Roles and Responsibilities

- 6.4 **Force Risk Owner**
The senior figure within the organisation who has overall responsibility for the management of Risk. The responsibilities of this position rest with the Deputy Chief Constable.
- 6.5 **Force Risk Manager**
The person within the organisation responsible for the day to day management of Risk for the organisation on behalf of the Force Risk Owner. The responsibilities of this position rest with the Commander Corporate Services Department.
- 6.6 **Risk Evaluator**
The nominated person(s) within the component parts of the organisation responsible for evaluating risks in the first instance within specific local environments (BCU/ Departments etc).
- 6.7 **Force Risk Management Panel**
The Force Risk Management Panel will be established centrally to provide direction for risk management in support of the Force Risk Owner and the Force Risk Manager. It will be supported by its own specific Terms of Reference. It will be chaired by the Commander, Corporate Services, on behalf of the Deputy Chief Constable. It will brief the Force Executive Board and the Force Performance Board on the action that it takes.
- 6.8 **Force Risk Review Group**
The Force Risk Review Group will be established centrally to support the Force Risk Manager in the evaluation and moderation of Risk. It will be supported by its own

DRAFT

specific Terms of Reference. It will be chaired by the Principal Analyst and have a defined membership. It will provide a vehicle for the collation and evaluation of risks identified within local risk registers.

Governance

- 6.9 The local risk registers will follow the corporate template, model and scoring process, as provided by Corporate Services Department and be accessible to the Force Risk Review Group.
- 6.10 The ownership of all risks displayed within local risk registers will remain with the relevant BCU/ Department.
- 6.11 The Force Risk Review Group will review those risks from all local Risk Registers that lay above the corporate tolerance level on a monthly basis. As a result of this review the Group will evaluate them for inclusion within the Devon and Cornwall Constabulary Corporate Risk Register.
- 6.12 The Force Risk Review Group will only actively consider, collate and evaluate those risks within individual risk registers that lay above the corporate tolerance level. In practice however they will have access to all of the component registers for information purposes.
- 6.13 After each meeting of the Force Risk Review Group the Chair will bring the attention of the Risk Management Panel to the current most significant risks facing the Police.
- 6.14 The Chair of the Force Risk Management Panel will subsequently brief the Force Risk Owner, who will review the most significant risks.
- 6.15 The Executive Board will nonetheless, formally review the Devon and Cornwall Constabulary Corporate Risk Register on a periodic basis and the information contained therein will assist the Police during the annual strategic planning cycle.
- 6.16 It will be the responsibility of the nominated strategic owner to develop appropriate actions to allow the risk to be mitigated as per para 6.3.
- 6.17 It will be the responsibility of the strategic risk owners to ensure that relevant mitigation plans are clearly defined and auditable. This will ensure risks are re-scored as necessary, variations in levels of risk are properly monitored and appropriate management intervention undertaken.
- 6.18 It will be the responsibility of the strategic risk owners to ensure the Corporate Risk Register is kept up to date.

Process

- 6.19 The process of risk evaluation will require sufficient information on the nature of the risk to be made available.
- 6.20 The individual risk will be evaluated against the corporate risk scoring model (see Appendix A) to establish its Impact and its Likelihood.

- 6.21 The Impact of the risk is a measure of the consequences that will apply if the risk becomes a reality, together with its seriousness. This will be measured against a range of categories defined within a matrix, which will include specific definitions. The scores from those categories will be added together and averaged to produce a single Impact score.
- 6.22 The Likelihood is a measure of how likely the risk is to occur. The likelihood will be measured against scoring values contained within a matrix, which will include specific definitions.
- 6.23 To enable the risk to be evaluated in this manner an individual risk index card will be produced for each risk, which will enable all subsequent activity relating to the management of the risk to be recorded.
- 6.24 Once the impact & likelihood scores are identified they are multiplied together to give an overall risk score. This will allow the most significant risks to be readily identified. Subsequently each risk can then be presented in a priority table for ease of reference.

Tolerance and appetite

- 6.25 It is important in the management of risk that the organisation sets a clear level of tolerance on the level of risk it is prepared to carry. This is sometimes called the organisation's appetite for risk.
- 6.26 The tolerance level will also identify to the organisation in general the level above which all risks must be escalated to the next level of corporate governance, irrespective of the mitigation actions planned and/ or instigated already by the risk owner.
- 6.27 The corporate scoring model adopted by the organisation provides for a very simple method of risk tolerance to be determined. The Force tolerance level will be set by the Force Executive Board on the advice of the Risk Management Panel.

MONITORING

- 7.1 Progress in mitigating against risks, through the use of clear auditable mitigation plans, will be monitored through the Force Performance Board.
- 7.2 The internal inspection and/ or audit of individual mitigation plans relevant to the Devon & Cornwall Constabulary will be carried out by the Audit & Compliance Section within the Corporate Services Department.
- 7.3 The inspection and/ or audit of individual mitigation plans relevant to the Devon and Cornwall Police Authority will be carried out by Devon Audit Services.
- 7.4 The Force Risk Management Panel will review the Corporate Risk Register to ensure that all mitigation actions and plans accurately reflect the status of the risks.

OWNERSHIP & REVIEW

DRAFT

- 8.1 This policy is owned by the Commander Corporate Services Department and will be reviewed on an annual basis.

APPENDIX A

THE DEVON & CORNWALL CONSTABULARY RISK EVALUATION MODEL

- 1.1 Identified risks within the Devon & Cornwall Constabulary will be evaluated in line with the Police's Risk evaluation model.
- 1.2 The impact of any risk will be measured in eight key areas. These are:
 - a) Crime Investigation
 - b) Life & Welfare
 - c) Citizen focus
 - d) Crime Reduction
 - e) Resources
 - f) Financial Impact
 - g) Promoting safety & Providing assistance &
 - h) Leadership & Direction
- 1.3 Within each of these key areas individual risks will be measured against 5 criteria and a score (between 1 & 5) allocated to each area.
- 1.4 When each area has been allocated an individual score these will be added together to arrive at the total impact score for the selected risk.
- 1.5 Once the total score for the selected risk has been determined it will be divided by eight in order to arrive at the average impact score for the individual risk.
- 1.6 The impact score will then be multiplied to the identified likelihood score for the individual risk. A separate table of criteria is provided to enable calculation and evaluation of the likelihood of any individual risk.
- 1.7 Once the individual risk score has been identified the risk may be included within the appropriate risk register as per para 6.24 and an appropriate response as per paragraph 6.3 determined.
- 1.8 The details given hereinafter are also available within a matrix, which may be easier to reference. This is available from the individual risk evaluators or the Force Risk Manager, within the Corporate Services Department
- 1.9 **Crime Investigation Criteria**

When considering the impact in this area, consider the capability to undertake investigations from the point of report through to supporting a prosecution at court. Consequently, if a risk is being considered that may impact upon elements of the Criminal Justice process (i.e. Custody) then the risk should also be assessed against crime investigation.

 - 1.9.1 No impact on Level 1 or 2 investigative capability, forensic services or criminal justice processes. **SCORE: 1**
 - 1.9.2 Minor impact on Level 1 or 2 investigative capability, forensic services or criminal justice processes. **SCORE: 2**

1.9.3 Significant Impact upon Level 1 or 2 investigative capability, forensic services or criminal justice processes. **SCORE: 3**

1.9.4 Major impact on level 1 or 2 investigative capability, forensic services or criminal justice processes. **SCORE: 4**

1.9.5 Inability to conduct investigation, forensic services and/or criminal justice processes. **SCORE: 5**

1.10 Life & Welfare criteria

The actual risk itself, or the consequences, must have a direct impact on life and welfare. For instance, if the risk being assessed arises out of a failure to provide occupational health support for staff, then you would grade the risk accordingly. If the Force failed to provide occupational health support, it would be argued that this would have an impact upon the quality of life and emotional wellbeing of staff.

In relation to the risk of fatality, if a risk is identified that could result in a fatality then that scores the highest on the matrix. Risks that could result in multiple fatalities do not need to be assessed higher than a single fatality. This relates to the Force's obligation to protect life and property, and obligations under the Human Rights Act, where a single fatality is as important as multiple fatalities.

1.10.1 No risk of injury, illness or fatality and no impact upon the quality of life (emotional wellbeing) of any individual. **SCORE: 1**

1.10.2 An impact upon the quality of life (emotional wellbeing) of any individual. **SCORE: 2**

1.10.3 Significant impact upon the quality of life (emotional wellbeing) of any individual **SCORE: 3**

1.10.4 Major impact upon the quality of life (emotional wellbeing) of any individual or circumstances likely to result in the injury/ illness of any individual. **SCORE: 4**

1.10.5 Fatality of any individual. **SCORE: 5**

1.11 Citizen focus criteria

In assessing risk in this area the impact of the risk upon our accessibility (e.g. ease of contact, esp via the telephone and contact centres, Police station opening, contact directly with officers, use of web site etc.), our ability to engage with the public (i.e. how easy they think we are to contact and their perception of the Force) and our ability to respond to their requirements (i.e. how we take on board what our surveys tell us) should be considered. This criterion also covers the Force's integrity. Integrity in this context includes breaches of the discipline code or employment law and also standards in relation to how the Force undertakes policing.

1.11.1 No impact upon accessibility or our ability to understand, engage or respond to the public or our integrity. **SCORE: 1**

1.11.2 Minor impact upon accessibility or our ability to understand, engage or respond to the public or our integrity. **SCORE: 2**

1.11.3 Significant impact upon accessibility or our ability to understand, engage or respond to the public or our integrity. **SCORE: 3**

1.11.4 Major impact upon accessibility or our ability to understand, engage or respond to the public or our integrity. **SCORE: 4**

1.11.5 Inability to be accessible or to understand, engage or respond to the public, or our professional standards (integrity) have been compromised and the Force's reputation will be substantially damaged. **SCORE: 5**

1.12 Crime Reduction & Community Safety criteria

Risks in this area would include risk to our ability to impact upon all areas of crime reduction but especially on volume crime and crimes against the diverse community, and also risks to our ability to reduce crime through effective partnership working. As an example, if a partnership is entirely dependent upon data supplied by the Force that enables them to keep working and a risk is identified to that data source then the risk should be graded in this area.

1.12.1 No impact upon our ability to reduce all crime and impact upon crimes against our diverse communities through effective partnership working.

SCORE: 1

1.12.2 Minor impact upon our ability to reduce all crime and impact upon crimes against our diverse communities through effective partnership working.

SCORE: 2

1.12.3 Significant impact upon our ability to reduce all crime and impact upon crimes against our diverse communities through effective partnership working.

SCORE: 3

1.12.4 Major impact upon our ability to reduce all crime and impact upon crimes against our diverse communities through effective partnership working.

SCORE: 4

1.12.5 Inability to reduce all crime and impact upon crimes against our diverse communities through effective partnership working.

SCORE: 5

1.13 Human Resources criteria

Risks in this area would include risks that fall under the headings of; Training & Development, Reward, Resourcing and Employee relations.

1.13.1 No impact upon Training & Development, Reward, Resourcing or Employee Relations.

SCORE: 1

1.13.2 Minor impact upon Training & Development, Reward, Resourcing or Employee Relations.

SCORE: 2

1.13.3 Significant impact upon Training & Development, Reward, Resourcing or Employee Relations.

SCORE: 3

1.13.4 Major impact upon Training & Development, Reward, Resourcing or Employee Relations.

SCORE: 4

1.13.5 Inability to Train or Develop, Reward, Resource or maintain Employee Relations.

SCORE: 5

1.14 Cost to the organisation criteria

Loss in this area would include finances not being available to spend as intended (i.e. budget lines have to be realigned to pay for the impact of the risk) or monies being spent on matters to the detriment of other provided services. It also relates to the likely costs to the organisation arising out of adverse actions or judgements.

1.14.1 Costs up to £25,000

SCORE: 1

1.14.2 Costs between £25,000 & £500,000

SCORE: 2

1.14.3 Costs between £500,000 & £2million

SCORE: 3

- 1.14.4 Costs between £2m & £5million **SCORE: 4**
1.14.5 Costs in excess of £5million **SCORE: 5**

1.15 Promoting safety and providing assistance criteria

Risks in this area relate to our ability to intervene against Anti Social Behaviour and provide public reassurance at both level 1 & level 2 and therefore includes our operational support capability, including roads policing.

- 1.15.1 No impact upon ASB or public reassurance or our capability to provide level 1 or 3 operational support i.e. roads policing. **SCORE: 1**
1.15.2 Minor impact upon ASB or public reassurance or our capability to provide level 1 or 3 operational support i.e. roads policing. **SCORE: 2**
1.15.3 Significant impact upon ASB or public reassurance or our capability to provide level 1 or 3 operational support i.e. roads policing. **SCORE: 3**
1.15.4 Major impact upon ASB or public reassurance or our capability to provide level 1 or 3 operational support i.e. roads policing. **SCORE: 4**
1.15.5 Inability to address ASB or public reassurance or provide level 1 or 3 operational support including provide roads policing. **SCORE: 5**

1.16 Leadership and Direction criteria

Risks in this area would include risks to the leadership structure (Command Team/ Senior Management Team/ Gold Control/ Police Authority) of the Force whether it is at Level 2 or Level 1 (includes Silver Control Capability). This also includes risks to the corporate governance, strategic meeting and performance management processes.

- 1.16.1 No impact upon Force Strategic management, performance management or the NIM processes. **SCORE: 1**
1.16.2 Minor impact upon Force Strategic management, performance management or the NIM processes. **SCORE: 2**
1.16.3 Significant impact upon Force Strategic management, performance management or the NIM processes. **SCORE: 3**
1.16.4 Major impact upon Force Strategic management, performance management or the NIM processes. **SCORE: 4**
1.16.5 Inability to undertake Strategic management function, manage Force performance or deliver the NIM process. **SCORE:5**

1.17 Likelihood criteria

When evaluating any event against the likelihood factors it is important to remember that this process relates to risk. Where an event is identified as having a greater than 80% chance of occurring consideration should initially be given as to whether the event is a risk or a certainty. If the situation can be considered as a certainty then it should not normally be reflected in the risk register, unless other factors apply that would need different types of risks to be considered accordingly.

- 1.17.1 Rare – Highly unlikely to occur in a five year period or less than a 2% chance of occurrence **SCORE: 1**
1.17.2 Unlikely – Unlikely to occur within a five year period or probability of occurrence between 2 & 15%. **SCORE: 2**
1.17.3 Possible – Likely to occur within a five year period or a probability of occurrence between 15 & 25%. **SCORE: 3**

DRAFT

1.17.4 Likely – Likely to occur within a 3 year time period or with a probability of occurrence between 25 & 50%. **SCORE: 4**

1.17.5 Almost certain – Likely to occur within a twelve month period or with a probability between 50% and 80%. **SCORE: 5**