



**Title:** Risk Register

**Date of Review - May 2010**

**Authorising Officer:** - Mark Gilmartin, Chief Executive

**Assessor:** Susie Latta, Policy Officer

## **THE MANAGEMENT OF RISK WITHIN THE KPA**

The following documents are included in the Risk Register:

1. Guidance Note that details the Risk Management approach adopted by the KPA.
2. A scoring summary for the following pages.
3. A Horizon Scanning table highlighting issues that may develop into risks but which have not been properly assessed (i.e. too early to do so or not enough information on which to base assessment) – updated with the Risk Register and filled by all Officers
4. The Risk Register.
5. Statement of Controls.
6. Relevant Action Sheets (i.e. risk treatment) containing Risk Action Plans for risk ranked medium or above.
7. Issues Log (identifying risks that have occurred and any remedial action taken).

Appendices include:

- A scoring matrix for the Likelihood and Impact of risks.
- A matrix showing the consequence of risk.
- A matrix showing the levels of risk and the KPA's appetite for them.

## **ITEMS FOR INCLUSION IN THE KPA RISK REGISTER**

### **GUIDANCE NOTE**

1. All Officers are involved in the task of Risk Management; identifying situations and issues which, unless action is taken to minimise the risk, have the potential to compromise the business of the KPA. Risks should be identified, documented, assessed and scored using the Scoring Matrix in conjunction with the Consequences Matrix. These are shown in Appendix 1 and 2.
2. If a risk rating of Very Low or Low is obtained, no action is required beyond normal actions undertaken by the relevant officer.
3. If a risk rating of Medium, High or Very High is obtained, action is required and a Risk Action Sheet prepared. All Very High risks are to be notified immediately to the Chair and Chief Executive.
4. If there are resources (budget, staff capacity, capability, time, effort etc) available within the remit of the Officer which can be used to implement risk treatment, this should be done, and, on completion, the risk re-scored.
5. If scoring shows the risk has been minimised to an acceptable level, the facts should be documented on the Action Sheet and the risk closed. The Action Sheet is to be retained for Audit Purposes.
6. If the risk cannot be minimised by the Officer, an Action Plan should be prepared and the risk should be referred to the Chief Executive.
7. The risk item will be entered on the Risk Register and will be reviewed by the Chief Executive at least every quarter.
8. If resources (budget, staff capacity, capability, time, effort etc) are agreed for implementation of a risk treatment plan, the risk will afterwards be re-scored.
9. If the risk has been minimised to an acceptable level it will be documented on the Action Plan and closed. The Action Plan is to be retained for Audit Purposes.

<b>Log of Changes</b>			
<b>Date</b>	<b>By Whom</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>Details</b>
13.01.2009	Susie Latta	Addition	Addition of PO retention and Employee relations to Horizon Scanning
09.03.09	Susie Latta	deletion	<del>KPA 14 KPA is not a member of the Kent Partnership limiting influence over LAA governance potentially leading to disputes over priorities</del>
<b>Changes made after PA Inspection and Internal Audit Recommendations</b>			
14.05.09	Susie Latta	addition	Likelihood score definition in line with the force and review likelihood scores
14.05.09	Susie Latta	addition	separate scoring for inherent and residual risk
14.05.09	Susie Latta	change	inclusion of controls on risk register and deletion of controls statement
14.05.09	Susie Latta	change	clarification of risks
14.05.09	Susie Latta	addition	risks aligned to KPA committees
14.05.09	Susie Latta	deletion	<del>KPA 13 The extent of KPA scrutiny of protective services may be insufficient to ensure value for money from PS investment</del> deleted as similar to KPA 01
14.05.09	Susie Latta	deletion	deletion of Children's Trust from horizon scanning as significant progress made
14.05.09	Susie Latta	deletion	FCC roof discharged from issues log
04.08.09	Susie Latta	Addition	Addition of business plan objectives and sort in order of highest residual risk first
04.08.09	Susie Latta	Formatting	Sort risks by committee
10/18/2009	Susie Latta / Treasurer/ Chief Exec	Change	Items added to Horizon scanning
			minor change to controls KPA 23
			KPA 08 Risk increased from 12 to 16 and residual risk increased from 8 to 12 (medium) and risk action sheet completed
			KPA 12 risk increased from 12 to 16 and residual from 6 to 8 (low)
11/18/2009	Susie Latta	addition	KPA 08 highest risk and moved to top of register
11/18/2009	Susie Latta	addition	PCSO funding added to horizon scanning
11/24/2009	Susie Latta	deletion	PCSO funding added to horizon scanning
1/18/2010	susie Latta	Addition	Risk Action sheets for KPA 23 and 22 as low and not needed as per KPA Risk Strategy
1/18/2010	susie Latta	Addition	Update of total place entry on horizon scanning to add group members.
1/18/2010	Susie Latta	Addition	KPA 25 - policing pledge risk
3/5/2010	Susie Latta	Addition	Complaints process changes to horizon scanning
5/26/2010	Susie Latta	deletion	CAA from horizon scanning as CAA abolished by new government
		deletion	KPA 16 - lack of resilience in KPA media comms - removed after recruitment of asst
		Changes	KPA 06 changed to update the nature of collaboration risk
		addition	KPA 26, 27, 28, 29, 30,
		increase	KPA 8, KPA 24, KPA 20
		decrease	KPA 5, KPA12, KPA 03, KPA 15,
		Controls changed on	KPA 12 , KPA 24, KPA 01, KPA 19, KPA 21
		Move	PCSO funding moved from Horizon Scanning to risk register ( KPA 27)
		Move	Employee dissatisfaction moved from Horizon Scanning to risk register ( KPA 26)
		Addition	Lack of staff turnover to Horizon scanning
		Merger	merger of Issues log and horizon scanning

<b>Risk - Horizon Scanning</b>			
<b>Area/Statement of Concern</b>	<b>Potential Owner</b>	<b>Action to assess level of concern</b>	<b>Action By</b>
<b>Police Officer Retention</b>	Mike Campbell HR Policy Officer	Monitor in Force and via SE Retention Group. Milestones are Olympics 2012 and opening of high speed rail line at end of 2009 which could lead to problems with retaining Kent Officers. Update: 26/05/10 Economic situation has lead to low turnover but keep on horizon scanning for when recruitment starts again	Mike Campbell HR Policy Officer
<b>Kent Partnership and Total Place Initiative</b>	Mark Gilmartin, Chief Executive	Monitor and Review, membership of Total Place Representation Group	Mark Gilmartin, Chief Executive
<b>Thames Estuary Airport</b>	Mark Gilmartin, Chief Executive	Monitor and Review	Mark Gilmartin, Chief Executive
<b>Lack of retirement/ staff turnover leads to lack of career development opportunities for staff</b>	Mike Campbell HR Policy Officer	Monitor in force. Plan to provide alternative opportunities	Mike Campbell HR Policy Officer
<b>PCSO Partner funding</b>	Mark Gilmartin, Chief Executive	Monitor and Review	Mark Gilmartin, Chief Executive
<b>Change to complaints processes</b> i) resource implications and ii) its ability to meet public expectations.	Suzanne Pearson, Policy Officer	Monitor and Review	Suzanne Pearson, Policy Officer

## KENT POLICE AUTHORITY - RISK REGISTER

Register Version		Risk Assessor		Susie Latta		Date of Review						26.05.2010				
RISK ASSESSMENT																
Risk Ref	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	Link to KPA Business Plan Objectives	Inherent Risk				Residual risk after controls						Date Risk Identified	Date Last Changed	Committee Aligned to	
			Consequences (C)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Rating (CxL)	Risk Ranking	Controls to eliminate, reduce or transfer risk	Adequacy of controls	Consequences C	Likelihood (L)	Risk Rating (CxL)	Risk Ranking				
<b>KPA 08</b>	Revenue budget is insufficient to meet operational policing requirements leading to cuts in services	Delivering Value for Money and Productivity	4	5	20	Very High	Prudent Financial Management Reasonable reserves A&G oversight Budget Review Group Efficiency strategy Lean and Collaboration	A	4	4	16	High	29.5.07	26.05.10	Audit and Governance	
<b>KPA 20</b>	Changes in Home Office DSP Funding could leave the Authority financially exposed	Delivering Value for Money and Productivity	4	4	16	High	Monitoring of policing developments from Home Offices and through APA Influence policy making directly and through APA	U	4	4	16	High	08.10.08	26.05.10	Full Authority	
<b>KPA 24</b>	Increased demands on policing resources combined with inadequate budgetary control leads to overspending and depletion of reserves	Delivering Value for Money and Productivity	3	4	12	Medium	Reinforced budget monitoring adequate level of resources and reserves as starting point Audit and Governance Committee monitoring Effective internal Audit Members and officers financial management skills	A	3	3	9	Medium	14.05.09	26.05.10	Audit and Governance	
<b>KPA 30</b>	Failure to achieve the single confidence measure and perceptions of ASB, will impact negatively on the confidence of stakeholders and the public and could lead to sanctions from the Home Office/HMIC.	Supporting Performance Improvement	3	4	12	Medium	Oversight by Policing Performance Committee and lead/area members KPA involvement in workshops and consultation events Peer involvement and research into best practice CO leadership Establish Public Service Board	A	3	3	9	Medium	26.05.10	26.05.10	Full Authority & Policing Performance Committee	
<b>KPA 17</b>	Force activity and response to events/issues consequently impacts on Authority reputation.	Setting strategic direction and priorities	4	3	12	Medium	Clear lines of communication between Force Chief Officers and Authority Chair / Chief Executive. Dedicated KPA media professional/resource.	A	4	2	8	Low	04.02.08	08.10.08	Full Authority	

## KENT POLICE AUTHORITY - RISK REGISTER

Register Version		Risk Assessor		Susie Latta		Date of Review						26.05.2010				
RISK ASSESSMENT																
Risk Ref	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	Link to KPA Business Plan Objectives	Inherent Risk				Residual risk after controls						Date Risk Identified	Date Last Changed	Committee Aligned to	
			Consequences (C)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Rating (CxL)	Risk Ranking	Controls to eliminate, reduce or transfer risk	Adequacy of controls	Consequences C	Likelihood (L)	Risk Rating (CxL)	Risk Ranking				
KPA 23	The policing of a major event or series of events such as the climate camp puts a strain on financial, physical and human resources, resilience and financial reserves.	Delivering Value for Money and Productivity	4	3	12	Medium	Adequate starting point for reserves KPA oversight of event planning and lead member scrutiny Continual environmental scanning to monitor risks Force Resourcing Unit	A	4	2	8	Low	06.11.08	18.10.09	Full Authority	
KPA 27	There is a reduction of service to the public if the Home Office withdraws PSCO funding.	Delivering Value for Money and Productivity	4	3	12	Medium	Oversight by Audit and Governance and HR Committee Oversight by lead and area members Awareness of national developments	U	4	2	8	Low	26.05.10	26.05.10	HR & A&G Committee	
KPA 29	That police information is not managed correctly leading to incident , financial or legal sanction or Reputational damage	Setting strategic direction and priorities	4	3	12	Medium	Oversight by Protective Services Review Board and Intel Board, both with Member involvement Oversight by Professional Standards Committee Information sharing agreements Chief Constable presentation to members	A	4	2	8	Low	26.05.10	26.05.10	Professional Standards Committee	
KPA 01	The Authority does not monitor the force and they fail to meet protective services standard set by HMIC risking sanction or lack of resilience	Supporting Performance Improvement	3	3	9	Medium	KPA representation on PS Review Board PS performance monitoring PS lead members PS policing plan measure NPIA Recognition	A	3	2	6	Low	29.5.07	29.5.07	Policing Performance	
KPA 03	Failure to discharge duties in relation to statutory partnerships could lead to adverse comment by inspectors or partners	Achieving results through consultation, collaboration and partnership	3	3	9	Medium	On strategic boards eg: LSPs, Children's Trusts Membership of all CDRPs and other partnerships Review of partnerships by auditors	A	3	2	6	Low	29.5.07	26.05.10	Full Authority	

## KENT POLICE AUTHORITY - RISK REGISTER

Register Version		May-10		Risk Assessor	Susie Latta		Date of Review					26.05.2010				
RISK ASSESSMENT																
Risk Ref	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	Link to KPA Business Plan Objectives	Inherent Risk				Residual risk after controls						Date Risk Identified	Date Last Changed	Committee Aligned to	
			Consequences (C)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Rating (CxL)	Risk Ranking	Controls to eliminate, reduce or transfer risk	Adequacy of controls	Consequences C	Likelihood (L)	Risk Rating (CxL)	Risk Ranking				
KPA 04	Inadequate performance management arrangements in place between authority and force leads to fall in performance and threatens public confidence.	Supporting Performance Improvement	3	3	9	Medium	KPA Policing Performance Committee Performance Pack Policing Plan Group Area Member / Lead Member arrangements	A	3	2	6	Low	29.5.07	29.5.07	Policing Performance	
KPA 05	Authority fails/performs poorly in inspection from HMIC/Audit Commission threatening the credibility and reputation of the Authority	Setting strategic direction and priorities	3	3	9	Medium	Positive pilot inspection experience Sharing experience with peers PA stakeholder group Business planning and continuous improvement	A	3	2	6	Low	29.5.07	26.05.10	Full Authority	
KPA 06	Collaboration with Essex fails to realise expected benefits causing budget shortfalls, fall in service standards or employee relations issues	Achieving results through consultation, collaboration and partnership	3	4	12	Medium	Joint statutory committee Strong leadership Strategic plan, performance monitoring and oversight Joint Statutory Committee with Essex Police Authority Policing Plan savings target. Specialist legal and HR advice	A	3	2	6	Low	29.5.07	29.5.07	Full Authority	
KPA 07	Capital budget is insufficient to support operational policing requirements leading to need to cut capital programme.	Delivering Value for Money and Productivity	2	4	8	Low	A&G oversight Capital Review Board Full review in 2009/10 Budget Review Group	A	2	3	6	Low	29.5.07	14.05.09	Audit and Governance	
KPA 10	Failure to discharge statutory duty to promote diversity both in and outside of the Force leads to a loss of confidence among minority groups	Setting strategic direction and priorities	3	3	9	Medium	Citizens' Panel Establishment of strategic and Local Independent Advisory Groups KCVS - minority group booster sample Single equality scheme Winder community engagement and lead member activity	A	3	2	6	Low	29.5.07	29.5.07	Full Authority	

## KENT POLICE AUTHORITY - RISK REGISTER

Register Version		May-10		Risk Assessor	Susie Latta		Date of Review						26.05.2010			
RISK ASSESSMENT																
Risk Ref	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	Link to KPA Business Plan Objectives	Inherent Risk				Residual risk after controls						Date Risk Identified	Date Last Changed	Committee Aligned to	
			Consequences (C)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Rating (CxL)	Risk Ranking	Controls to eliminate, reduce or transfer risk	Adequacy of controls	Consequences C	Likelihood (L)	Risk Rating (CxL)	Risk Ranking				
KPA 11	Failure to undertake adequate community engagement and consultation limits Authority knowledge of public demand and means that authority is not accurately representing the public.	Achieving results through consultation, collaboration and partnership	3	4	12	Medium	Citizens' Panel and KCVS KPA consultation KPA publications Stakeholder consultation Joint Force - Authority Community Engagement Strategy KPA representation on Community Engagement Delivery Board	A	3	2	6	Low	29.5.07	29.5.07	Full Authority	
KPA 12	Authority does not secure an efficient and effective police service and so does not deliver efficiency savings leading to financial shortfalls or Reputational damage.	Delivering Value for Money and Productivity	3	4	12	Medium	KPA representative on Kent development board PPC monitoring and KPA member involvement Oversight of lean reviews and collaboration	A	3	2	6	Low	29.5.07	26.05.10	Full Authority	
KPA 18	Providing policing support for the Olympics will impact negatively on the finances and reputation of the Authority	Delivering Value for Money and Productivity	3	3	9	Medium	Reserves maintained Monitor all Olympic planning process directly and through the force and APA Take all opportunities to influence policy making Identify and maximise benefits and opportunities for Kent Regular member briefings	U	3	2	6	Low	08.10.08	08.10.08	Full Authority	
KPA 19	Lack of succession planning for the chief officer team reduces the force resilience	Setting strategic direction and priorities	3	3	9	Medium	Leadership and high potential development within force Promotion of PDR process to develop talent Be aware of senior management ambitions, needs, skills and opportunities Carry out a succession planning and development exercise Manage the reputation of Kent to attract high calibre managers	A	3	2	6	Low	08.10.08	08.10.08	HR Committee	

## KENT POLICE AUTHORITY - RISK REGISTER

Register Version		May-10		Risk Assessor	Susie Latta		Date of Review						26.05.2010			
RISK ASSESSMENT																
Risk Ref	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	Link to KPA Business Plan Objectives	Inherent Risk				Residual risk after controls						Date Risk Identified	Date Last Changed	Committee Aligned to	
			Consequences (C)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Rating (CxL)	Risk Ranking	Controls to eliminate, reduce or transfer risk	Adequacy of controls	Consequences C	Likelihood (L)	Risk Rating (CxL)	Risk Ranking				
KPA 21	Prevent strategy is not monitored correctly and fully leading to damage to community relations or an attack by a Kent terrorist	Achieving results through consultation, collaboration and partnership	4	3	12	Medium	Lead member for CT and briefings with Head of CT Area members briefing with BCU commanders All members security cleared Develop action plan for KPA - linked to force action plan Prevent Partners Steering Board	U	3	2	6	Low	08.10.08	08.10.08	Full Authority	
KPA 22	Credit crunch and the associated freezing of KPA deposits in Icelandic banks will have an impact on the adequacy and level of reserves	Delivering Value for Money and Productivity	3	4	12	Medium	Oversight by A&G and full KPA Regular liaison with KCC and political lobbying	A	3	2	6	Low	22.10.08	14.05.09	Audit and Governance	
KPA 25	Failure to deliver the Policing Pledge leads to loss of confidence by the community.	Supporting Performance Improvement	3	3	9	Medium	Member involvement in establishing the pledge. Monitoring by PPC and PS Committee. Follow up on AFIs from HMIC inspection	A	3	2	6	Low	18.01.10	18.01.10	Policing Performance	
KPA 26	Employee dissatisfaction or strikes disrupt service delivery to the public	Delivering Value for Money and Productivity	3	3	9	Medium	KPA involvement in staff consultation. Relationship with Staff Associations Authority oversight of Force changes and plans Ensure staff are involved in plans	A	3	2	6	Low	26.05.10	26.05.10	HR Committee	
KPA 28	Possible legal action which might be taken against the Authority will threaten resources available inc under Health and Safety legislation.	Setting strategic direction and priorities	3	3	9	Medium	legal reserve and insurance Legal Advisor joint with Essex PA Oversight by HR Committee and Full Authority Delegated authority to Chief Constable H&S included in Sect 23 Collaboration agreements	A	2	3	6	Low	26.05.10	26.05.10	Full Authority	

## KENT POLICE AUTHORITY - RISK REGISTER

Register Version		Risk Assessor		Susie Latta		Date of Review						26.05.2010				
RISK ASSESSMENT																
Risk Ref	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	Link to KPA Business Plan Objectives	Inherent Risk				Residual risk after controls						Date Risk Identified	Date Last Changed	Committee Aligned to	
			Consequences (C)	Likelihood (L)	Risk Rating (CxL)	Risk Ranking	Controls to eliminate, reduce or transfer risk	Adequacy of controls	Consequences C	Likelihood (L)	Risk Rating (CxL)	Risk Ranking				
KPA 09	Policing Plan does not reflect national/ local/ partner/ public priorities causing lack of confidence	Setting strategic direction and priorities	2	4	8	Low	Policing Plan Group chaired by KPA member Citizen Panel/KCVS Stakeholder consultation Link to partners eg: CDRPs, KCJB Link to National Policing Priorities	A	2	2	4	Low	29.5.07	29.5.07	Full Authority	
KPA 15	Turnover / unplanned Secretariat absence hinders effective support to the Authority	Setting strategic direction and priorities	2	5	10	Medium	Effective staff management processes/ working environment/ Work life balance Use of force Positive Attendance management (PAM) Increased staff numbers	A	2	2	4	Low	04.02.08	26.05.10	Full Authority	
KPA 02	Poor overview and scrutiny of the Chief Officer Team by the KPA leads to financial, legal or Reputational damage.	Setting strategic direction and priorities	3	4	12	Medium	Full KPA meetings Advisory board meetings Chief/ Chair and Chief Exec/ DCC meetings Structured PDR process	A	3	1	3	Very Low	29.5.07	29.5.07	Full Authority	

## RISK ACTION SHEET

<b>Risk Ref:</b>	KPA 08 & KPA 24				
<b>Description of Risk:</b>	KPA 8: Revenue budget is insufficient to meet operational policing requirements leading to cuts in services KPA 24: Increased demands on policing resources combined with inadequate budgetary control leads to overspending and depletion of reserves				
<b>SUMMARY - Recommended response and impact:</b>					
Significant robust and deliverable additional savings need to be clearly identified and agreed, prior to the setting of the 2011/12 budget and Medium Term Plan (MTP). Treasurer and DFAIS working to identify savings.					
<b>RISK ACTION PLAN</b>					
<b>1. PROPOSED ACTION(S):</b>					
A fundamental review of the Medium Term Plan is being undertaken prior to Members' consideration of the 2011/12 budget, based upon alternative economic scenarios. The existing plan requires the identification of annual efficiency savings totalling £8.3m in the three years to 2012/13. A further target of 5% of controllable expenditure is being required of all areas and departments. The government requires are further £2.7m of savings with the current year's grant cut.					
<b>2. RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</b>					
The planning and implementation of savings is being achieved with existing resources.					
<b>3. RESPONSIBILITIES FOR ACTION:</b>					
The delivery of required efficiency savings and management of operational consequences is the collective responsibility of the Force SMT led by the Chief Constable. Responsibilities for ensuring that overall expenditure is matched by income lies with the Treasurer.					
<b>4. TIMINGS FOR ACTION:</b>					
The additional 5% savings requirement needs to be clearly identified and individual components risk assess prior to Members' consideration of the revised MTP in January 2011.					
<b>5. REPORTING AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS:</b>					
Budget monitoring and reporting initially to Audit and Governance Committee by the DFAIS, needs to be timely and robust. Budget Review Group are responsible for the annual review of the Medium Term Plan. Both report to the full Authority regularly.					
<b>COMPILED BY:</b>	Treasurer	<b>DATE:</b>	26.05.10	<b>DATE IMPLEMENTED</b>	ongoing

## RISK ACTION SHEET

<b>Risk Ref:</b>	KPA 20				
<b>Description of Risk:</b>	Changes in Home Office DSP Funding could leave the Authority financially exposed				
<b>SUMMARY - Recommended response and impact:</b>					
Awaiting discussions with Central Government on this issue.					
<b>RISK ACTION PLAN</b>					
<b>1. PROPOSED ACTION(S):</b>					
Monitoring of policing developments from Home Offices and through APA Influence policy making directly and through APA					
<b>2. RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</b>					
None needed					
<b>3. RESPONSIBILITIES FOR ACTION:</b>					
None currently					
<b>4. TIMINGS FOR ACTION:</b>					
None Currently					
<b>5. REPORTING AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS:</b>					
report to KPA in June 2010 and updates as appropriate					
<b>COMPILED BY:</b>	Chief Executive	<b>DATE:</b>	26.05.10	<b>DATE IMPLEMENTED</b>	ongoing

<b>RISK ACTION SHEET</b>					
<b>Risk Ref:</b>	KPA 30				
<b>Description of Risk:</b>	Failure to achieve the single confidence measure and perceptions of ASB, will impact negatively on the confidence of stakeholders and the public and could lead to sanctions from the Home Office/HMIC.				
<b>SUMMARY - Recommended response and impact:</b>					
Establish new Public Service Board to oversee confidence Keep stakeholders involved in all progress towards the target Oversight and scrutiny of force Confidence Strategy and associated work					
<b>RISK ACTION PLAN</b>					
<b>1. PROPOSED ACTION(S):</b>					
Public Service Board Oversight by Policing Performance Committee and lead/area members KPA involvement in workshops and consultation events Peer involvement and research into best practice CO leadership Reality testing of service on the ground.					
<b>2. RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</b>					
Increased member and officer time will be needed and achieved by diverting resource from elsewhere.					
<b>3. RESPONSIBILITIES FOR ACTION:</b>					
Chief Executive to establish the new Public Service Board as directed by the Authority					
<b>4. TIMINGS FOR ACTION:</b>					
As directed by the Authority					
<b>5. REPORTING AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS:</b>					
Reporting to Full KPA.					
<b>COMPILED BY:</b>	Chief Executive	<b>DATE:</b>	26.05.10	<b>DATE IMPLEMENTED</b>	Dec-10

# **Risk Register Appendices**

Appendix A

**Scoring Summary \***

<u>Adequacy of Controls</u>		<u>Consequences</u>		<u>Likelihood</u>		<u>Risk Rating</u>		<u>Changes to Risk Rating</u>	
Adequate	<b>A</b>	Catastrophic	<b>5</b>	Certain	<b>5</b>	V High	<b>20-25</b>	Controls	<b>C</b>
Inadequate	<b>I</b>	Severe	<b>4</b>	Likely	<b>4</b>	High	<b>15-19</b>	Risk Reduced	<b>R</b>
Uncertain	<b>U</b>	Significant	<b>3</b>	Possible	<b>3</b>	Medium	<b>9-14</b>	Risk Increased	<b>I</b>
		Minor	<b>2</b>	Unlikely	<b>2</b>	Low	<b>4-8</b>		
		Low	<b>1</b>	Rare	<b>1</b>	V Low	<b>1-3</b>		

\* see appendices for further details

Appendix B

IMPACT LEVEL / SCORE		CONSEQUENCES			
		COSTS	REPUTATION / PUBLICITY	LITIGATION	QUALITY
<b>LOW</b>	<b>1</b>	< £5k	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Isolated comment from single local media source.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minor Non-Compliance</li> </ul>
<b>MINOR</b>	<b>2</b>	£5k - £50k	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criticism of KPA in multiple local media publications.</li> <li>Breakdown in relations with single partner agency/body.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minor ex gratia settlement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Single failure to meet Internal Standards</li> </ul>
<b>SIGNIFICANT</b>	<b>3</b>	£50k - £500k	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant criticism of KPA in local/regional media &lt; 7-day coverage.</li> <li>HMIC / GOSE concern.</li> <li>Breakdown in relations with wider partner agencies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Civil action against KPA – no defence offered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Repeated failures to meet Internal Standards</li> </ul>
<b>SEVERE</b>	<b>4</b>	£500k - £5m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant criticism of KPA in National media &lt; 3 day coverage</li> <li>Use of Government Capping Powers invoked</li> <li>MP concern</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criminal prosecution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent failure to meet National / External / Professional Standards</li> </ul>
<b>CATASTROPHIC</b>	<b>5</b>	> £5m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant and sustained criticism of KPA in National media &gt; 3 day coverage</li> <li>Parliamentary or public enquiry launched.</li> <li>Use of Home Secretary's Intervention Powers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criminal prosecution – no defence</li> <li>Statutory Officer fined or imprisoned</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent failure to meet Legal Standards</li> </ul>

**RISK RATING – SCORING MATRIX**

<b>LIKELIHOOD</b>		<b>IMPACT</b>				
		<b>LOW</b>	<b>MINOR</b>	<b>SIGNIFICANT</b>	<b>SEVERE</b>	<b>CATASTROPHIC</b>
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>RARE</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>UNLIKELY</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>POSSIBLE</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>LIKELY</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>CERTAIN</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>25</b>

<b><u>RISK RATING</u></b>	
<b>Very Low</b>	<b>1-3</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>4-8</b>
<b>Medium</b>	<b>9-14</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>15-19</b>
<b>Very High</b>	<b>20-25</b>

Appendix D

# Likelihood Scoring

Level	Descriptor	Likelihood over 12 months (Expressed as a percentage)	
1	Rare	> 1% likely to happen	On the evidence available and under the known circumstances it has been assessed that the event is unlikely to occur except under truly exceptional circumstances
2	Unlikely	> 10% likely to happen	On the evidence available and under the known circumstances it has been assessed that the event is unlikely to occur in the next 12 months.
3	Possible	> 30% likely to happen	Whilst there is no evidence to indicate that the event may occur given the known circumstances it has been assessed that the event could possibly occur in the next 12 months.
4	Likely	51% likely to happen	On the evidence available and under the known circumstances, the event has been assessed as more likely to occur than not, within the next 12 months.
5	Certain	100% likely to happen	Given the preponderance of evidence available and under the known circumstances, it has been assessed that the event is almost certain to occur within the next 12 months.

Appendix E

<b><u>RISK APPETITE – DESCRIPTION OF RISK</u></b>		
<b><u>Level of Risk</u></b>	<b><u>Descriptor</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>
<b>Very Low</b>	Very Low Risk	An acceptable risk.
<b>Low</b>	Low or Tolerable Risk	A risk that is accepted and managed by normal systems and processes within the KPA that are established and observed. Periodic monitoring is required.
<b>Medium</b>	Moderate Risk	Management responsibility and control is required to reduce risk. This should be specified and detail the actions, processes or procedures that are in existence to manage risk at this level.
<b>High</b>	High Risk	Senior management action required. The risk may indicate a potential failure to meet a legal requirement, a KPA Target, Policy or Objective. Additional actions may need to be devised to manage risk. Risk to be reported through the Audit & Finance Committee to the KPA Board.
<b>Very High</b>	Very High (not acceptable to the KPA)	Risk not tolerated or acceptable to the KPA. Urgent focussed attention is required to manage or reduce risk. Chair and Chief Executive are to be informed.