

MOPACMAYOR OF LONDON
OFFICE FOR POLICING AND CRIME**METROPOLITAN
POLICE****TOTAL POLICING**

AUDIT PANEL

Tuesday, 19 December 2017

Alignment of MOPAC and Met Risks

Report by: MOPAC Chief Executive Officer & Met Director of Strategy & Governance

Report Summary

Overall Summary of the Purpose of the Report

This report sets out the developing quarterly report for aligned Met and MOPAC risks. We have considered over the last quarter the principles of a joint risk and the most appropriate way to provide oversight and progress of joint controls.

Key Considerations for the Panel

To consider evolving reporting on joint Met/MOPAC risks and gain assurance that MOPAC and the Met are progressing work to develop processes for the alignment of risk and the reporting of these.

Interdependencies/Cross Cutting Issues

- This report refers to both the Met and MOPACs' risk registers presented in separate reports to this meeting.

Recommendations

The Audit Panel is recommended to:

- a. Review and comment on appendix 1 and the proposed improvements to reporting in the coming quarter.

1. Supporting Information

- 1.1 At the September meeting of Audit Panel the Met and MOPAC submitted their second joint risk report covering those risks which align to prevent both organisations from delivering key objectives within the Police and Crime Plan. The Panel requested future quarterly reports with more detail.
- 1.2 A senior meeting was held on 19 October to establish the principles of joint risk and whether there was benefit in developing a joint risk register. Given the operational and strategic differences between the organisations, and how this subsequently is reflected in the risks themselves, it was agreed that a joint risk register would not be beneficial at this time.
- 1.3 Developing a process for looking at joint controls was deemed to be a productive and effective approach. As a consequence of these discussions, a representative from the Met's Insight Team now attends the MOPAC Governance & Risk working group on a quarterly basis, the first meeting was on 23 November. This allows for joint discussions regarding the controls put in place around the joint risks and work to progress them.
- 1.4 The MOPAC CFO and Director of Strategy also attend the Met's Risk and Assurance Board. Amendments to the terms of reference for this meeting are planned to clarify the role of MOPAC on this Board. The intention is to ensure joint risks are identified and discussed at both organisations' strategic Boards.
- 1.5 Further to this work, on 14 November, Director of Strategy (MOPAC) and Director of Strategy and Governance (Met) agreed to align the Met asks of partners on the London Crime Reduction Board (LCRB) sub-boards, and vice versa the partners' asks of the Met – through a new workshop approach to develop the delivery plans of each sub-board. This process will commence with the VAWG Board and the others will follow into the Spring of 2018. This will bring a greater alignment around governance and delivery of the PCP commitments.
- 1.6 The developments over this quarter will enable a more detailed discussion in coming quarters to improve our reporting on joint risk controls in line with the Panel's request that the MOPAC and Met joint risk report become a more comprehensive document.
- 1.7 In future quarters we will include the key residual risks for each area and an assessment of whether controls are in place and working.
- 1.8 The four risks identified remain the same. These are:
 - Funding
 - Governance
 - Safeguarding
 - Insight
- 1.9 Audit Panel are invited to comment on the risk report at **appendix 1** and the proposed improvements in the coming quarter.

2 Equality and Diversity Impact

This report has no direct equality and diversity impacts. Actions to control risks will be subject to the relevant Met and/or MOPAC processes to assess equality and diversity impacts.

3 Financial Implications

The MOPAC/Met risk management frameworks will contribute towards the management of MOPAC/Met budgets and ensure that financial pressures are responded to effectively. Any funding required over and above these existing budgets will be subject to the normal MOPAC/Met governance approval and planning processes.

4 Legal Implications

There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

5 Risk Implications

Risk reporting assists MOPAC and the Met to manage and track risk to the achievement of the Police and Crime Plan focusing particularly on whether controls are fit for purpose and manage risk areas as intended.

6 Contact Details

Report authors:

Jo Collins Email: jo.collins@met.pnn.police.uk

Gemma Deadman Email: Gemma.Deadman@mopac.london.gov.uk

7 Appendices and Background Papers

Appendix 1 – Met/MOPAC joint risk overview

Risk 1: Safeguarding

Current risk description	Organisation	Risk owner	Risk Trend
Failure to play our part to protect the most vulnerable members of the community and deliver an effective service to those most in need	Met	ACTP	↔
Ineffective use of resources to embed vulnerability in the strategic response to crime reduction	MOPAC	Director of IOM	↔

Joint Controls

- **Police and Crime Plan:** There is a clear message within the Police and Crime Plan which addresses vulnerability of both people and places. This will assist to shift culture away from a volume crime focus in both organisations.
- **London Child Protection Policing Improvement Oversight Group:** Chaired by the Deputy Mayor this group provides external oversight of the Met's response to HMICFRS's National Child Protection Inspection.
- **Child Safeguarding Gold Group:** Provides oversight within the Met of our response to HMICFRS's National Child Protection Inspection. MOPAC are represented at this meeting.
- **Victims' Commissioner:** The new Commissioner took up post in June 2017. A discussion regarding the role of the new Commissioner has taken place at the DMPC/Commissioner management teams' seminar in July and the Commissioner is meeting with senior members of staff in both organisations.
- **A joint workshop** took place between the Met and MOPAC at their away day on 9 October to gain a common understanding of vulnerability and safeguarding and to better define the responsibilities the Met, MOPAC and partners have in this regard.

Risk 2: Governance

Current risk description	Organisation	Risk owner	Risk Trend
Failure to ensure effective governance of the Met that results in a lack of accountability, robust and effective assurance and empowerment of leaders	Met	Deputy Commissioner	↔
Failure to agree effective and efficient processes for governance across the full scope of PCP delivery	MOPAC	Chief Finance Officer	↓

Joint Controls

- **Oversight Board:** The MOPAC-Met Oversight Board has been established to enable the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime (DMPC) to effectively exercise the role and duties of the Police and Crime Commissioner of the Metropolis, as delegated by the Mayor of London.
- **Quarterly reporting:** We are working jointly to develop improved and standardised quarterly reporting which includes key measures that highlight our progress to deliver objectives within the Police and Crime Plan. When complete this report will be made publicly available.
- **Investment Advisory Board:** The Investment Advisory Board meets monthly to ensure the MOPAC estates strategy is fit to meet the objectives outlined in the Police and Crime Plan and the operational requirements of the Commissioner. It also ensures that Met investment decisions deliver the Police and Crime Plan and are founded on a sound business case, contributing to the budget targets set by the DMPC for the MPS.

Potential Controls

- **Scheme of Delegation:** The scheme of delegation from MOPAC to the Met to be reviewed

Risk 3: Money

Current risk description	Organisation	Risk owner	Risk Trend
Failure to align our overall medium term resources to support the Police and Crime Plan and MPS strategic objectives	Met	Director of Finance and Commercial	↔
Failure to attract adequate resources for policing taking account of the needs of London, or to fulfil our statutory duty to secure the efficiency and effectiveness of the MPS	MOPAC	Chief Finance Officer	↑

Joint Controls

- **Lobbying:** MOPAC and the Met will continue to lobby on police funding, though we will need and want to take different approaches to this. MOPAC/Met is already on funding formula groups - awaiting HO decision on way forward.
- **Quarterly budget monitoring**
- **Precept planning** – working group in place has developed a precept ready reckoner, to compare different precept scenarios and assess implications of changes against budget and spend decisions.
- **Service Area Reviews:** MOPAC to introduce a mechanism for reviewing Met service areas at Investment Advisory Board. IAB Forward Look schedules monthly service area reporting on significant contracts.

Risk 4: Insight

Current risk description	Organisation	Risk owner	Risk Trend
Failure to invest in developing our insight capability resulting in missed opportunities to deliver effective information for decision making	Met	Deputy Commissioner	↔
Failure to adapt to emerging policy and operational challenges, and make effective interventions through oversight or convening of partners	MOPAC	Director of Strategy	↔

Joint Controls

- **Insight services:** In 2014 the Met's research team moved to MOPAC where a joint service is provided: greater liaison is required in respect of this service to ensure that we are achieving the best insight on which to direct activity to deliver the Police and Crime Plan.
- **Capacity and capability grip** on MOPAC Evidence & Insight team's workload. Monthly reports to Police and Crime Plan delivery group to set out prioritisation of workload across MOPAC and Met customer requirements. This allows for re-prioritisation of internal resource and diversion of tasking to external service providers.
- A new **service level agreement** between MOPAC and Met on work of MOPAC Evidence & Insight team is under discussion between Director of Strategy (MOPAC) and Director of Strategy and Governance (Met)