



TOTAL POLICING

MOPAC

MAYOR OF LONDON
OFFICE FOR POLICING AND CRIME

MPS-MOPAC JOINT AUDIT PANEL

18 January 2021

MOPAC Risk Management update

Report by: The Director of Strategy

Report Summary

Overall Summary of the Purpose of the Report

This report provides an overview of risk for the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC), along with the process to ensure controls are in place to address these.

This document summarises the organisation's headline risks (**Appendix 1**). Further detail on risk score, direction and key controls is presented in **Appendix 2**. The corporate risk register is reviewed monthly at the Governance and Risk working group meeting.

Key Considerations for the Panel

Review the control plan for MOPAC's risks, whilst being aware of the dynamic approach to the risk register that this improved system offers.

The Panel may also wish to discuss the critical dependencies. For example, the impact of funding (Risk 1) on most other risks within the matrix and how controls need to adjust depending on the outcome of this.

Interdependencies/Cross Cutting Issues

At the July meeting, the Panel asked for a specific risk paper on the joint work the MPS and MOPAC has done on the financial settlement. This is a separate paper on the agenda, although it should be noted that the fluidity of the Government's finances and Covid19 responses, and their subsequent effect on City Hall's financial planning, means that we will be in a better position to provide a verbal update on the latest developments.

Recommendations

The Audit Panel is recommended to note MOPAC's risk management approach.

1. Supporting Information

- 1.1. MOPAC reviews progress against each risk at the monthly Governance and Risk working group meeting and provides internal challenge to ensure the risk remain correct. Controls are assessed to understand whether they remain appropriate to address the risk, and whether any further controls need actioning. The championing of risk management by Directors ensures that sufficient pressure is applied to drive this work forward.

Court Delays

- 1.2. Court Delays and the implications this has had on victims of crime and the ability to signpost to the right services was discussed at the monthly Governance and Risk Working Group. The risk that it creates is around victims and is reflected within the controls of risk 4.
- 1.3. The issue stemmed back to the start of the pandemic, when the number of cases 'finalised' in London courts each week fell from 1,291 in Feb to 305 in the first week of April. Although the numbers have recovered there remains a significant backlog of cases. For MOPAC, the additional concern lies with the lack of reliable data on the backlog, with no way to identify who is most affected and to identify who has been referred to victim and witness services in London.
- 1.4. The DMPC has convened weekly meetings with relevant stakeholders to resolve the data issue; whilst the Mayor has written to Secretary of State Robert Buckland MP, setting out the disproportionate case for London and asking for plans for the Nightingale Courts to be expedited; needs of victims and witnesses to be considered carefully when listing cases; and data to be published. MOPAC will use its governance mechanisms to ensure all avenues to progress work in this area are used

Changes and movement of risk since last quarter

- 1.5. *Risk 4 - MOPAC fails to effectively discharge its statutory responsibilities to provide, or arrange the provision of, services to help victims and witnesses of crime.* – as set out above, the issue around court delays has impacted on service provision, particularly for the DA and sexual offences offer. For this reason, the risk scores have been set at *High impact* and *High likelihood*, with additional control actions in place.
- 1.6. Risk movement for all other risks has remained static for this quarter. MOPAC accepts that the controls in place are sufficient at this time to manage the corporate risks it faces. Although headline scores have stayed the same, the controls and potential future controls have been discussed and amended throughout.

1.5 More detail on some key risks where controls have progressed can be seen in Appendix B.

2. Equality and Diversity Impact

MOPAC consider risk on a Programme and Corporate level, with risk alignment taking place at a forum that is representative of the diversity of MOPAC staff and enables a transparent assessment of risks. Risks and mitigations identified recognise that equality, diversity, and community engagement should be treated as strategic priorities.

3. Financial Implications

3.1 A corporate risk facing both MOPAC and the MPS is that the Government fail to provide adequate funding for policing in London. Through its role on the Home Office group to advise on the new police funding formula MOPAC will continue to influence future discussions. Work continues to identify the demands on the police and drive efficiencies.

3.2 A separate paper outlining the work MOPAC and the MPS has done regarding the financial settlement is on the agenda.

3.3 The MOPAC risk management framework will contribute towards the management of MOPAC budgets and ensure that financial pressures are responded to effectively.

4. Legal Implications

There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

5. Risk Implications

The paper details the risk implications facing MOPAC and any interdependent risks or issues with the MPS.

6. Contact Details

Report author:

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

7. Appendices and Background Papers

Appendix A – MOPAC corporate risk overview

Appendix B – MOPAC summary risk position – Official Sensitive

Appendix A: MOPAC corporate risk overview

| Risk Theme | | Risk Description | Risk Owner |
|------------|--|---|---|
| Strategic | 1 | MOPAC fails to secure adequate resources and set a balanced budget for policing in London | Interim CFO |
| | 2 | MOPAC fails to secure the effectiveness and efficiency of the MPS, through ineffective use of its oversight | CEO |
| | 3 | MOPAC fails to hold the Commissioner to account for the legitimacy of the MPS, in relation to equalities, community engagement, custody and other areas defined in statute | Director of Strategy |
| | 4 | MOPAC fails to effectively discharge its statutory responsibilities to provide, or arrange the provision of, services to help victims and witnesses of crime. | Head of Policy & Commissioning - victims |
| | 6 | MOPAC fails to secure an effective partnership response for community safety and crime in London | Director of Commissioning and Partnership |
| | 7 | MOPAC fails to secure improvements in the criminal justice service for London owing to insufficient levers or not being able to secure necessary cooperation from central | Head of Policy & Commissioning - offenders |
| | 8 | MOPAC fails to influence London-wide and national delivery within policing and crime through its pilot programmes and published research | Director of Strategy |
| | Operational | 9 | MOPAC fails to deliver its commitments to the Mayor's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion strategy, in its delivery of services or as an employer |
| 10 | | MOPAC's reputation is negatively impacted by the failure of a commissioned service | Director of Commissioning and Partnership |
| 11 | | MOPAC fails to implement effective strategy, policy and practice for Information Governance in relation to its own delivery | Director of Strategy |
| 12 | | MOPAC fails to implement effective policy and practice in relation to safeguarding vulnerable individuals as an employer or in the delivery of its events and commissioned services | CEO |
| 13 | | MOPAC lacks the capacity and capability to deliver its responsibilities | CEO |
| 14 | | MOPAC lacks a programme and project management approach able to shape and track the delivery of outcomes and outputs and escalate programme risk | Director of Strategy |
| 15 | | MOPAC lacks adequate physical infrastructure, technology support or access to shared services to provide an effective platform for delivery | Director of Strategy |
| Financial | 16 | MOPAC fails to deliver a safe and healthy working environment for its staff and/or fails to provide adequate support for wellbeing | CEO |
| | 17 | MOPAC fails to plan for resilient performance in the face of disruption to business continuity | Director of Strategy |
| 18 | MOPAC's complex income streams are not adequately matched to the requirements of ongoing commissioned services | Director of Commissioning and Partnership | |

