

**M O P A C**MAYOR OF LONDON
OFFICE FOR POLICING AND CRIME

MPS-MOPAC JOINT AUDIT PANEL

5 July 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

In general, the Panel is content that MOPAC and the MPS has good governance in place to manage interdependent risks.

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.

Oversight of the MPS

- 1.2. At the March meeting the Panel asked for further information on the changes being made to assist with the oversight of the MPS and the effectiveness of the strategic approach.
- 1.3. MOPAC uses the term 'oversight' to describe the lever it deploys to hold the MPS to account on behalf of the public. It was identified, through the Change Programme, that there was a need to strengthen this function within MOPAC and the resultant restructure has sought to address this need, directing resource and providing more focus on oversight.
- 1.4. The renaming of the MOPAC Strategy Directorate to the Directorate of Strategy and Policing Oversight demonstrates clear focus on oversight of the MPS. The Director of Strategy and policing oversight has responsibility for overseeing the effectiveness and legitimacy of the MPS, whereas the CFO and Director of Corporate Services is responsible for the efficiency of the MPS.
- 1.5. Other key roles within the Strategy Directorate help to support that clear focus, in particular the creation of the Head of Oversight and MPS Performance brigades all oversight and performance work strands under one senior lead.
- 1.6. An amended MPS oversight regime will set the high-level areas where we want to oversee the MPS and reflect this in an outcome focussed oversight framework. MOPAC has done some of this work through the monthly oversight meeting and changes to internal governance, but further work is required. This is part of the Change Programme project of *Strengthening oversight of the MPS*, which aims to draw together the various resources which input into oversight of the MPS to create a single coherent framework for oversight. Work is progressing well, with a broad approach approved by MOPAC Board and initial conversations having taken place with the MPS. The next step will be to develop this work alongside the Police and Crime Plan, undertake further consultation and implement fully.

Governance reform

- 1.7. The Panel also asked for more information on the result of the governance reform review, one of the control actions from risk 6.

- 1.8. A significant amount of work has gone into governance reform to develop the new governance structure for the London Crime Reduction Board (LCRB) and London Criminal Justice Board (LCJB). Similar to the issues set out above for performance and oversight governance, the management of partnership governance was under-resourced. The Change Programme has sought to address this with a clear focus on Partnership through the renaming of the Commissioning and Criminal Justice Directorate to the Directorate of Commissioning and Partnerships. This helps to demonstrate the organisational focus on the development and management of partnerships. A new team has been created to drive partnership development and implement the new governance structure. Interim resource is in place to help build more effective partnerships, and the implementation of the new LCRB/LCJB structure will commence as soon as is practicable.

2. **Changes and movement of risk since last quarter**

- 2.1 *Risk 1 - MOPAC fails to secure adequate resources and set a balanced budget for policing in London* – At the current time it is felt that the funding risk is managed. MOPAC has a balanced budget for 2021-22 and the Met secured a reasonable funding settlement for the period, as well as an allocation from the national police officer uplift programme. This provides MOPAC with certainty over its resources in the short term. The uncertainty presents from 2022/23 onwards, where the Home Office grant or allocation of police officer uplift are still to be agreed and numerous elements of historic Mayoral growth funds come to an end. This risk will remain on the corporate risk register with the current score.
- 2.1. *Risk 18 - MOPAC's complex income streams are not adequately matched to the requirements of ongoing commissioned services* – Work has been completed between the commissioning team and finance team to ensure good budgetary control for 2020/21 and decisions have been made to set the budget for 2021/22. As a result, it has been agreed to close this risk.
- 2.2. 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.
- 2.3. More detail on some key risks where controls have progressed can be seen in Appendix B.

3. **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.

4. Financial Implications

- 4.1 As described in 2.1 above, the funding settlement was reasonable and allowed for a balanced budget. MOPAC will continue in its role on the Home Office group to advise on the new police funding formula and continue to influence future discussions. Work continues to identify the demands on the police and drive efficiencies.
- 4.2 The MOPAC risk management framework will contribute towards the management of MOPAC budgets and ensure that financial pressures are responded to effectively.

5. Legal Implications

There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

6. Risk Implications

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

7. Contact Details

Report author:

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

8. Appendices and Background Papers

Appendix A – MOPAC corporate risk overview

Appendix B – MOPAC summary risk position – Official Sensitive

Appendix A: MOPAC corporate risk overview

MOPAC Corporate Risks

Risk Theme	Risk Description	Risk Owner
Strategic	MOPAC fails to secure adequate resources and set a balanced budget for policing in London	CFO
	MOPAC fails to secure the effectiveness and efficiency of the MPS, through ineffective use of its oversight	CEO
	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
	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
	MOPAC fails to secure an effective partnership response for community safety and crime in London	Director of Commissioning and Partnership
	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
	MOPAC fails to influence London-wide and national delivery within policing and crime through its pilot programmes and published research	Director of Strategy
	Operational	MOPAC fails to deliver its commitments to the Mayor's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion strategy, in its delivery of services or as an employer
MOPAC's reputation is negatively impacted by the failure of a commissioned service		Director of Commissioning and Partnership
MOPAC fails to implement effective strategy, policy and practice for Information Governance in relation to its own delivery		Director of Strategy
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
MOPAC lacks the capacity and capability to deliver its responsibilities		CEO
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
MOPAC lacks adequate physical infrastructure, technology support or access to shared services to provide an effective platform for delivery		Director of Strategy
MOPAC fails to deliver a safe and healthy working environment for its staff and/or fails to provide adequate support for wellbeing		CEO
MOPAC fails to plan for resilient performance in the face of disruption to business continuity		Director of Strategy

