

KEY		
A	B	C
<b>Risk Level 1-25</b>	<b>Impact Score 1-5</b>	<b>Likelihood Score 1-5</b>
1-5 = Low	1 = No impact	1 = Not at all likely
6-10 = Low/medium	3 = Moderate impact	3 = Neither likely or not likely
16-20 = Medium/high	5 = Significant impact	5 = Certain
21-25 = High		

Ref	General description of the risk of not launching PTEC	A	B	C	Risk Score	Guidance
1	Individual: Officers become aware of PTEC and feel deprived of it (moral injury)	Low/Medium	3	3	9	PTEC is already available in the academic material and interest in new trauma tools can grow and ease expectations. Early communications on forces interest in PTEC is advised internally from May 2023 when PTEC will be more widely known.
2	Individual: Officers become aware of PTEC and use it without guidance or support	Low/Medium	3	3	9	While PTEC is a wellbeing tool, it is advisable to make guidance readily available with links to further support included clearly on the tool.
3	Individual: Trauma unknowns remain unknown, i.e. individuals' awareness of trauma impact levels, triggers and resiliences.	Medium/High	4	4	16	Unknown trauma sources and issues equate to unprocessed trauma which we know leads to PTSD. If a force decides not to use PTEC to help identify unprocessed trauma, alternate means of supporting individuals should be provided to mitigate CPTSD levels in force which is often hidden in the sickness date categories.
4	Organisation: Risk to efficacy for stakeholders with an investment in UK Police trauma resilience including the National Police Wellbeing Service, The College of Policing, The National Police Chief's Council and HMICFRS.	Low/Medium	4	4	8	Without PTEC, the NWBS trauma tracking is limited as is NPCC's understanding of national trauma management, alternative means of capturing data for APP is advised.
5	Operations: Trauma Triage at Police Care UK, in forces, with EAPs and even in the NHS will not have the opportunity to benefit from PTEC.	Medium	3	4	12	Without PTEC, trauma triage, signposting and treatment decision making will lose out on additional support and benefits, which could increase capacity and efficacy over time.
6	Reputation: Stakeholders and forces not engaging with PTEC (with or without a full launch) may be called on to explain why, by individuals more publicly.	Low	2	3	3	Not taking up PTEC could be interpreted as being negligent or unsupportive of police trauma if no alternative of trauma monitoring is being used in force.

KEY		
A	B	C
<b>Risk Level 1-25</b>	<b>Impact Score 1-5</b>	<b>Likelihood Score 1-5</b>
1-5 = Low	1 = No impact	1 = Not at all likely
6-10 = Low/medium	3 = Moderate impact	3 = Neither likely or not likely
16-20 = Medium/high	5 = Significant impact	5 = Certain
21-25 = High		

Ref	General description of risk of launching PTEC	A	B	C	Risk Score	Guidance
<b>1a</b>	Individuals: Being intrigued and then being overwhelmed.	Low	3	3	3	Case studies and pilots demonstrated more relief and insight in individuals than overwhelm, especially using the guide for individuals.
<b>b</b>	Individuals: Using PTEC raises difficult feelings or emotions for the individual completing the tool.	Low/Medium	3	2	6	Case studies showed that PTEC captures existing areas of difficulty and helps to give them clarity and places them in common ground.
<b>c</b>	Individuals: Sharing without the guidance.	Low	1	1	1	Any risks of sharing a wellbeing tool can be mitigated against by good communications advising use and accompanying guidance.
<b>d</b>	Individuals: Not knowing if they need help or not, and where to get it from.	Low	4	1	4	Providing contacts and informing about existing support is vital for success in using PTEC with individuals.
<b>e</b>	Individuals: Individuals being erroneously/unnecessarily identified by their managers (or others) as needing help or support.	Low	2	1	2	Forces need to be clear about how PTEC can reflect resilience as well as vulnerability, Training managers using the guidance provided is advisable.
<b>f</b>	Individuals: Individuals wary of not being supported in using PTEC.	Low	1	1	1	Forces may need to use PTEC to enjoy more confidence in addressing stigma so individuals give themselves better chances for support.
<b>2a</b>	Forces: Revealing a (previously) hidden PTSD prevalence.	Low	2	1	2	PTEC is not an indicator or predictor of PTSD but a means to capture exposure in daily life engagement.
<b>b</b>	Forces increased OH and EAP referrals	Low/Medium	3	3	9	Initial engagement in trauma support is expected from any improvements in signposting. Early indications in case studies suggest uptake of services is minimally affected.
<b>c</b>	Forces: misuse of PTEC raising sickness levels and early retirement claims	Low	1	1	1	Effective communications and use of guidance will ensure PTECs proper use and explain its inability to provide any data on PTSD of clinical significance.



KEY		
A	B	C
<b>Risk Level 1-25</b>	<b>Impact Score 1-5</b>	<b>Likelihood Score 1-5</b>
1-5 = Low	1 = No impact	1 = Not at all likely
6-10 = Low/medium	3 = Moderate impact	3 = Neither likely or not likely
16-20 = Medium/high	5 = Significant impact	5 = Certain
21-25 = High		

Ref	General description of risk of launching PTEC	A	B	C	Risk Score	Guidance
3a	Forces: Not understanding how to fit PTEC in with existing interventions.	Low	1	1	1	Effective force-wide communications on how PTEC supports existing provision, wellbeing team delivery, Occupational Health and TRIM can encourage smooth integration and improvements to service flow.
4a	Forces: Concern that data collected using PTEC could be leaked or FOI'd	Low	4	1	4	Forces need to be clear with supervisors and force systems and initiatives, that PTEC data is subject to the same GDPR and data quality controls as other personal data in force.
b	Force: PTEC misinterpreted as a deterrent to join the police	Low	1	1	1	Effective media management when launching PTEC in force will protect forces against risks to recruitment. Guidance for trainers and recruitment is also available.
c	Force: PTEC seen as revealing unknown hazards.	Low	1	1	1	PTEC only covers the most common ground as all police trauma - 25% of other exposures that are uncategorised are excluded.
5a	PTEC Risk: If stakeholders (wellbeing leads/trim leads/OHs/NPCC etc) are not supportive of PTEC - roll out will be unsuccessful and may damage the reputation of the tool/workstream and inhibit the tool's ability to support officers.	Medium	4	3	12	Case studies demonstrate that PTEC needs to be integrated fully in to all tiers of management as a trauma management tool for individuals, their managers and the senior officers that oversee the performance and resilience of the wider organisation. Full guidance on promoting PTEC decision making in forces is available.
b	PTEC Risk: Managers' concern for PTEC starting new uncomfortable conversations so avoid PTEC	Low	3	1	3	As well as guidance for supervisors, there is a case study to better explain how to encourage and ensure confidence in using PTEC in supervisory roles
6	PTEC Risk: A culture of suspicion about PTEC among senior management developing - leading to under-utilisation/avoidance and subsequently damage to the reputation of the tool/workstream and inhibit the tool's ability to support officers.	Low	5	1	5	Case studies revealed low level suspicion of PTEC only in cases where there had been insufficient training in PTEC and where time pressures and capacity were at their limits. With full training and use of guidance, suspicion transformed to relief and gratitude for a new way of getting on top of a key trauma issues locally and potentially nationally.