

The command log entries for ICI would benefit from more detail, particularly regarding specific capability. The detail is in the supporting text narrative but clarity in the ICI summary is best practice.

### **Threat, Harm and Risk Assessment**

The TFC assesses the Threat, likely harm and risk flowing from the known information and intelligence. He summaries the threat faced as:

“This OCG have access to Firearms and a propensity to discharge against rival groups. There is an intention to assist Izzet Eren in escaping from custody and this is likely to involve the use of weapons to place custodians under duress.”

All relevant groups at risk from this threat are then individually assessed and graded with a supporting rationale. This then produces a hierarchical TFC working strategy, which is later endorsed by the SFC as the adopted strategy to drive the operational priorities:

Each group that is assessed is ultimately graded as L (Low) in both SFC and TFC logs as the risk level at the time of writing, there is supporting rationale that explores some elements of risk due to time and location, but this is not comprehensive.

The use of multi-dimensional Threat Harm and Risk assessment should be adopted in the written command logs, to give clarity of the multi-dimensional risk – such as

- risk now
- risk should the subjects drive a point of contact (the criminal intent) or
- risk at the Police point of contact (our intervention).

This will bring clarity of the policing purpose relating to the when and where of Article 2 Human Rights Pressures, as we would see the risk to Serco custodians be at H- High at a subject point of contact, risk to other occupants of the prison bus, and any public in the immediate vicinity of the attack facing elevated risk. Similarly, the risk to armed and unarmed and tasked and untasked police officers should be defined across the timescales.

These elements do not feature in the SFC or TFC written assessments. The risk to Izzet Eren and other prisoners on the prison van are considered by the TFC, but do not feature in the final strategy.

The risk to the unknown subjects is considered and graded Low, with the supporting rationale:

“The subjects may be subjected to an armed interception / intervention if circumstances dictate. The chosen location, tactics and the use of trained personnel who will be in possession of appropriate