

OFFICE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CONSTABLE

JOINT AUDIT COMMITTEE

9th March 2022

Present: Mrs D Turner (Chair)
Mr J Sheppard, Mr A Blackmore, Mr R Leadbeter and Dr J Wademan

Together with: Ms E Thomas - Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner (DPCC)
Mr D Garwood-Pask – Chief Finance Officer (CFO)
Mrs S Curley – Chief Executive (CEX)
Mrs J Regan – Head of Assurance and Compliance (HoAC)
Mrs N Warren – Governance Officer (GO)
Ms P Kelly – Chief Constable (CC)
Mr N Stephens – Assistant Chief Officer, Resources (ACOR)
Mr N McLain – Head of Continuous Improvement (HoCI)
Mr M Coe – Head of Finance (HoF)
Mrs H Cargill – (TIAA)
Ms H Williams – Audit Wales (AW)
Mr N Selwyn - Audit Wales (AW1)

The meeting was held online via Teams and commenced at 9:30am.

| 1. <u>APOLOGIES</u> | Action |
|--|---------------|
| Apologies for absence were received from Mr J Cuthbert, Police and Crime Commissioner, Mrs A Blakeman Deputy Chief Constable and Mrs T Veale, Audit Wales. | |
| 2. <u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> | |
| There were no advance declarations made in relation to the business to be transacted. | |
| 3. <u>APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR</u> | |
| <p>The CFO informed us that as per the Joint Audit Committee (JAC) Terms of Reference (ToR), the appointment of the Chair and Vice-Chair needed to be undertaken annually. We noted that the Chair may be re-elected but could serve no more than 3 consecutive years, other than in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>We agreed to nominate the current Chair, Mrs D Turner to the role for the coming financial year; she accepted the nomination and subsequent</p> | |

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| <p>appointment to the role of Chair. We thanked the Chair for her work in guiding the Committee over the previous two years.</p> | <p>Action</p> |
| <p>4. <u>APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIR</u></p> | |
| <p>Dr J Wademan was nominated and accepted the appointment as Vice-Chair for the ensuing year.</p> | |
| <p>5. <u>PRESENTATION ON JOINT WORKING BETWEEN EMERGENCY SERVICES.</u></p> | |
| <p>We received a presentation on Joint Working Between Emergency Services from Audit Wales.</p> <p>The review was focussed on two areas of work, including how emergency services in Wales were collaborating where possible; and how they were taking an integrated approach for the delivery of their services. The key elements of focus included current collaborative arrangements, analysis of the arrangements and identifying opportunities and plans for the future.</p> <p>It became clear early on in the project that the emergency services were responding to Covid as a priority and therefore, a revised terms of reference was produced and agreed by the Joint Emergency Services Group (JESG). Work commenced in May 2021 and the second stage concluded almost a year later. The report focussed on the second area of work to examine whether emergency services in Wales were working more closely together to make better use of resources. This included a review of the work of the JESG; Strategic Collaboration Board (SCB); the five collaboration work streams; lessons learnt as a result of Covid; and other wider learning that could be drawn from other emergency services in the UK.</p> <p>Although there's a long history of emergency services working together in Wales, government policy and legislation stipulates that collaboration needs to happen more quickly to meet the needs of the 21st Century. However, it is recognised that many elements of emergency services work would need to remain independent.</p> <p>AW1 advised us that the JESG has been providing clear leadership in terms of collaborative work, as it is the key priority with integration being a priority for the future.</p> <p>Although collaboration was taking place and progressing, the review had identified more opportunities for collaboration and that it could be conducted more efficiently in certain areas.</p> <p>Audit Wales considered the establishment of the SCB by the JESG to be beneficial, as it facilitates the identification, management and delivery of joint collaboration opportunities. However, some collaborative plans are more advanced than others, as there are opportunities to strengthen how the projects are managed to ensure delivery of the intended outcomes.</p> | |

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| <p>Evaluation of the impact of collaboration also requires strengthening, as there are no measures in place within the JESG to conduct this type of evaluation as yet.</p> <p>There are 9 recommendations within the report for consideration, including the use of a data tool to explore data further.</p> <p>The report was published in January 2022 and presented to the Public Accounts and Public Administration Committee, where the findings were accepted by the members. The work will be followed up in the future to ascertain if any further opportunities can be identified.</p> <p>The JESG have also accepted the findings of the review and plan to use them to improve current performance and to strengthen the work being undertaken.</p> <p>The Chair asked if there were any constraints in implementing the recommendations in terms of budget and how it would be managed.</p> <p>The ACOR informed us that the JESG had been established for a considerable amount of time and the level of engagement was good in ensuring all blue light services in Wales coordinated the work that could be done together. However, although some of the larger project work was well structured in terms of governance, such as the Emergency Services Mobile Communications Programme (ESMCP), which will replace Airwave with the digital Emergency Services Network (ESN), it was recognised as part of the Audit Wales review that some opportunities weren't being conducted in this structured manner, even though there was a good governance structure in place. This was often due to smaller collaborative projects being managed independently. This had already been recognised by the JESG and new project management structures had been established in order to manage this. The new structures had been running effectively over the course of the last 12 to 18 months. A recent example of this being the development of new alternative power sources for the Fleet vehicles for emergency services in Wales. The JESG is reviewing all options for blue light provision, to identify the best value and the most appropriate solution for each of the blue light services, as opposed to this being done separately.</p> <p>We were advised that the Audit Wales recommendations would be addressed at the Welsh Police Finance and Resources Group (WPFRG) and the structures and proposals would be developed as recommended within the report.</p> <p>The DPCC explained that there had been demonstrable evidence of collaborative work with other emergency services during Covid and asked if this could have been captured within the review, due to the timing of it. The DPCC suggested that if the review was to be revisited at a later date, as opposed to being conducted during Covid, further collaborative work between emergency services could have been identified. England and Wales also have different governance, therefore, collaborative opportunities could be taken in England in some areas, but not in others. Other PCCs also have the opportunity</p> | <p>Action</p> |
|---|----------------------|

| | |
|---|---------------|
| <p>to work with Fire Services, but that was not the case in Wales as Partner emergency services in Wales are devolved. Therefore, understanding the issues in relation to devolved and non-devolved services should be considered when identifying opportunities for collaboration.</p> <p>AW1 informed us it was probable that not all collaborative work between emergency services in Wales was captured during Covid, however, Audit Wales were able to gain a good understanding of the work through regular attendance at the JESG and were able to observe how the group were making decisions collectively in relation to collaboration through good leadership. The issues in relation to devolved and non-devolved opportunities was reflected within the report and it had been recognised that this does bring unique challenges to Wales. The report recognises the pragmatic approach taken by the Forces in Wales, whereby each of the PCCs acknowledge the importance of their role in terms of an integrated service response and working with other Welsh organisations directed by the Welsh Government.</p> <p>We thanked AW1 for summarising his report.</p> | Action |
| 6. <u>MINUTES</u> | |
| <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 8th December 2021 were received and confirmed.</p> | |
| 7. <u>ACTIONS</u> | |
| <p>We received and noted the actions from the meeting held on 8th December 2021 and actions outstanding from earlier meetings.</p> <p>Action 2, 8th December 2021, To Discuss New Risks and Changes to Risk Ratings on the Joint Risk Register We noted the JAC Risk Lead had met with the Force and OPCC to discuss the format of the Joint Risk Register and it was expected that the revised version would be presented at the June 2022 meeting.</p> <p>Action 1, Actions, 8th December 2021 The JAC Audit Lead thanked the CFO and ACOR for producing the summary of accounts as requested as members of the public would find it much easier to understand.</p> <p>Action 10, OPCC Data Protection Report 8th December 2021 We noted the comprehensive report was dated up to March 2021 and asked that future reports could be presented on a more timely basis. However, it was understood why the report was presented at this point in time. We noted appendix 2, Freedom of Information 2021 referred to Avon and Somerset. However, the information for Gwent Police FOIs could be found in the drop down list on the accompanying spreadsheet.</p> | |
| <p>8. The information contained in the report(s) below has been subjected to the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, Data</p> | |

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| <p>Protection Act 2018 and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Gwent's public interest test and was deemed to be exempt from publication under section 7.</p> | <p>Action</p> |
| <p>9. <u>TO DISCUSS NEW RISKS AND CHANGES TO RISK RATINGS</u></p> | |
| <p>We received and noted the Joint Risk Register.</p> <p>The HoCI confirmed that several meetings had taken place with JAC Risk Lead and the Force Risk Manager over the last month and thanked him for his time and input in relation to the revision of the Risk Register. The Risk Register was in the process of being completed prior to being submitted to the relevant governance boards.</p> <p>The revised format would contain more detail regarding the control mechanisms for each individual risk, such as the desired outcome, the action plan and timescale to reach the outcome. An abstract of the Risk Register would be produced for the JAC in an easy-read format, containing brief details of the risk and assurances from Senior Management on how the risk was being managed; or if there were issues that needed to be brought to their attention.</p> <p>The JAC Risk Lead reiterated the requirement for the revision, particularly for JAC, as the existing report presented to the meeting contained a large amount of operational information that was not relevant to JAC. Therefore, it was unclear what actions were being taken to mitigate the risks and whether the actions were sufficient and progressing at the right pace to meet the desired outcome. Affirmation from Senior Management would also provide assurances that the risks were being managed appropriately.</p> <p>Our attention was drawn to the new risk regarding spiking. The JAC asked if the risk would still be noted on the Risk Register at the following meeting, as the documents had shown what actions had been taken and which policies had been followed in order to mitigate the risk. The HoCI confirmed there were timeliness issues in relation to this risk and confirmed that it would remain on the Risk Register for the following meeting.</p> <p>It was acknowledged that although the Risk Register was to be revised, it was evident from the documentation and the governance processes, that Risk Management was well embedded within the organisation. JAC were assured that the revised version for JAC would provide further assurance of this, in the form of a Management Statement.</p> <p>The JAC ICT Lead asked what the Force and OPCC position was in terms of achieving an international best practice standard; and if they were aiming for that standard, many other public sector organisations had equivalents. The HoCI explained that a significant amount of scoping had been undertaken in relation to Risk Management and Risk Management Training had been received. The Force have looked at how Private Companies and other Police Forces manage risk and had set about using what was best practice for the Force.</p> | |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| <p>The JAC ICT Lead asked how JAC could gain an understanding as to what the internal controls were that have been put in place in terms of the different lines of defence and whether this would be embedded within the register. The HoCI advised us that the information on internal controls would be made available should it be required, or it could be added to the JAC Management Statement if required at a later date.</p> <p>The JAC ICT Lead asked if there were plans to use dedicated Risk Software in order to gain an appreciation of Force-wide real-time issues and their prioritisation, or if a spreadsheet was being used. The HoCI informed us that a spreadsheet was used at present, with the view that a facility within Microsoft O365 (O365) would be developed going forward.</p> <p>We noted previously that real-time issues were managed through Daily Management Meetings and asked if this was still the procedure. The HoCI confirmed that the meetings were still taking place and the risks were managed accordingly.</p> <p>We asked when the revised version of the Risk Register could be expected. The HoCI reiterated that it would need to be reviewed by the relevant governance boards for approval; and if this has not been completed by the JAC meeting in June 2022, a template version could be presented for review prior to the final version being presented at following meetings.</p> | Action |
| <p>10. The information contained in the report(s) below has been deemed not to be subject to the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, Data Protection Act and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Gwent's public interest test and is deemed not to be exempt from publication under Section 7.</p> | |
| <p>11. <u>INTERNAL AUDIT (TIAA)</u></p> | |
| <p>We received the following update reports:</p> <p>a) Update Report</p> <p>TIAA advised us the Collaborative Payroll and Creditors Audits had not taken place due to resourcing issues within TIAA and offered her apologies. The majority of the Welsh Forces had agreed that the timescale was too difficult to reschedule due to other commitments and therefore, the audits have been deferred to 2022/23 and will take place early next year. We were assured it would not affect the Head of Internal Audit's opinion. These audits had also received positive assurance ratings in previous years and therefore, there were already systems in place that were working well.</p> <p>The JAC Audit Lead queried why the Local Policing, Property and Cash - Part 2 audit had been deferred to Q1 2022/23, as this has been an ongoing issue for a number of years. The ACOR advised us that a project team had been functioning for a couple of years within the evidential team and substantial progress has been made regarding the decommissioning of individual</p> | |

evidential holding stores. The audit was deferred purely due to a timing issue, as the teams would be in the process of moving evidential property to the old Headquarters (HQ) during that period. This will be an interim move whilst the current evidential property store is refurbished. The Force plans to demolish the old HQ in July 2023 which should take 6 months and is expected to be completed by January 2024. The ACOR assured us that the audit would take place in the coming months. TIAA confirmed a date has been planned for the audit to take place.

We noted that progress could also be seen in relation to the Local Policing, Property and Cash audit within the Joint Risk Register documentation.

We referred to the Survey of Clients and asked how TIAA judged effectiveness in the context of the questions posed. TIAA informed us that the question was very basic and related to whether or not respondents felt home working had been effective and if they were able to continue to deliver their work effectively.

The JAC asked if the survey was conducted on a cross section of staff. We were advised that it was sent to the main contact in Force. The ACOR confirmed that he had received it and a response had been sent.

b) Draft Annual Internal Audit Strategy 2022/23

Our attention was drawn to Key Emerging Themes.

JAC referred to recruitment and asked if there were issues with levels of attrition in Gwent Police, or in Forces across Wales and whether this had been or should be considered as part of the audit reviews. TIAA confirmed they had looked at training and workforce planning, but recruitment had not been reviewed in Forces over the last twelve months. The ACOR advised us that the Value for Money Profiles (VfM) Deep Dive presentation following the meeting would provide clarity on this, as it contained a table of the number of leavers and attrition within the Force compared to other Forces, in which Gwent were the median level.

The CC informed us there were a number of factors impacting on this area, including the introduction of the performance framework, which meant that certain training must be undertaken by new recruits. National surveys had indicated that the extraction levels and the expectations of this training impacted on officers across the UK, who had then decided to leave the service at a rate of 11-12%. This level was comparable with other organisations, but this was not the case previously within Forces.

Although recruitment had improved nationally in terms of Black and Ethnic Minority employees, the number of black employees leaving Forces was also increasing, although this was primarily in other larger Forces.

The CC assured us that she was monitoring these issues and ensuring that as much information as possible was being gleaned through good exit interviews,

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| <p>The ACOR informed us that the Audit Plan 2022/23 would be presented at the June 2022 JAC meeting.</p> <p>There were a number of audits planned for the final quarter, all of which were progressing apart from one. The audit outcomes were positive as indicated in the audit reports circulated to JAC members. The ACOR assured us that he was satisfied that the Shared Resource Services (SRS) Management and the Torfaen County Borough County Council (TCBC) internal auditors were working together to ensure the risks and issues were being identified.</p> <p>The JAC Audit Lead referred to Key Points to Note in the TCBC Summary of Internal Activity report and asked why the Mobile Computing audit had not been completed within the expected duration. The ACOR confirmed that it was currently in progress.</p> <p>JAC referred to the other key point 'requiring the need for effort to ensure the plan is completed by the year end is repeated' and asked if this is something that could be an issue. The ACOR advised us that he had been assured by SRS Management that they were in a position to provide the necessary resources to support the work of the auditors. The JAC ICT Lead attends quarterly meetings with the ACOR and SRS Management and therefore has been party to this discussion.</p> | <p>Action</p> |
| <p>13. <u>EXTERNAL AUDIT</u></p> | |
| <p>We were advised that the Annual Audit Plan had been delayed due to an administrative delay. However, interim audit work was underway and the report would be presented at the June 2022 JAC meeting. Audit Wales apologised for the delay.</p> <p>We received and noted the following reports from External Audit:</p> <p>a) Update Report</p> <p>Audit Wales intend to deliver their Audit of the Accounts by the 31st July 2022.</p> <p>The JAC ICT Lead asked why the Big Red Button (BRB) software had become obsolete, given that it was highlighted as a key tool in the mapping of the accounts and that there were concerns noted within the report about mapping issues on the ledger. The CFO explained that although resources had been invested in the process both in terms of money and time, the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) no longer wished to support the BRB. However, the Force have gained valuable knowledge during the implementation process, in terms of mapping the Force's Fully Integrated Resource Management System (FIRMS) in an appropriate format into the Local Authority CIPFA code.</p> <p>The HoF advised us that the Finance Team had used BRB for the last four years and they assisted with the development of the tool. Although it was not</p> | <p>GO</p> |

the Force's decision to stop using it, we were assured the expertise within the team had grown as a result of its use. The mapping document used to map the trial balance to the BRB would be retained to use as a link between the general ledger and the accounts. The knowledge gained had enabled the Finance Team to build a clear set of accounts for Audit Wales to audit.

Action

JAC asked how consistency between the Forces' accounts would be maintained, if the BRB was no longer in use. The HoF advised us that he and his counterparts communicated on a regular basis, as the accounts were at 85-90% in terms of their similarity, with the exception of a small element for local requirements. This enabled issues to be ironed out and a consistent approach taken across the Welsh Forces. This approach also assisted Audit Wales when auditing the accounts.

JAC acknowledged there was consistency on an all-Wales basis and asked if this applied on a UK basis also. We were advised the Four Welsh Forces followed a standardised accounts process and that all Forces worked from the same Local Authority Accounting Code. However, simplifying the Accounts had been an ongoing discussion with CIPFA.

We noted the lessons learnt paper indicated that the BRB work had been completed and suggested that Audit Wales removed the recommendation from their report. Audit Wales agreed to remove the action.

AW

b) SRS Review

The JAC ICT Lead asked how the SRS review was going to be taken forward for the benefit of the individual partners and as a whole generally, as there were no definitive recommendations noted within the report. The ACOR informed us that this report was presented to SRS board members, who were ultimately responsible for setting the strategic direction. The report had also been scrutinised through the relevant governance boards, including the SRS Finance Governance Board (FGB). It had been agreed that the existing arrangements in terms of governance and resourcing were sufficient to deliver the collaborative work to Local Authority and Policing Partners. This was particularly demonstrative during the impact of Covid, where the SRS were able to work at pace to ensure business continuity for all partners. There were also other benefits for using a shared ICT model. A recent example being the use of M365, where collaborative tools have been developed within applications that the partners can use as part of multi-agency working.

The CC advised us that effectiveness of partnership working was reflected within the report, in terms of day-to-day business. However, the level of capacity was a concern, as innovation could sometimes be curtailed. The CC suggested there could be more innovation built into the five-year plan and acknowledged that partners were working at different levels in some areas, although acknowledged the gap was narrowing. The JAC ICT Lead agreed it appeared that the SRS had been established as an efficient delivery mechanism, but don't have the capacity or capability in order to look further

| | |
|--|---------------|
| <p>There was a precept increase of 6.82% proposed in December 2021 in the Chief Constable's bid resulting in a £1.9m deficit in funding for the following financial year.</p> <p>The precept proposal was subsequently revised from 6.82% to 5% following receipt of the Provisional Settlement, Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) and the results of the Precept Consultation Survey. There were a number of influencing factors relating to the decrease in the proposed precept, such as the advance funding for the third year of Operation Uplift, resulting in a non-recurrent surplus; and the capping levels in England standing at a £10 increase. A rise of 6.82% would have equated to £20 for Gwent. The public were asked during the Precept Survey if they would be willing to pay a £2 a month rise for policing, equating to a £24 rise per year and £4 over what was initially proposed. Only 49% of respondents said they would. This was lower than in previous years, so this was also taken into consideration. The PCC also had to consider the unprecedented increase in living costs.</p> <p>Having scrutinised the bid in detail, the OPCC felt assured the bid would provide effective operational delivery and agreed the cost envelope to support it.</p> <p>The bid was presented to the PCP who were very supportive of the work of Gwent Police and were very aware of the challenges faced by the public due to the cost of living pressures. However, they were concerned about the level of borrowing required to support the Commissioner's Estate Strategy. Following a debate, the panel agreed to Veto the proposed precept and raised it from 5% to 5.5%, resulting in a funding deficit of £2.2m.</p> <p>The Veto recommendation was accepted.</p> | Action |
| <u>15. COMMISSIONING INTENTIONS REPORT 2022/23</u> | |
| <p>We received and noted the Commissioning Intentions Report 2022/23.</p> <p>The report demonstrates proposed commissioning activity to 2022/23.</p> <p>The CFO advised us that this report would be brought to JAC on a regular basis in March each year and a further report focussing on year-end performance of commissioning outcomes presented in July meetings.</p> <p>We were advised that the document was dynamic, according to changing commissioning requirements. The commissioning intentions would be guided by the new Police and Crime Plan, the Force Delivery Plan and the OPCC Business Plan and would provide transparency to the public of Gwent.</p> <p>The document was currently undergoing assessment, to identify new gaps in commissioning. The governance process was also being revised to clarify that the commissioning intentions were jointly owned by the Force and OPCC.</p> | |

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| <p>The DPCC advised us that the PCC was fully committed to commissioning in partnership with the Chief Constable and her team and this joint approach was not one that was followed by many other OPCCs.</p> | <p>Action</p> |
| <p>The JAC asked how VfM and effectiveness was assessed for laudable projects; what procurement controls were in place in relation to the grants; and what was the decision making process with regards to how long the pilot projects continued for. The CFO agreed to address these questions in his year-end Commissioning Performance deep dive presentation in July.</p> | <p>CFO</p> |
| <p><u>16. REVIEW OF MANUAL OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE (INCLUDING TERMS OF REFERENCE)</u></p> | |
| <p>We received and noted the Manual of Corporate Governance (including the Terms of Reference).</p> <p>The CEx reminded us that ordinarily, the JAC would have received the amendments to the Manual of Corporate Governance MoCG for approval prior to the SPB meeting. The PCC and CC had agreed the amendments in principle, subject to any amendments recommended by JAC.</p> <p>We noted the proposed changes to the MoCG were indicated within the Annex provided, including terminology changes; changes to the Schemes of Delegation; and updated legislation. A tracked changed copy had been circulated to JAC members outside of the meeting as requested.</p> <p>The appropriate departments had been consulted, including Joint Legal Services, to ensure the relevant changes had been incorporated within the review.</p> <p>A review of the JAC Terms of Reference had been conducted and no changes were made.</p> <p>The JAC asked if the change in the Head of Professional Standards from Chief Superintendent to Superintendent was a change in structure, or an amendment to the title. The CEx confirmed it was change to title not the structure or responsibility.</p> | |
| <p><u>17. CAPITAL STRATEGY REPORT 2022/23-2026/27</u></p> | |
| <p>We received and noted the Capital Strategy 2022/23-2026/27</p> <p>This CFO informed us there had been minor changes since the previous version in March 2019, the main change being the addition of the Environmental and Sustainability Strategy and the Greener Gwent Strategy (GGS).</p> <p>It's an overarching document that incorporates all of the functional strategies, statutory requirements, internal policies and governance processes to ensure delivery of the Capital Programme.</p> | |

| <u>19. OUTSTANDING AUDIT INSPECTION RECOMMENDATIONS</u> | Action |
|--|---------------|
| <p>We received and noted the Outstanding Audit Inspection Recommendations.</p> <p>The ACOR advised us that progress had been made in relation to both TIAA and TCBC audit recommendations.</p> <p>There was an extension request in relation to the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) Compliance Audit Review 1, to the 31/12/2022. Although the Force have a completed a significant amount of work in terms of reviewing documents on filing systems, there were some outstanding issues, such as the transferring of information to M365 Sharepoint, that required completion. The ACOR assured JAC that the work was progressing and suggested an update be provided to JAC in December 2022, when the work should be complete.</p> <p>The JAC ICT Lead asked how confident the ACOR was in terms of meeting the target and if there were contingency plans and internal milestones to indicate if things were on target to meet that date. The ACOR confirmed he had received a programme of work and he would share it with the JAC ICT Lead at their next ICT meeting, in order to provide assurance that work was progressing.</p> <p>The extension was agreed given the complexity of the task.</p> <p>The ACOR's suggested approach with regards to updating the Committee in December 2022 was also agreed.</p> | ACOR |
| <u>20. UPDATE ON ACCOUNTS LESSONS LEARNED ACTION PLAN</u> | |
| <p>We received and noted the Update on the Accounts Lessons Learned Action Plan.</p> <p>The HoF informed us 4 of the 5 actions had been completed since the action plan was presented to JAC in December 2021.</p> <p>The accounting issues in the previous financial year, caused by receiving 3 iterations of the IAS19 pension liability information on Police Pension Schemes from the Government Actuary Department (GAD), had been resolved as it had been agreed that the information would be received in April 2022. This approach would provide the Finance Team more time to make the adjustments to the draft unaudited accounts, should there be any issues. However, given the change in administrator from Capita to XPS, this was not expected to be an issue.</p> <p>The remaining outstanding action related to working papers documentation. Discussions have been taking place with Audit Wales to ensure the documentation is in the correct format, as the Force would not be using the BRB software.</p> | |

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| <p>West of England. This had helped to ensure ethical issues across the policing arena are captured.</p> <p>The CEx confirmed the Ethics Committee was formed in 2015, whereby the membership was a mix of officers, staff and members of the public. Members of the public have been able to offer their perspective to the Committee, which had proven to be very valuable in terms of Ethical Dilemmas. A new Terms of Reference (ToR) has been drafted, with the expectation that the Committee would comprise a minimum of three independent members as well as an independent Chair. It is also the intention to appoint members with expertise in Ethics.</p> <p>The JAC welcomed further development of the Ethics Committee and asked how individuals could raise issues to put before the Committee. The CEx confirmed there was a link on the Force Intranet where issues could be submitted by name or anonymously. The Committee Lead presented issues on behalf of the anonymous reporters, or in many cases the individuals wished to present the issues to the Committee themselves. Local and Regional Ethical Dilemmas were also discussed with the Committee, a recent example being the use of Automatic Facial Recognition.</p> <p>The JAC asked if there was an option for the general public to report on Ethical Dilemmas. The CEx advised us that there was not a formal process at the moment, but this was something that could be discussed with the Committee going forward. However, when questions were received from the public where an Ethical element could be identified which could benefit from further exploration, the issues were discussed by the Committee.</p> <p>We noted the report referred to external members and the ToR referred to independent members and asked if they were one and the same role. The CEx confirmed that they were.</p> | <p>Action</p> |
| <p><u>25. ANY OTHER BUSINESS</u></p> | |
| <p>We noted the following:</p> <p>Disaster Recovery The ACOR confirmed that British Telecom had made the changes to the circuit. The SRS now needed to activate the configuration. Plans were in progress to make the changes in March and April and once complete, the Disaster Recovery system would be tested.</p> <p>The JAC ICT confirmed she was satisfied that the ACOR had addressed the concerns raised. The Chair thanked the ICT Lead for her work, as it provided JAC with further assurance in this area.</p> <p>Deep Dive Topics We discussed the Deep Dive Topics and agreed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 2022, Tour of the New Headquarters | |

