

JAC SELF ASSESSMENT ACTION PLAN

		<u>ACTION PLAN</u>		
		Key: Green = On-going Blue = Completed		
<u>Questionnaire Number and Question</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Suggested Resolution</u>	<u>Agreed Resolution (To be completed at the meeting)</u>	
ROLLED OVER FROM PREVIOUS YEARS ACTION PLAN				
4.	Do the committee's terms of reference explicitly address all the core areas identified in CIPFA's Position Statement.	<p>Assurance Framework Action rolled over from previous financial year: A pictorial representation of the sources of assurance that make up the framework could be beneficial, indicating opportunities for triangulation.</p>	Work is ongoing between the force and OPCC to develop a pictorial representation and will be shared with JAC members for feedback.	<p>Update June 2021: Now the BAF has identified gaps and is being monitored and progressed via the Strategic Planning Group, the HoAC and the Chief Inspector will work on developing a pictorial representation for JAC.</p> <p>Update December 2021: The HoAC and Chief Inspector have agreed on a potential suitable pictorial representation of the BAF for the JAC. This will be developed and the JAC sighted prior to finalisation but has currently been put on hold due to other demands. The BAF action plan can be shared with JAC if they wish to see the progress being made.</p> <p>Update March 2022: Update as per December 2021.</p> <p>Update June 2022: The HoAC has started to look at how this can be best presented to the JAC. A draft version for feedback will be circulated prior to an updated and final version being presented to the JAC for their annual review at the September 2022 meeting.</p> <p>Update September: After feedback from the JAC on the pictorial representation, the HoAC has met with the CFO and a draft template has been devised. Further work needs to be completed before the template is shared with JAC for feedback.</p> <p>Update December: Absence of the HoAC has delayed the meetings planned on the BAF. They</p>

				have now been re-planned for Dec & Jan.
6.	Has the committee sought assurance in relation to governance arrangements for major change programmes and key collaboration/outsourcing arrangements (whether with police bodies, other public sector bodies or the private sector?) Has the committee considered its role in respect of these arrangements?	<p>Action rolled over from previous financial year Over half of the respondents did not feel that the committee were in a position to seek overall assurance in terms of governance arrangements for major change programmes and key collaboration, although it was acknowledged oversight had improved particularly in relation to the new HQ build and management of audit actions by SRS.</p> <p>The majority of respondents were satisfied that the committee were in a position to seek overall assurance in terms of governance arrangements for major change programmes and key collaboration. However, it was suggested that further development was needed in this area to understand the growing importance of collaboration in other public services, particularly in light of the Covid restrictions and the Force could benefit from toolsets developed by Cabinet Office as a result of lessons learnt from previous successes and failures.</p> <p>Response from 2022 Process: Most respondents agreed the JAC have been provided with assurance in relation to governance arrangements for major change programmes and key collaborations. However, it was suggested that a list of the change programmes and key collaborations/outsourcing arrangements would be useful for JAC, including those with partners outside of policing.</p> <p>It was also suggested that the organisation could benefit from the toolsets developed by the Cabinet Office as a result of lessons learnt from previous successes or failures and for more there to be more precision in the design stage with respect to expectations and deliverables and the evidence required to prove achievements.</p>	<p>Internal Audit has previously reviewed major change programmes and methodologies, examples including New HQ and the Continuous Improvement Change Management approach. In addition, Audit Wales has reviewed the governance arrangements concerning police Collaboration in Wales.</p> <p>The AW report (and the SRS one) and associated action plan is being taken forward through the All Wales Collaboration Board.</p> <p>In addition, Welsh Police Finance and Resources Group (WPFRG) have 'sponsored' the maintenance of a collaboration register which includes the capturing of benefits too. This register initially focussed on inter Force collaboration but will be expanded in due course to cover other collaborations, such as those with Local Authorities.</p> <p>As mentioned in row 6 under actions rolled over from previous years, work is progressing in this area and the JAC will be provided with a list, as appropriate, in future.</p> <p>In relation to the toolsets mentioned, please could copies or a link to the documents referenced be provided and they will be considered.</p> <p>Further discussion needed at meeting.</p>	<p>Update March 2021: Work has started to produce a log of all collaboration agreements held within the OPCC. This will be shared with the force once complete and discussions had on how to provide assurance to the JAC on this area of work. This has also been identified as an area for improvement within the BAF.</p> <p>Update June 2021: The agreements spreadsheet has been collated and needs review within the OPCC prior to sharing with the force to ensure they did not hold any additional information prior to deciding how to progress further.</p> <p>Update December 2021: Work relating to the reporting on the governance of collaborations is being progressed but is a large piece of work that is currently still ongoing.</p> <p>Update March 2022: Collaboration register was due to be discussed at the December WPFRG but was postponed to March (See action sheet – action 11). An update would be provided in due course.</p> <p>Update June 2022: The HoAC and CI have now met and have collated an agreements register. This will be presented along with some recommendations on progression to the Strategic Planning Group for consideration.</p>

				<p>Separate to the above as clarified in the June 2022 action sheet, the WPFRG have established an All-Wales Productivity and Efficiency Group which is responsible for the collaboration register. The register will take around 6 months to update and will be reviewed again by WPFRG in Sept 2022. JAC will be presented with the most up to date register as soon as available.</p> <p>Additionally at the September meeting the CFO also provided the following update: <i>The Force Benefits Realisation Officer captures any proposed change programmes at the initial development of a business case and works with the sponsor to identify the benefits for reporting to the Service Improvement Board (SIB). There is also a Productivity and Efficiency Board within the Force to review and challenge the business benefits within business cases, prior to submission to SIB. The AWPEG have been sighted on the template used by the Force to assess and capture the benefits, in order that they can utilise the information for collaboration projects.</i></p> <p>Update December 2022: Ongoing.</p>
NEW ACTIONS				
5 (c)	Is there an agreed process for making risk management decisions? Is the committee informed of the judgements that have taken place in accordance with the process?	The majority of respondents agreed there is a satisfactory process in place for making risk management decisions. However, it was suggested that further improvements are required to the Risk Register in terms of its size and format; it should clearly articulate risk appetite and tolerance levels in order for JAC to better understand the appropriateness of pace, type and extent of risk mitigation actions proposed.	<p>It was acknowledged in the self-assessment feedback that the JAC lead member for risk had been supporting the Force and OPCC in the development of their risk processes/register. A new risk register is being developed with a summarised version tailored to JAC requirements which is expected to be presented to JAC at the June 2022 meeting.</p> <p>All risks are presented to the force Strategic Executive Board (SEB) where they are reviewed to check and moderate the risk rating. All risks are reviewed at each meeting and are updated to reflect any changes made to the risk rating or to confirm if the rating is maintained.</p> <p>Would suggest that when the JAC have reviewed the new risk update in June and are satisfied with what is being provided, that this action can be closed.</p>	<p>Update from September Meeting: As the JAC risk lead had to leave the meeting it was agreed that this would remain on the action plan for the next meeting.</p>

5 (d)	Is the committee satisfied the work of internal audit is properly focused on the organisation's major risk, including transformational change and collaboration?	<p>The majority of respondents were satisfied that the work of internal audit is properly focused on the organisation's major risk. However, it was suggested that ensuring audit needs and potential changes to focus should be considered.</p> <p>It was also suggested that IA ensure they have the appropriate advanced skills required to review transformational change and collaboration activity or alternatively JAC need to be made aware of where this assurance should be sourced from.</p>	<p>The Annual audit plan is determined via an assessment of risk taken from economic, societal, financial and other factors and also includes the corporate risk register, with the collaborative audit programme enabling comparison across forces.</p> <p>The transformational change programmes, including collaborations, are audited with examples including the new HQ Project Board. No major collaborative change programme has recently taken place for an audit to be undertaken.</p> <p>Any future recommissioning of internal audit provision will be explicit in the requirements for added value audit work with regard to transformational change.</p> <p>Further discussion needed at meeting.</p>	<p>Update from September Meeting: It was noted during the recent JAC Training Day that costs of collaboration should be a focus for JACs, to ensure there was clarity with regards to allocation of costs for collaborative projects. It was agreed this item would remain open until the aforementioned collaboration register had been received, to provide the necessary assurance and transparency.</p>
8.	Is there appropriate focus on both the Police and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner?	<p>Overall, it was agreed that there is appropriate focus on both the Force and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner and both organisations were well represented at the meetings. It was noted however that demarcation was not always obvious. More emphasis seems to be put on the Police rather than OPCC.</p>	<p>There is an action on the June action sheet for it to be made clear which reports are from the OPCC so we will add the OPCC logo on to any relevant future reports.</p> <p>A key indication of responsibility is also linked to the presenter of the report on the agenda. Where there is joint responsibility eg with the accounts, this will be show as CFO/ACOR.</p> <p>There will naturally be more focus on the work of the force as they are the larger of the two organisations and manage areas such as procurement and finance on behalf of the PCC. It can be difficult to distinguish between them. If there are any audits undertaken on areas that the OPCC run separately to the Force such as FOI/Data Protection, the OPCC is involved in those audit areas when they are planned and there have been separate audits undertaken on OPCC processes in the past, an example being the Partnership Fund audit.</p> <p>For further discussion at a meeting.</p>	<p>Update from September Meeting: It was agreed this item could be closed providing a document was drafted to reflect which policies were shared with the Force.</p> <p>Update December 2022: This is ongoing and will be progressed in the near future.</p>
24.	Has the committee considered whether all standing items on the agenda are truly adding value to the committee's work?	<p>The overall majority agreed all standing items had been considered with regards to their adding value to their work. However, it was suggested it could addressed more explicitly in a collaborative session.</p>	<p>See response to row number 23. Response to row 23 copied below: The Terms of Reference drive the forward work plan – they were reviewed in 2019 and are in line with the areas suggested within the CIPFA Audit Committee's guidance document.</p> <p>The forward work plan is shared with the JAC on an annual basis. Each report on the work plan has been married up to part of the ToRs so it is clear why and under what area we receive the reports that we do on the JAC agenda. There are not currently any reports received that are not therefore required. Consideration was also recently given to reducing the frequency of certain reports but timings were deemed to be appropriate.</p> <p>For further discussion at a JAC meeting but suggest that this action could be closed.</p>	<p>Update from September Meeting: It was agreed that this item should remain open.</p>