JAC SELF ASSESSMENT ACTION PLAN

		ACTION PLAN Key: **Green = On-going** **Blue = Completed**		
	Questionnaire Number and Question	**Comments**	**Suggested Resolution**	**Agreed Resolution (To be completed at the meeting)**
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.	**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.	Work is ongoing between the force and OPCC to develop a pictorial representation and will be shared with JAC members for feedback.	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. 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. Update March 2022: Update as per December 2021. 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. **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 need to be completed before the template is shared with JAC for feedback.**

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?	**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.	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.	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.
			The AW report (and the SRS one) and associated action plan is being taken forward though the All Wales Collaboration Board.	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.
		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.	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.	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.
				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.
				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.
				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.

NEW ACTIONS				
4 (b)	Is the balance of work in relation to business risk, internal control, fraud, financial reporting, regulatory matters, other matters right?	The majority of respondents agreed the balance of work was appropriate. However, while it was acknowledged that the Joint Risk Register was rightly placed at the beginning of the JAC agenda, it was suggested that the report dominates the agenda and does not meet the JAC members requirements. There was also the suggestion that the JAC may wish to consider whether resilience in times of major incidents such as a pandemic/civil unrest are addressed sufficiently by JAC. **N.B. The above points have been raised under multiple sections of the self-assessment questionnaire but have only been included in the action plan once.**	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. Business continuity plans are in place across all functions. There are also a quarterly business continuity meeting that reports to the Organisational Resources Board of which the ACOR is Chair. Broader issues are included in the Gwent Local Resilience Forum (LRF) which is chaired by the Chief Constable. Evidence is contained in the force Covid Gold meetings and GLRF which has its own website Home	Gwent Prepared. **Further discussion needed at meeting.**	
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.	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. 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. **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**.	
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?	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. 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.	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. 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. Any future recommissioning of internal audit provision will be explicit in the requirements for added value audit work with regard to transformational change. **Further discussion needed at meeting.**	

| 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? | 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.

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. | 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.

In relation to the toolsets mentioned, please could copies or a link to the documents referenced be provided and they will be considered.

Further discussion needed at meeting. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. | Is the audit committee aware of inspections and findings of the HMICFRS and other external regulators as appropriate? | It was agreed that JAC had been made aware of inspection and findings of HMICFRS. However, it was suggested that other inspection findings would provide more clarification. | A list of regulators that the OPCC and Force could be inspected by have been shared with the JAC. There are minimal inspections from other regulators that fall within the JAC ToRs as the majority, when they take place, will relate to operational policing.

Further discussion needed at meeting but suggest this could be closed. | |
| 8. | Is there appropriate focus on both the Police and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner? | 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. | 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.

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.

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.

For further discussion at a meeting. | |
| 12 (b) | Is the Chair of the committee involved in agenda management? | Most respondents were aware that the Chair of the Committee was involved in agenda management. However, not all members were certain. | The Chair has sight of the agenda prior to the JAC meetings to review the order and suggest any amendments.

Suggest this can be closed. | |
| 12(c) | Does the Chair of the committee have regular meetings with the office of the PCC and the Chief Constable to discuss the committee work programme | Most respondents were aware that the Chair of the Committee has regular meetings with the OPCC/Force. However, some members were uncertain. | The Chair will have additional meetings with the OPCC/Force when required. An example recently has been in relation to the recruitment of the new JAC members. A meeting was held to discuss the skillset required to replace existing members when their tenure concludes. | |

	and opportunities for the committee to add value?		The Chair is also sighted on the agenda and is able to feedback on the upcoming areas for discussion as necessary. Any request from the Chair for a meeting would be facilitated. Feedback is requested from the Chair if any formal meeting is required or if we continue as we are, with meetings facilitated when the need arises. **If Chair is satisfied with current arrangements, suggest this can be closed.**	
14 (b)	Are senior/relevant members of the organisations invited to attend audit committee meetings, participate in discussions, and provide information to the audit committee as and when the audit committee deems it necessary?	The majority agreed that senior/relevant members of the organisations were invited to attend audit committee meetings. However, it was suggested this could possibly be extended to "celebrate" substantial assurance and "support" in other areas and to ascertain barriers. It was also suggested that lines of communication with TCBC Internal Auditors could be improved but it was acknowledged that this is an ongoing issue that would require a change in approach by SRS partners.	IA recommendations are presented and acknowledged accordingly at the Force Assurance Board. CFO/ACOR provide feedback to officers for work well done. The JACs views are noted, the ACOR will continue to raise any concerns they have at the SRS meetings that he attends. **Suggest this action can be closed.**	
17.	Do the arranged 'Deep Dives' allow members to gain a wider/deeper understanding of the force and OPCC and also of relevance/use in their role?	It was agreed that deep dives were good for gaining a better understanding of the work of the OPCC/Force, however, it was suggested that they could also serve a dual function by providing assurance as to the Lines of Defence employed with respect to associated individual risks.	We will continue to agree the programme at future JAC meetings. **Suggest this action can be closed.**	
23.	Is there a clear 'forward plan' which sets out how the committee will meet the objectives set out in the terms of reference?	The majority agreed there was clear forward work plan in place and the JAC agenda has been reviewed regularly to help meet objectives. Although it was suggested it could probably be done more explicitly in a collaborative session with the aid of an underpinning mapping in the form of a compliance matrix.	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. 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. **For further discussion at a JAC meeting but suggest that this action could be closed.**	
24.	Has the committee considered whether all standing items on the agenda are truly adding value to the committee's work?	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.	See response to row number 23.	

26.	Please could you also consider how you would like to see the self-assessment process evolving in the future?	It was suggested that when the JAC members ask for additional information, if it is within their terms of reference, that unless it requires discussion at a meeting, it should be circulated as and when it is available rather than waiting for it to be circulated with the agenda.	We try to ensure any documents that could be circulated outside of the agenda are shared in this manner as it spaces out the amount of information members received. When information is requested by JAC members, unless otherwise requested, in future the default position will be to circulate information. On receipt, JAC members, if they deem it necessary, can ask for an item to be included on the agenda for further discussion. **Suggest that this action could be closed.**	
	Ethical values and countering fraud	At the July 2022 meeting, the JAC requested that this was added to the Self-Assessment Action Plan.	**Discussion required at meeting.**	