

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|--|--------------------|---|--|---|
| <p>Income & Debtors – March 2017 Rec. 4.1 – The Force should consider reviewing the current debt collection methods and consider implementation of taking legal action against outstanding debts over a certain value.</p> <p>Managers Response – The PCC/CC debt recovery policy will be reviewed. This recommendation is complete.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale 30.09.17</p> <p>COMPLETE</p> | Deputy Chief Finance Officer | 27.07.17 |
| <p>Learning & Development – March 2017 Rec. 4.1 – The approval process of the internal training plan should be documented specifying the roles and responsibilities of staff from both G4S and the Force involved in the process. This should also state any meeting / committee the plan should be presented to. A record of this approval should then be retained on file.</p> <p>Managers Response – Agree that the approval process should be documented so all involved are clear on their responsibilities. It should be noted that a record of approval is included through the minutes of the Professional Development Board.</p> <p>Managers Update As At 26.05.17 – At present, we are working on a process and associated documentation to support all three recommendations (which are linked together). Have met with Amy Johnson, IT and L&D Contract Manager in CPT and we will be putting a draft of the process forward to the Professional Development Board for agreement in July.</p> <p>Update As At 07.09.17 – I can confirm that the processes have been written to comply with the audit. With the change in the Chief Officer Group, the new ACO has asked us to enter into a consultation with Chief Superintendents as he wants to devolve some of the decision making processes. The consultation date is mid-September and we hope to have everything signed off by the end of the month.</p> <p>Update As At 03.10.17 – The consultation period has finished and CPT are now pulling together a decision paper based on the new process with an aim for the process to commence from end October 2017. This recommendation is complete.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale 31 August 2017 (to ensure process in place for next planning cycle)</p> <p>COMPLETE</p> | CPT L&D Contracts Manager (in conjunction with G4S L&D Manager) | 27.07.17 |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|---|--------------------|---|---|---|
| <p>Learning & Development – March 2017 Rec. 4.2 – The external training bid sheets sent out to Chief Superintendents / Superintendents should be amended to include a section for the respondents to include narrative as to whether value for money has been considered. The accompanying guidance sheet should also be amended to explain what the box is intended for. This could include questions such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are alternative providers available? • Have alternative quotations been obtained? • Why the selected option has been chosen? <p>Managers Response – Whilst operational managers can provide information on what providers are available (and may state their preferred provider), L&D staff should progress with the administrative tasks of ensuring the Financial Regs are adhered to and alternative quotations obtained, rather than operational managers obtaining various quotes. Agree that the bid form / guidance sheet should be reviewed and this will be progressed and it will be agreed what questions should be included for managers to complete prior to submission to L&D.</p> <p>Managers Update As At 26.05.17 – At present, we are working on a process and associated documentation to support all three recommendations (which are linked together). Have met with Amy Johnson, IT and L&D Contract Manager in CPT and we will be putting a draft of the process forward to the Professional Development Board for agreement in July.</p> <p>Update As At 07.09.17 – I can confirm that the processes have been written to comply with the audit. With the change in the Chief Officer Group, the new ACO has asked us to enter into a consultation with Chief Superintendents as he wants to devolve some of the decision making processes. The consultation date is mid-September and we hope to have everything signed off by the end of the month.</p> <p>Update As At 03.10.17 – The consultation period has finished and CPT are now pulling together a decision paper based on the new process with an aim for the process to commence from end October 2017. This recommendation is complete.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale 31 August 2017 (to ensure process in place for next planning cycle)</p> <p>COMPLETE</p> | CPT L&D Contracts Manager (in conjunction with G4S L&D Manager) | 27.07.17 |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|---|--------------------|---|--|---|
| <p>Learning & Development – March 2017 Rec. 4.3 – Chief Superintendents / Superintendents should be reminded of the need to comply with instructions provided within the external training bidding process which ask for supporting rationale to be provided e.g. the statutory requirement or strategic priority the training is aligned to. In addition, management should also consider whether a more rigorous process should be followed to ensure all supporting rationale is provided. For example, where the rationale supporting each of the five prioritisation scores for high prioritised bids is not provided, the bid will not be considered.</p> <p>Managers Response – It is agreed a more rigorous process is required ensuring that detailed rationale is provided. This would reduce the oversubscription previously experienced, particularly on the proportion of bids being given the maximum score by operational managers. It is accepted that manual intervention is resource intensive, but it is a requirement of L&D to assess them and if there are deficiencies these should be directly raised with the manager who has submitted. Agree that when the external training bid process commences there is clear guidance regarding this and if relevant supporting rationale is not provided Managers should be informed at that stage that this will void their applications. A more pro-active approach to be considered in addition to just sending an email with bid forms attached (perhaps attendance at SMTs by L&D managers).</p> <p>Managers Update As At 26.05.17 – At present, we are working on a process and associated documentation to support all three recommendations (which are linked together). Have met with Amy Johnson, IT and L&D Contract Manager in CPT and we will be putting a draft of the process forward to the Professional Development Board for agreement in July.</p> <p>Update As At 07.09.17 – I can confirm that the processes have been written to comply with the audit. With the change in the Chief Officer Group, the new ACO has asked us to enter into a consultation with Chief Superintendents as he wants to devolve some of the decision making processes. The consultation date is mid-September and we hope to have everything signed off by the end of the month.</p> <p>Update As At 03.10.17 – The consultation period has finished and CPT are now pulling together a decision paper based on the new process with an aim for the process to commence from end October 2017. This recommendation is complete.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale 31 August 2017 (to ensure process in place for next planning cycle)</p> <p>COMPLETE</p> | CPT L&D Contracts Manager (in conjunction with G4S L&D Manager) | 27.07.17 |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|--|--------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <p>Collaboration – East Midlands Police Legal Services (EMPLS) – Nov 2016 Rec. 4.1 – The Management Board for EMPLS should be reinstated to provide oversight and assurance with regards the unit's performance and delivery of its objectives. The Management Board members should ensure they have a timetable in place to attend meetings and carry out their responsibilities in line with the Section 22 agreement that is in place.</p> <p>Managers Response – It is acknowledged that the Management Board have not met for some time and Derbyshire will lead on re-establishment of this Board.</p> <p>Managers Update As At 06.04.17 – Update provided by Chief Finance Officer, Derbyshire Police from their JARAC in March – Mr Dale advised that the Management of EMPLS has been added to the Deputies Board which will take place on a bi-annual basis. The next meeting will take place on 27 September. Mr Dale assured members that he will provide a steer on the level of assurance required and Members will receive a report for the meeting of the Committee in December. To provide additional reassurance Mr Neaves added that Mr Sutherland (the Force Solicitor) has provided the DCCs with a full update and work is already underway.</p> <p>Update As At 02.06.17 – Update provided by Chief Finance Officer, Derbyshire Police – Although addressed elsewhere, I confirm that a meeting of the management Board took place in February this year, when it received a report on and approved the matters set out hereafter.</p> <p>Update As At 05.10.17 – Update provided by Chief Finance Officer, Derbyshire Police – The Management Board has continued to meet and considered our KPIs and arrangements for performance monitoring. Current KPIs have been left in place but are to be revised once we have completed the activity referred to in the response at 4.3 below. Future meetings have been calendared.</p> | 1 | Original Timescale 31.01.17 | David Peet Chief Executive | 27.07.17 |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|--|--------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| <p>Collaboration – East Midlands Police Legal Services (EMPLS) – Nov 2016</p> <p>Rec. 4.3 – EMPLS should review the current KPI's that are in place and should prepare updated KPI's that can be presented to the Management Board for scrutiny and approval. Some considerations for performance indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of cases being handled; • Type of case being handled; • Response times to request for legal advice; • Value for money being delivered; • Comparisons of performance across periods, such as per quarter and year on year; and • A review of the hours spent on cases and the alternative costs if this was completed by external solicitors. <p>Managers Response – EMPLS will discuss the current KPI's with the Forces DCC's and look to put in place more relevant indicators of performance with input from Management Board members.</p> <p>Managers Update As At 02.06.17 – Update provided by Chief Finance Officer, Derbyshire Police – The Management Board approved a refreshed set of KPI's and received information on compliance with those indicators. However, going forward, the Department is procuring a new case management system which includes, within its specification, the ability to produce detailed management information, primarily focussed around the key measures of costs, volumes and timeliness. The system is required to be capable of producing user-configurable bespoke reports as well as standard management information. On installation, budget provision has been made for optimum configuration to ensure key information can be produced.</p> <p>Managers Update As At 05.10.17 – Update provided by Chief Finance Officer, Derbyshire Police – We have now appointed a supplier to provide a new case management system for EMPLS which has the capability to provide a wide range of management data to support the settling of KPIs and to enable greater performance oversight. A project plan is being worked through with a view to setting an installation date early in the New Year.</p> | 2 | Original Timescale 31.03.17 | Head of EMPLS | 27.07.17 |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|---|--------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| <p>Collaboration – East Midlands Police Legal Services (EMPLS) – Nov 2016 Rec 4.5 – In accordance with Recommendation 4.1, once the Management Board meetings have been established they should include a review of performance and this should be noted or actions put in place to address areas of concern. Managers Response – In line with the two recommendations above, a regular performance report to Management Board will be established pending further discussions with the Forces. Managers Update As At 02.06.17 – Update provided by Chief Finance Officer, Derbyshire Police – Information was produced to the management Board in relation to the performance of the Department, in terms of the scope of the work undertaken, volumes and general budget performance. The ability to produce more detailed information will be enhanced by the introduction of a new case management system.</p> | 2 | Original Timescale 31.03.17 | Head of EMPLS | 27.07.17 |
| <p>Collaboration – East Midlands Police Legal Services (EMPLS) – Nov 2016 Rec 4.6 – The risk register should be updated to include a RAG rating between the target risk score and the current risk score to clearly identify the priorities for risk mitigation actions. The risk actions should be separated into ongoing actions and specific actions that will be taken on a set date, with the planned effect on the risk score clearly stated. Review of the risk register should be a standard agenda item at EMPLS Silver Meetings and should be included in the reporting to the Management Board. Managers Response – Agreed. The template will be updated in line with the recommendations to improve the current format of the risk register. Whilst it was not listed on the latest agenda that was provided to audit, the risk register, third party risk register and any risks discussed at bronze level meetings are always discussed at EMPLS silver meetings. Feedback to Forces on risks is completed on an individual basis in the absence of any management board reporting at present. Pending changed to management board reporting risks will be fed into this as well. Managers Update As At 02.06.17 – Update provided by Chief Finance Officer, Derbyshire Police – The Department maintains two registers. The Departmental Register contains details of risks relating to the Department itself. It is now RAG rated using a 5x5 risk scoring matrix. It is a standing item at Silver Meetings. Additionally, risk is a standing item at team (Bronze) Meetings, which also consider the Third Party Risk Register, identifying risks to Forces. That Register is also considered at the Silver Meeting and any risks rated at Red or Amber notified to the relevant Force(s). Managers Update As At 05.10.17 – Update provided by Chief Finance Officer, Derbyshire Police – Risk Registers are a standing item in Bronze Team Meetings and considered at alternate Silver meetings (i.e. monthly)</p> | 2 | Original Timescale 31.03.17 | Head of EMPLS | 27.07.17 |

Appendix A

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|--|--------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| <p>Collaboration – East Midlands Operational Support Services (EMOpSS) – May 2017 Rec 4.1 – A review of the current governance groups should be undertaken and a consistent format to the terms of references should be applied across EMOpSS. These should include, but not be limited to: Purpose, Scope, Membership, Decision making authority, Reporting Requirements, Frequency of meetings, Review. The Terms of Reference should be established for each of the governance groups and the forums with decision making powers should ensure that they have a decision log in place and record meeting minutes.</p> <p>Managers Response – EMOpSS has recently gone through significant change within the Leadership Team. A review of the Governance structure is currently underway and will be discussed at the first SMB which is scheduled for 14th June 2017. As part of that review Terms of Reference for each forum will be put in place and consideration given to the methods in which they are recorded.</p> <p>Managers Update As At 14.09.17 – Update provided by Ch. Supt. Smith – We have now completed a review of our terms of reference for the SMB, SLT, Performance, and Establishment meetings and in addition the Uniform and Fleet working groups. These are now up to date on our intranet page. Our meetings now have a robust structure to ensure that a decision log is in place, any key decisions and actions are correctly recorded and where appropriate full minutes are taken.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale 30.09.17</p> <p>COMPLETE</p> | Ch. Supt. Smith | 27.07.17 |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|---|--------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| <p>Collaboration – East Midlands Operational Support Services (EMOpSS) – May 2017</p> <p>Rec 4.5 – EMOpSS should continue to develop a performance framework. This should consider the outputs and quality of its deployments across the region to ensure effective performance monitoring can take place.</p> <p>Managers Response – EMOpSS are continuing to develop this framework under the new leadership team. There is a clear focus on outcomes and in particular links to local issues within each Force area.</p> <p>Managers Update As At 14.09.17 – Update provided by Ch. Supt. Smith – The team are working on providing a regional update performance document with bespoke force information. There are some challenges in collating data over a four force area with varying IT systems and ways of presenting the information. The regional performance document has been produced and its content agreed at the SMB (14/06/17), these will be shared with the Chief Officer teams on a quarterly basis. We are continuing to develop a performance framework to ensure that our outputs and outcomes are recorded in a timely manner, these will be included in the monthly performance report and help to drive increased performance across the department. We are still experiencing issues surrounding data capture due to the difference in the four forces IT systems and the different methods of displaying that data over the region.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale Ongoing</p> <p>Revised Timescale Ongoing</p> | Ch. Supt. Smith | <p>27.07.17</p> <p>31.10.17</p> |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|---|--------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| <p>Collaboration – East Midlands Operational Support Services (EMOpSS) – May 2017</p> <p>Rec 4.6 – The risk register should be updated to include a RAG rating between the target risk score and the current risk score to clearly identify the priorities for risk mitigation actions. The risk actions should be separated into ongoing actions and specific actions that will be taken on a set date, with the planned effect on the risk score clearly stated. The Risk Register should be a standard agenda item at the Strategic Management Board meetings.</p> <p>Managers Response – The Business Partner is currently working on the recommendations made. The risk register will be placed on the SMB agenda commencing 14/6/17.</p> <p>Managers Update As At 14.09.17 – Update provided by Ch. Supt. Smith – Regionally, Forces are moving towards aligning their Risk Management processes, which includes the manner in which they record their risk this will inevitably assist collaborative units. To this end, the EMOpSS risk register has been transferred onto the Leicestershire corporate risk software Orchid as the SMT sit within this Force. The Orchid software records the residual score - it does not allow for the recording of a target score. Orchid does not have the functionality for recording of 'risk actions'. It records the additional controls; work in progress to further control and mitigate the risk. These infrequently have a date set for when this specific action will be taken, rather than a target date for completion. The additional controls have been updated to reflect what impact it is anticipated to have on the risk in general terms. It would be very difficult to predict what effect individual controls will have on the overall risk score. All risks have been updated and are updated after each EMOpSS SMT meeting; a highlight report of our high risks is also taken to the Strategic Management Board meetings. Risks from all regional collaborations such as ourselves, EMSOU, EMCJS etc. are collated and submitted to the regional DCC board.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale 30.09.17</p> <p>COMPLETE</p> | Ch. Supt. Smith | 27.07.17 |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|---|--------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Collaboration – East Midlands Special Operations Unit (EMSOU) – March 2017 Rec 4.1 – A review of the current governance groups should be undertaken and a consistent format to the terms of references that are in place should be applied across EMSOU. These should include, but not be limited to: Purpose, Scope, Membership, Decision making authority, Reporting Requirements, Frequency of meetings and Review.</p> <p>Managers Response – Agreed. As EMSOU has developed new forums have been put in place and the timing of these is likely to have caused some inconsistency in format. Decision making is widely known, if not formally documented, and it is agreed it would be best practice for each forum to review its terms of reference to ensure it is clearly stated.</p> <p>Managers Update As At 26.09.17 – Update provided by Head of Finance & Corporate Services – The Terms of Reference for the following meetings have been reviewed to ensure that there is consistency of purpose and scope and to remove any duplication of responsibilities: EMSOU Business Change Board, Collaboration Efficiency Board, EMSOU Management Board, Regional DCC Board, EMSOU Health & Safety Board, EMSOU SMT (SOC / Forensics / Major Crime / SB), EMSOU SLT</p> | 2 | Original Timescale 31.08.17 | Head of Finance & Corporate Services | 27.07.17 |
| <p>Collaboration – East Midlands Special Operations Unit (EMSOU) – March 2017 Rec 4.3 – Appropriate business plans should be put in place in line with the section 22 agreements. The business plans should have a three year outlook, clearly stating reporting requirements that will allow for an effective review of performance against the objectives set.</p> <p>Managers Response – Agreed. Alongside the business plans, the development of longer term financial planning documents are being prepared including capital expenditure. Once a business plan is completed, it will be taken through the appropriate boards for approval and then a review process will be put in place to monitor progress.</p> <p>Managers Update As At 26.09.17 – Update provided by Head of Finance & Corporate Services – A draft 3 Year Strategic Budget Plan for all of EMSOU has been shared with Chief Constables and PCC's. The Budget Plan has highlighted a number of key financial factors that impact on the Unit's ability to deliver SOC capabilities to tackle new and emerging threats. The Plan sets out the Unit's approach towards meeting saving targets and investment plans for the period 2018/19 to 2020/21. A detailed 3 year revenue and capital plan will be presented to various Boards as part of the budget setting process and reported back to the Joint PCC's/CC's Board in November 2017.</p> | 2 | Original Timescale 31.08.17 | Head of Finance & Corporate Services | 27.07.17 |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|
| <p>Collaboration – East Midlands Special Operations Unit (EMSOU) – March 2017 Rec 4.4 – A consistent approach to managing risk, including the format of risk registers, should be established across EMSOU. This should include consistency in the scoring of risks in order that EMSOU SLT is able to more effectively manage risks across each unit. A risk register should be put in place in respect of the Serious Crime unit.</p> <p>Managers Response – Agreed. The Major Crime risks have historically been monitored through the Serious Organised Crime register but they should develop their own register. Consistency across all the risk registers should be sought and work is also being started on developing the risk appetite of the collaboration with support from the Regional Risk Management forum. This will assist in the developing consistent risk scoring across the EMSOU risk registers. A new member of staff began in January 2016 and they are being tasked with driving this forward.</p> <p>Managers Update As At 26.09.17 – Update provided by Head of Finance & Corporate Services – A Risk Register is now in place for each area of EMSOU (SOC / Forensics / Major Crime / SB). Each register is reviewed by the respective SMT and all areas of High Risk are consolidated into a single report to the Senior Leadership Team. Further scrutiny of all high level regional risks are now reported quarterly to the Regional DCC's Board.</p> | 2 | Original Timescale 31.08.17 | Head of Finance & Corporate Services | 27.07.17 |
| <p>Victim Services – June 2017 Rec 4.1 – The OPCC should put in place a clear governance structure that states the roles and responsibilities for the delivery and management of Victim Services.</p> <p>Managers Response – It is anticipated that changes to the service will be considered upon the delivery of the Victims Strategy and audit recommendations will be reviewed in line with the consultant's recommendations.</p> <p>Managers Update As At 25.09.17 – The governance of victim services will be the responsibility of the Partnership and Delivery Manager, the advertisement of this post is to close on the 22 September 2017 with the view to be in post within the next six weeks. There will also be a Partnership and Delivery Support Officer who is due to start within the next four weeks subject to the necessary employment checks.</p> | 2 | Original Timescale 30.09.17 | OPCC Chief Executive | 31.10.17 |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|---|--------------------|--|-----------------------------|---|
| <p>Victim Services – June 2017 Rec 4.3 – The OPCC should look to develop a performance framework that collates performance from all elements of Victim Services including: Contracted providers performance, In-house Victim Lincs performance and All other providers performance.</p> <p>Managers Response – Following the outcome of the Victim Strategy this will guide the future approach to the service and performance monitoring will be reviewed in line with this.</p> <p>Managers Update As At 25.09.17 – The aim of the newly established Victims Commissioning Group is to develop a performance framework of all commissioned victim services. A performance framework for Victim Lincs is currently in development and is to be completed in October 2017. Victim Supports quarterly performance reports are reviewed at quarterly meetings with the OPCC. Based on the benefits of these meetings it is thought to extend these meetings to all commissioned service providers.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale 30.09.17</p> <p>Revised Timescale 31.10.17</p> | OPCC Chief Executive | 31.10.17 |
| <p>Victim Services – June 2017 Rec 4.4 – Following the completion of the Victim Strategy project, the OPCC should ensure that the risks to victim services are being appropriately managed and that risks to the service are captured on the appropriate risk register.</p> <p>Managers Response – The Victim Strategy project scope includes the review of risks to the service and during the implementation phase this will be reviewed to ensure risk management to the service is adequately covered.</p> <p>Managers Update As At 25.09.17 – There is a risk register in place which covers the victim strategy project, it is regularly updated and will be reviewed at the Victims Commissioning Group on a quarterly basis.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale 30.09.17</p> | OPCC Chief Executive | 31.10.17 |
| <p>Procurement – July 2017 Rec 4.1 – The Force should complete a review of the Transparency Report to ensure clarity in the information provided. This may include removal of the Value for money column and its replacement with an overarching statement, including a reference to the Financial, Contract and Procurement Regulations.</p> <p>Managers Response – Agreed. The Transparency report has been updated to remove the Value for Money column in line with the recommendation.</p> <p>This recommendation is complete.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale Immediate</p> <p>COMPLETE</p> | Force Chief Finance Officer | 31.10.17 |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|---|--------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|
| <p>Procurement – July 2017 Rec 4.2 – The Force should ensure that all Exceptional Purchase Action (EPA) Forms clearly set out the reason for their submission. EPA's should be submitted and approved in a timely manner and prior to the previous contract expiring where appropriate. This should be more than one week prior to the contract commencement to ensure the Procurement Team have sufficient time to award and place the winning contract. Contract owners should be reminded to begin the procurement process in a timely manner prior to the previous contract expiration.</p> <p>Managers Response – Agreed that EPAs should clearly set out the rationale for their submission. They should be promptly submitted and approved and a reminder will be issued to contract owners and other staff likely to be involved in procurement. The audit identified two exceptions where it was unclear why EPA was appropriate; the following should be noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work in respect of consultancy services had initially been broken down into two contracts, each £25k (the limit above which an EPA should have been submitted). When it was established that this was just the one contract to the value of £50k, an EPA was submitted retrospectively. 2. An EPA had been submitted on the basis of the existing knowledge of the Force by the consultant. However, it was then established that the service could have been provided by other consultants, albeit the existing consultant could have then submitted a lower tender bid using this experience and thereby allowing the Force to demonstrate best value through the competitive process. 3. The importance of following procedure has been drawn to the attention of the officer concerned. <p>This recommendation is complete</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale Immediate</p> <p>COMPLETE</p> | Force Chief Finance Officer | 31.10.17 |
| <p>Procurement – July 2017 Rec 4.3 – Staff should be reminded to ensure all exceptions processed through an EPA Form on the Procurement Database are highlighted in the "Recordable in Accounting Year" to confirm they are visible on the Exceptions Report produced from the Database. Consideration should also be taken to reviewing the procurements processed in 2016/17 and 2017/18 to date to ensure all Exceptions have been identified and highlighted through the above method.</p> <p>Managers Response – Agreed. A review of all EPA forms submitted will be undertaken to ensure inclusion on the procurement database. This recommendation is complete.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale Immediate</p> <p>COMPLETE</p> | Force Chief Finance Officer | 31.10.17 |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|--|--------------------|---|---|---|
| Online Banking & Sungard System – May 2017 There are no priority 1 & 2 recommendations on this report. This has been added for information only. | N/A | N/A | N/A | 31.10.17 |
| Fleet Management – August 2017 There are no priority 1 & 2 recommendations on this report. This has been added for information only. | N/A | N/A | N/A | 31.10.17 |
| Payments & Creditors – February 2017 (Re-issued July 2017) Rec 4.1 – Where payment approval of an invoice is delegated to an alternative member of staff in the absence of the approver, this should be to a member of staff with the appropriate delegated authority, and to a different person which had receipted the goods. In addition, the transport team should make clear which officer has goods receipted the invoice to ensure segregation of duties are maintained between the goods receipt and payment approval processes. Managers Response – The receipting of non-purchase order invoices is a manual off-system process which is done either by certification on the invoice or via an attached email. We have a segregation of duties which means that two different individual receipt and approve the invoice. The audit highlighted a potential issue when the budget managers delegated their authority when on annual leave. Clear guidance will be given to budget managers giving them instructions on who to delegate to. This will reduce the risk of the same person receipting and approving the invoice. A revised process has been implemented to ensure a strict segregation of duties between the individual receipting the goods /services and the budget manager who approves the invoice for payment. The Fleet Workshop staff undertake a manual process to stamp/sign/date the respective invoice to evidence the receipting of the goods/services. The invoice is then entered onto tPolice and approved by the budget manager via AME workflow. The new process started in April 2017. | 2 | Original Timescale 30.09.17 COMPLETE | Exchequer Services Manager | 31.10.17 |
| G4S Contract Management – August 2017 Rec 4.2 – All super KPIs, KPIs and PIs should be systematically validated on a rolling basis to ensure the information reported by G4S is accurate. Any discrepancies should be investigated and resolved. Managers Response – A performance Matrix has been implemented to ensure the correct periodic validation process takes place. Due to the capacity within the CPT this has not been fully completed within the financial year. 2016/17. However all SKPIs and KPIs will be checked on a rolling basis at least once annually going forward. Due to the resource impact, it is not deemed necessary to include the PIs as they are not considered to be significant risk. | 2 | Original Timescale Immediate COMPLETE | Finance Scrutiny & Performance Officer / CP Manager | 31.10.17 |