

## **JOINT ASSURANCE REVIEW MEETING held 22 September 2021 – KEY DISCUSSION POINTS.**

### **1. Progress update –**

- 1.1. The JAR meetings had now been formalised with an agenda, action log, and key discussion points being noted.
- 1.2. 6 operational maps are now 'live' with all being RAG rated and recent updates completed by the Leads for each.
- 1.3. The CFO is in contact with the FSP to discuss the most appropriate time to introduce the new Mapping process to the support functions, taking into account the G4S transition and implications.
- 1.4. All the previously set objectives for the development of the map have been completed. (action log now in place to track progress).

### **2. Discussion points**

- 2.1. The current content of the map and progress with its development was discussed at the opening of the meeting.
- 2.2. **Current overall RAG ratings** were agreed including discussions on the newly updated 'Crime' Assurance Map. (These now appear within the Dashboard).
- 2.3. The results of the operational leads self-assessments (of RAG ratings) were confirmed - with all those received aligning with those agreed by the members of the JAR (in June 2021).
- 2.4. It was agreed the Crime map should have a RED rating - key factors included
  - 2.4.1. Unprecedented volume of change 'projects' underway across the command.
  - 2.4.2. The growth in volume of change projects since the creation of the map (original suggested rating was Amber in Dec 2020).
  - 2.4.3. Effective oversight and overarching planning of these multiple change projects and the finite capacity of local management – leading to gaps in assurance.
- 2.5. The Assurance map should be seen as a management tool for practical use by the operational leads rather than just a tool for use by the 'centre' / COT & OPCC
- 2.6. **Meeting with Force leads** (2<sup>nd</sup> Hour of the Meeting DCC, RPO, FRPRO & operational leads)
  - 2.6.1. **Outline agenda** - Status of the Map / RAG ratings & self-assessment (Force leads)
    - 2.6.1.1. DCC / RPO / FRPRO - use of the Map, content & updating process
    - 2.6.1.2. User Feedback / questions arising
    - 2.6.1.3. Actions arising.
  - 2.6.2. The DCC re-iterated the purpose of the Assurance map and its potential value as a management tool for the leads, plus the need to regularly update their own maps and make them living documents so they become part of conducting 'business as usual'.
  - 2.6.3. Feedback from the operational leads on their experience of using the maps was noted, summary points:
    - 2.6.3.1. After the initial period of using the maps their value had become more apparent – they provided a good snapshot of current issues and activity.
    - 2.6.3.2. Having a consistent approach to how each lead used them was important.
    - 2.6.3.3. A few practical examples of how to complete the template should be added to the supporting information for users of the map – this would prove useful to 'new' users – particularly when changes in local 'ownership' / leadership took place. (eg secondment of operational leads to major operations such as Op Talla).
    - 2.6.3.4. Several leads requested a briefing be delivered to their SLTs by the RPO to help embed the use of the maps and to answer any questions on their practical use (in addition to the written examples requested).

2.6.4. The Assurance map will prove useful when HMICFRS inspect the force / department as it provides a lot of useful information and demonstrates good governance / awareness of local and wider national issues impacting on operations.