

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>Recruitment Follow-Up – June 2019 – Rec. 4.2 The details of the ex-gratia payment made should be shared with the OPCC CFO in line with agreement in previous audit report. The Force should ensure that a process is put in place for future ex-gratia payments that includes the correct authorisation levels.</p> <p>Management Response – The management response in the previous report stated “<i>Agreed. The Force will provide the documentation in respect of this payment to the CFO for retrospective consideration. The force will be requesting to the PCC that a change in the delegated levels are increased for ex-gratia payments as the Chief Constable believes that the current £10k level is too restrictive and a restriction on his statutory powers as a corporation sole.</i>” The outstanding issue is that the full details have not yet been shared with the PCC CFO because the CC believes this is not appropriate as the issue involves a previous employee of the CC. This is subject to ongoing discussion between the PCC and CC. The Chief Constable will then take advice on the matter. In terms of the process, the FCFO is the authoriser on t-Police for the relevant cost centre for ex-gratia payments. In future, where an ex-gratia payment has been submitted to Finance for entry on t-Police, those over the £10k limit will be flagged. The FCFO will refer on to the OPCC for further approval before authorising on t-Police.</p> <p>Update Sept 2019 – This recommendation is partially complete – the process change has been implemented, the PCC and CFO still hasn’t been provided with the documents for retrospective authorisation.</p> <p>Update Oct 2019 – The PCC CFO still hasn’t been provided the documentation, but this will be addressed as part of the review of the Integrated Scheme of Governance currently taking place by the Governance Working Group.</p> <p>Update Dec 2019 – Governance review is in progress. No further update at this time.</p> <p>Update May 2020 – No further update. The Governance Working Group is considering the matter. This body isn’t currently meeting due to social distancing restrictions.</p> <p>Update Jul 2020 – No further update. The Governance Working Group is considering the matter.</p> <p>Update Sept 2020 – There has been no further progress. FCFO cannot influence the completion of this recommendation, as it’s outside the FCFO responsibility and is a matter for discussion between the Governance Working Group and the Chief Constable.</p> <p>Update Jan 2021 – This recommendation has been re-addressed and ultimately superseded in a second Recruitment Follow Up audit, which was held in August 2020. However, the second report is still to be finalised and is currently pending further management comments. This recommendation remains open currently.</p> | 1 | <p>Original Timescale Immediate</p> <p>Ongoing</p> | FCFO | <p>19.11.2019</p> <p>27.01.2020</p> <p>10.06.2020</p> <p>25.11.2020</p> <p>26.01.2021</p> |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|---|--------------------|--|--|---|
| <p>Collaboration – Strategic Financial Planning – February 2019 – Rec. 4.4 The Resource Board should determine a consistent approach to budget underspends and efficiency savings to ensure each collaboration unit is engaged and incentivised to deliver efficiency savings. Moreover, there should be clarity when savings are being prepared and proposed so that it is understood what type of saving are being proposed and the impact for all stakeholders.</p> <p>Management Response – This recommendation has become more topical in light of the 2019/20 regional budget settlement and is agreed. Under the settlement agreed by PCCs for 2019/20, the underspends for all regional collaboration will be carried forward (with correct accounting principles) into the EMSOU budget to offset cost pressures. A risk inherent in that approach is to reinforce a ‘spend it or lose it’ mentality in the other collaboration units. The East Midlands CFOs/FDs will discuss this issue at their next meeting (8th April 2019) and make recommendations through the CFO representative to the Resources Board (or future equivalent) for consideration. Those recommendations will include clarity over carry-forward arrangements (as informed by the respective s22 agreements) together with how sound financial management principles will be reinforced.</p> <p>Update Nov 2019 – This has been discussed but it is subject to a proposal that will be tabled to the Resources Board and then agreed with PCCs/CCs.</p> <p>Update Mar 2020 – This has been discussed but it is subject to a proposal that will be tabled at the PCC Business Meeting in April 2020.</p> <p>Update May 2020 – A current update was requested on 12 May 2020, it has been confirmed that there are no further updates in relation to this recommendation at present. This is the most recent update.</p> <p>Update June 2020 – The CFOs/FDs are still discussing this with a view to agreeing a consensus for the Resources Board. Target date for agreement 30.06.20 for application to 2020/21 financial year.</p> <p>Update Sept 2020 – CFOs/FDs have agreed a form of words that will apply for the 2020/21 year-end (with the first trigger point being late Q3). Final write-up has been delayed by other CV19 priorities but will be completed by 31/10/20.</p> <p>Update Jan 2021 – No further update is currently available for this recommendation.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale 08.04.19</p> <p>Revised Timescale 30.04.20</p> <p>Revised Timescale 30.04.21</p> <p>Revised Timescale 31.10.20</p> | <p>East Midlands CFOs/FDs</p> <p>Leading to: East Midlands Resources Board (or equivalent)</p> | <p>19.11.2019</p> <p>27.01.2020</p> <p>10.06.2020</p> <p>25.11.2020</p> <p>26.01.2021</p> |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|--|--------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| <p>Victims Code of Practice – October 2019 – Rec. 4.5 The manner in which feedback is sought, reviewed and communicated should be reviewed.</p> <p>Management Response – Agreed. The OPCC, through discussions with the Head of Strategic Development, is progressing the introduction of the use of an automated victim satisfaction survey.</p> <p>Update Apr 2020 – The automated satisfaction survey has been developed with the OPCC, in conjunction with strategic development. This has been created through the use of Survey Monkey. Plans were in place to deliver this, however there has been a change of lead in force for the Victim Focus work stream from C/S Mayo to T/C/S McAdam and as such a request was made to pause on this for a short period whilst a review of all victim processes was carried out. This delay has now fallen into the COVID-19 period and as such there has been limited opportunity to bring stakeholders together. There is a new meeting format for Victim Focus under the ‘Putting Victims First’ development where all victim matters are discussed with the OPCC represented alongside key force personnel to ensure a clear delivery plan can be developed. This survey is captured as part of this and in the interim the Leicester surveying is continuing. The timescale is pushed back a further 2 months to allow the delivery of an outcome for this action to enable the victim work to be pulled together and the survey to form part of these plans.</p> <p>Update Sept 2020 – This recommendation has 2 main points to address; one being the format of surveying victims and the second being how we are using the feedback to inform practices and develop our approach to victims. The surveying is still planned to ultimately bring it in house through the use of the OPCC’s Survey Monkey. This platform has been developed and has been in use with Victim Lincs for the last few months to seek feedback on service providers that they have signposted victims to for support. Having now had this in use it was agreed we would evaluate this approach and whether this was still the right platform to consider for Lincolnshire Police to use for developing the in house victim surveying. A meeting is set to take place on 8th October 2020 with the OPCC victim leads to understand the effectiveness of this and work through the next steps for developing the wider victim survey and to understand associated costs. All feedback received through the surveying of victims is to be reviewed through the Putting Victims First Delivery Group. This group meeting was paused during the COVID-19 pandemic but is reconvening on 14th October 2020. This is an established agenda item with appropriate representation from commands to ensure action and follow up on these. This recommendation is still being worked through with regards the survey development.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale 30.04.20</p> <p>Revised Timescale 30.06.20</p> <p>Revised Timescale 31.12.20</p> <p>COMPLETED</p> | T/Ch. Supt. Jon McAdam | <p>27.01.2020</p> <p>10.06.2020</p> <p>25.11.2020</p> <p>26.01.2021</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Victims Code of Practice – October 2019 – Rec. 4.5 Continued</p> <p>Update Jan 2021 – The surveying of victims is subject to ongoing review. The previous arrangements of outsourcing this to Leicestershire Police remain in place, as has been for a number of years now, with responses being received on a monthly basis. These responses are subject to then identified to the command the crime type relates to and then passed through to the respective Detective Chief Inspector (Crime Manager) for that command to ensure recognition of good victim updates and identification where standards have not seemingly been met. The victim satisfaction details are then also subject to review at the Force Putting Victims First Delivery Group.</p> <p>The work undertaken within the OPCC Victim Lincs team to provide a survey monkey link to victims utilising their services is subject to ongoing liaison and assessment to understand the take up of victims and whether a statistically significant return is made to inform overall performance and practice.</p> <p>A case is being considered to bring the surveying of victims “in house” for Lincolnshire Police. This will bring benefits of full autonomy for any changes and enable a more intuitive approach to surveying and what crime types are to be surveyed. This however will come with a resource uplift which is significantly more than the current arrangements and as such the full benefits must be recognised before any such decision can be made. Early scoping exercises have been carried out, but when considering this uplift option there has been significant financial uncertainty for Lincolnshire Police. Whilst this has been mitigated for the immediate future the long term need for permanently resourcing such roles has to be carefully considered. It has therefore been determined that we will remain with Leicestershire Police for the next financial year to then allow a far more informed benefits realisation review to be conducted and future plans considered for presenting to Chief Officers.</p> <p>Having reviewed this there remains a surveying arrangement in place and renewed scrutiny of the outcomes. This recommendation can be detailed as completed at this time unless there is a desire to retain this open throughout this year whilst the additional scoping and proposals are updated.</p> | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|---|--------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| <p>Counter Fraud – February 2020 – Rec. 4.3 The Force and OPCC should review the current Fraud Awareness training that is provided to new starters to confirm if it meets the needs of the Force and OPCC. The Force/OPCC should ensure that regular refresher training is completed so that staff have awareness of Fraud and Corruption. It should also be considered how and who will monitor the completion of any training. The Force/OPCC should consider carrying out a training needs analysis to establish which areas of the Force have a higher risk of fraud and corruption and then consider if tailored training needs to be rolled out.</p> <p>Management Response – a) Anti-fraud and Corruption Steering Group (AFCSG) agree that formal training needs analysis (TNA) should be conducted. RPO to investigate scope and commissioning with the Commercial Partnership Team in the first instance. B) Following completion of the TNA a training action plan will be developed and agreed by the AFCSG for implementation.</p> <p>Update May 2020 – Training Needs Analysis (TNA) requirements have been discussed with L&D (and they have provided supporting documentation). A brief questionnaire has been sent out to those organisational areas identified as higher risk (based on the Fraud Risk register). The existing mandatory induction training module is being assessed to ensure it remains relevant / current. The survey will be returned to L&D by the 15 May 2020 and L&D has been asked to prepare an update for the next AFCSG meeting on the 3 June 2020.</p> <p>Update Jul 2020 – The training needs analysis proposal was presented to the AFCSG on the 30 June 2020. The group did not accept the proposal and decided that further work was required to fully meet the counter fraud training requirements. The group decided to consider further what the wider counter fraud training requirements are, specifically including the procurement fraud related elements. This has been placed on the agenda for the next scheduled AFCSG meeting in October 2020.</p> <p>Update Sept 2020 – September AFCSG meeting requested that further information be sought by the RPO regarding the scoping process for counter fraud training needs – RPO to consult with LCFP on their approach to scoping of counter fraud / corruption training needs. RPO to report back to December 2020 AFCSG.</p> <p>Update Jan 2021 – The October AFCSG requested that the RPO investigate how scoping for counter fraud training was conducted by the LCFP and report back to the December AFCSG to help inform the next steps in revising the training provision. At the December AFCSG it was agreed that a separate meeting outside of the AFCSG schedule be arranged to discuss in more detail the scope and agree next steps in determining the training required and how it should be delivered.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale a) 31.03.20 b) Dependent on the above date</p> <p>Revised Timescale 30.06.20</p> <p>Revised Timescale 31.12.20</p> <p>Revised Timescale 31.12.21</p> | RPO | <p>10.06.2020</p> <p>25.11.2020</p> <p>26.01.2021</p> |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|---|--------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| <p>Counter Fraud – February 2020 – Rec 4.4 The Force and OPCC should consider ensuring that the fraud risk register is specific in nature and thus does not replicate existing risk management systems.</p> <p>Management Response – Roles and responsibilities for the management of the Fraud Risk Register and the reporting mechanisms associated with it were agreed at the AFCSG meeting in January 2020 (action plan in place). The update of policies and procedures associated with the fraud risk register scheduled within action plan dependent on each document/stage of implementation.</p> <p>Update May 2020 - The Antifraud and corruption policy (PD161) has been refreshed to incorporate reference to the Fraud Risk Register and bring it up to date with recent changes in police regulations. (Completed and Approved by HoPSD and RPO) Minor updates to policy template underway – due for completion by the end of May. A new joint Anti-fraud and corruption strategy has been drafted and approved by HoPSD and RPO – due for ratification by OPCC CEX by the end of May. Review of content of Draft Fraud risk register scheduled for completion by end of June (to be conducted by FRPRO and RPO). Refresh of Risk management policies and strategies to include reference to fraud risk register and associated processes – scheduled for completion by end of September 2020. Briefings for Fraud risk register SPOCS and associated staff are under construction – schedule for completion by end Sept 2020. The AFCSG meeting which was scheduled to be held in April was cancelled due to availability of attendees. Agenda items will be rolled over to the June meeting.</p> <p>Update Sept 2020 – 1. The Antifraud and corruption policy (PD161) refresh has been completed. (Approved by Force / OPCC). 2. A new joint Anti-fraud and corruption strategy has been completed. (Approved by Force / OPCC). 3. Review of content of Draft Fraud risk register– Issues raised during discussion at September 2020 AFCSG prompted further meeting between Internal Auditor, RPO / FRPRO on 29th Sept 2020. Actions arising from this meeting include consideration by RPO / FRPRO of alternative format for recording of fraud risks and greater engagement with operational leads within risk areas / functions. Potential solutions to the issues raised are to be agenda item at Dec 2020 AFCSG. 4. Refresh of Risk management policies and strategies to include reference to new fraud risk register and associated processes – progress is pending decision on above point (3). 5. Briefings for Fraud risk register SPOCS – progress is pending decision on above point (3). Note- programme of planned AFCSG meetings affected by availability of key attendees some meetings cancelled / postponed – revised workplan under construction.</p> <p>Update Jan 2021 – The rollout of the current Fraud risk register has been paused while its format is reviewed with a view to developing a new format that highlights and focusses more on the ‘day to day’ practical fraud risks faced rather than the currently very broad approach encompassing generic ‘theoretical’ fraud risks. The FRPRO, RPO and the internal audit manager are to schedule an initial meeting to discuss the proposed new format in early 2021.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale 30.09.20</p> <p>Revised Timescale 31.12.20</p> <p>Revised Timescale 31.12.21</p> | OPCC / Force | <p>10.06.2020</p> <p>25.11.2020</p> <p>26.01.2021</p> |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|--|--------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| <p>Book On / Book Off – March 2020 – Rec 4.1 The Force should look to increase the reporting capabilities within the DMS system to ensure appropriate analysis can be carried out efficiently.</p> <p>Management Response – The Force are aware of the limited capabilities, and there is a project ongoing at the moment to consider a data tool to assist with the reporting of and amalgamation of data across a number of systems.</p> <p>Update May 2020 – This recommendation is being picked up by the Business Intelligence (BI) tool project, which looks to bring together a whole range of management information from different systems operating within the Force. A business case is being developed as is a project plan. This recommendation is now being managed by the Project Manager of Horizons 2023 project.</p> <p>Update Sept 2020 – The BI Tool project will identify and implement (along with our strategic business partner) the most appropriate solution for the Force. As part of the future dashboard development, this will include Crown DMS as a data source. Please note, that the BI Tool Project timelines are fluid, there is no defined timeline for when the tool will be available in Force. A further update will be available at the end of December 2020.</p> <p>Update Jan 2021 – The business case, funding and G4S change control were approved in December for the BI Tool Project. Discussions will take place in January to develop requirements and the project plan.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale 30.09.20</p> <p>Revised Timescale 31.12.20</p> <p>Revised Timescale 31.03.21</p> | Project Manager, Horizons 2023 | 10.06.2020 25.11.2020 26.01.2021 |
| <p>Project Management – July 2020 – Rec. 4.3 The Force should decide whether the Wellbeing Programme is to be managed and monitored as a change, with oversight from the Change Board. Following the above decision, if it is to be treated as a change, the requirements of the Change Manual should be adhered to, to ensure that there is a clear methodology followed to deliver defined objectives, whilst having structured governance. This should include completion of all necessary templates per the Manual.</p> <p>Management Response – The Continuous Improvement Unit is awaiting direction from COG regarding whether there will be a continuing Wellbeing Programme. Advice, support and coordination with other programmes in the portfolio will be provided accordingly.</p> <p>Update Nov 2020 – COG have agreed that Wellbeing is to be an ongoing change programme within the Force's Change Portfolio. A project manager has been appointed, and the formal Programme Brief to commission the Programme at the Change Board is being compiled. This will agree the scope and resource requirements of the programme. It is expected that the Programme Brief will be submitted to the January 2021 Change Board.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale 31.10.20</p> <p>Revised Timescale 31.01.21</p> | Continuous Improvement Manager | 26.01.2021 |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|--|--------------------|--|----------------------------|---|
| <p>Archives Management – December 2020 – Rec 4.2 The Force should ensure that the contents of archived items received by the Archives team from the CJU are accurately recorded on Transearch. To ensure this, the Force should put in place an agreed process between the Archives team and the CJU for how this will be done. Furthermore, the Archives team should verify the contents of each archived item upon arrival at the Archives store, through reconciling the contents of the item with the record as per Transearch. This will enable Lincolnshire to monitor the contents of each archived item and effectively track the movements of records from each item.</p> <p>Management Response – It is accepted that there is a mixed process for CJU recording the details of the crime file contents on Transearch at the moment. This will be discussed with CJU to determine a consistent process moving forward. We do not believe it is necessary to open all files once they are received at the Archive. All additional media is secured within the crime file, which the file then being sealed in an envelope and barcoded. The sealed envelopes are placed in a secure crate, which is locked and tagged and only carried by 1 driver, directly from CJU to Archive. There is very little change of any of the enclosed material to go astray during this process. We actually think there would be more risk by opening the envelopes and pulling out the files and media at the other end.</p> <p>Update Jan 2021 – CJU staff will now be recording any additional items such as media, CCTV, worn video footage etc. on the Transearch system before sealing and bar coding the envelopes. CJU have updated their SOP to include this instruction. The Archives staff will not be re-opening the envelopes once they arrive at the Archive as this adds an additional risk that items will be lost. This recommendation is complete.</p> | 1 | <p>Original Timescale 30.12.20</p> <p>COMPLETE</p> | Vetting & Security Manager | 26.01.2021 |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|--|--------------------|--|----------------------------|---|
| <p>Archives Management – December 2020 – Rec. 4.3 The Force should extend the current monitoring process for removed paper items to include the removed media items as well. Furthermore, the Force should not delete the barcodes of archived media items that are removed to ensure they can carry out effective monitoring.</p> <p>Management Response – The Archives did previously retain and scan out media items to the person requesting and chased for return the same as the current process for paper files. The reason the process was changed to instead delete the barcodes relating to media was because the item is usually returned via CJS, where a new barcode would automatically be allocated to the item. When the item is received back at the archive the new barcode will be scanned to an archive location and the original barcode would still show as being booked out to the person who requested it, meaning that when they are chased for return, the archive is advised the item has been returned, but there is no indication of what barcode the item is now stored under, investigation is then needed in order to ascertain if the correct item has been received back at the archive store and to locate it within the store. There is a large volume of media items requested from the archive resulting in the follow up of these items and subsequent investigation to check if the item was indeed back in the archive store became an arduous task. That being said, we do acknowledge the risk described in the recommendation and will develop a new process with the CJU whereby they do not remove the previous barcode. Hopefully this will allow the Archive staff to monitor the whereabouts of the media, without the previous confusion. We will implement this from January – March 2021 on a trial basis to ensure that the task doesn't become too onerous for the small Archives team.</p> <p>Update Jan 2021 – The archive are from January 2021 onwards implementing a change to the process of providing original media items to now book the item out to the person requesting it and will chase for the return of the item as appropriate. The original barcode for each item will be retained within Transearch and once received back at the archive the item will continue to be stored under the original barcode. This recommendation is complete.</p> | 2 | <p>Original Timescale 31.01.21</p> <p>COMPLETE</p> | Records Archive Supervisor | 26.01.2021 |

| Audit Report & Recommendations | Priority 1 or 2 | Timescale for completion of Recs. | Manager Responsible | Date of JIAC Mtg Recs. Presented To |
|--|--------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| <p>Archives Management – December 2020 – Rec. 4.4</p> <p>The Force should extend the audit regime it currently has in place to encompass the management of archived items within its scope. This audit may include performing the following tests, although this is not a comprehensive list. Sample test new items to confirm these have processed correctly, so that the barcode and crime number reconciles to the Transearch record, the location is accurate, and the contents of the item have been correctly recorded. Test a sample of items that have either been moved or taken out the Archives store to confirm their location is accurate and the Archives team are aware of where they are and; confirm for a sample of items on destruction list that these can be traced to the disposal schedule and both the record of the item and the physical copy of the item has been disposed.</p> <p>Management Response – The Force is limited to 2 part time Auditors and currently has an extensive audit schedule. It will not be possible to implement this further audit at this time.</p> <p>Timescales were not applicable for this recommendation it has been added for information purposes only.</p> | 2 | N/A | N/A | 26.01.2021 |