

MPS-MOPAC JOINT AUDIT PANEL

28 March 2022

Record of the Meeting

PRESENT

Panel:

Suzanne McCarthy – Audit Panel Chair
Reshard Auladin – Audit Panel Member
Graeme Gordon – Audit Panel Member
Jon Hayes – Audit Panel Member

MOPAC:

Diana Luchford, Chief Executive
Lisa Kitto, Interim Chief Finance Officer
Kenny Bowie, Director of Strategy and MPS Oversight
James Bottomley, Head of Oversight and Performance

MPS:

Robin Wilkinson, Chief of Corporate Services
Ian Percival, Director of Finance
Roisha Hughes, Director of Strategy and Governance
Commander Jon Savell
Katherine King, Commercial Director (item 9)

Audit Representatives:

Julie Norgrove, Head of Internal Audit for MPS and MOPAC
Lindsey Heaphy, Head of Audit and Assurance, Internal Audit
David Esling, Head of Audit and Assurance, Internal Audit
Iain Murray, External Audit, Grant Thornton
Rebecca Lister, External Audit, Grant Thornton

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE, INTRODUCTIONS AND DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

- 1.1 An apology from Mark Roberts, Director of Commercial Services, MPS, was noted and that Katherine King was attending in his place.
- 1.2 The Chair advised that she had been appointed as a non-executive director to the Board of the College of Policing.

2. RECORD OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17 JANUARY 2022

- 2.1 The record of the meeting on 17 January 2022 was agreed, subject to a minor amendment to paragraph 5.1. The completed actions were noted.
- 2.2 It was noted that outstanding was the action for the MPS to provide for the March meeting the definition of its strategic approach to assurance, supported by a comprehensive Assurance Map or a timeline for completing one, following further discussion with Jon Hayes and Julie Norgrove. The MPS advised that it did not have the capacity to undertake that work in the timeframe requested due to reprioritisation of resources due to transition planning following the resignation of the Commissioner.
- 2.3 The Panel commented that undertaking this work would assist the MPS with progressing with the implementation of improvements in governance. It was keen for this to be completed and would continue to press for this to be done.

Action: MPS to arrange to discuss the development of an Assurance Map with Jon Hayes and Julie Norgrove ahead of the Panel's next meeting on 4 July.

3. REBUILDING TRUST AND CONFIDENCE

- 3.1 The Chair noted that there had been several key developments since the Panel's last meeting, including the publication by HMICFRS of its report 'An inspection of the MPS counter-corruption arrangements and other matters related to the Daniel Morgan Independent Panel' (the HMICFRS Report). The Panel had therefore decided to use the first part of the meeting to concentrate on the theme of rebuilding trust and confidence in the MPS – and draw on relevant elements from all of the agenda items.
- 3.2 The Chair advised that the Panel wanted to avoid duplication of work being undertaken in other fora; and wanted to add value by applying its independence and strategic oversight. Its aim was to support the MPS, in particular with exploring developments relating to organisational learning, assurance framework and professional standards.
- 3.3 It was noted that a key priority in the Mayor's new Police and Crime Plan was increasing trust and confidence in the MPS, and, in that context, the Panel also wished to discuss the development of MOPAC's oversight framework.
- 3.4 Robin Wilkinson outlined for the Panel the MPS's key priorities in light of the transition to a new Commissioner. He advised that the MPS was progressing with implementing the Commissioner's plan for rebuilding trust and confidence, as outlined in her letter of 4 February 2022 to the Mayor, and was working with Baroness Casey on her review of culture in the MPS. He was confident that the MPS had a credible, strong plan.
- 3.5 Diana Luchford noted that the focus on rebuilding trust and confidence would be reflected in MOPAC's governance and oversight of the MPS.

Rebuilding Trust and Confidence

- 3.6 Robin Wilkinson outlined the reasons for the assessment in the MPS paper that the Met had strong governance processes in place that allowed the consideration, coordination and response of all aspects of trust and confidence. He noted that the Rebuilding Trust Management Board, the Performance Board and the Inclusion, Diversity and Engagement Board were chaired at Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner level, and were overseen by the Management Board, chaired by the Commissioner. Responsibility was not delegated down and any cross-cutting issues were managed by the Management Board.
- 3.7 The Panel asked what were the key factors that would lead to real change and how were success measures being developed. The Panel was advised:
- Metrics were being developed in the Business Plan and Performance Framework for 2022-23.
 - Measures would include the Public Attitude Survey, the reporting of wrong-doing, and the staff survey.
 - Success was not just short term and not just measured in metrics – the MPS would need to decide what a healthy culture looked like.
 - Trust and confidence would be built on the MPS's policing performance.
- 3.8 The Panel was advised that the metrics had been approved and it was agreed that the MPS would share the metrics with the Panel members following this meeting and these would be discussed at the Panel's July meeting.
- 3.9 There was a discussion of how the changes needed were cascaded to officers on the street. The Panel was advised that there were challenges around the level of probationers and their supervision and that consideration was being given to changes to improve this area.
- 3.10 MOPAC was asked to outline its oversight activities regarding the rebuilding of trust and confidence. James Bottomley and Kenny Bowie outlined the range of ways MOPAC had oversight of the MPS's activities in this area. The Panel was advised that the oversight framework to support the new Police and Crime Plan was being finalised. As police effectiveness fed into trust and confidence, MOPAC was working with the MPS to develop a shared understanding of what that meant. Areas that were being developed or strengthened included public review meetings, expanding the Public Attitude Survey, oversight of discipline and conduct cases, and reforming community engagement and oversight.
- 3.11 The Panel requested that MOPAC hold a separate session to brief the Panel on the implementation of its new oversight framework.

Actions:

- MPS to share with the Panel the metrics following the meeting, and they would be discussed at the Panel's July meeting.

- Secretariat to arrange a date for MOPAC to brief the Panel on the implementation of its new oversight framework.

Risk Management

- 3.12 The Panel queried the MPS's Risk Management Update paper where it stated that Risk 3: Standards, was on track to meeting its target score by April 2022. Robin Wilkinson advised that the specific risk was about failure to communicate and that a lot of work had been undertaken in that area. However, the MPS's Risk and Assurance Board had noted that was not the whole risk and therefore the risk was being reframed and reassessed, including effectiveness of controls.
- 3.13 The Panel asked whether, in respect of Risk 10: Legitimacy, "legitimacy in the Met is weakened", accurately described the nature and extent of the risk. Robin Wilkinson advised that "weakened" was the right language – while work was needed to regain trust in areas such as with young people and with Black communities, people were still calling the police, crimes were still being solved. Work was on track and focus would be given to strengthening the frontline and officer supervision.

Governance Improvement Update

- 3.14 The Panel noted that the HMICFRS had described the MPS's organisational learning as fragmented, and asked how the MPS brought all the learning together, and ensured that it was disseminated and embedded.
- 3.15 Robin Wilkinson advised that a formal response to the HMICFRS report was being developed. Organisational learning had improved but how all issues were brought together remained a work in progress.
- 3.16 MOPAC was asked where oversight of operational learning took place at a strategic level. Kenny Bowie advised that the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime undertook this in her regular meetings with the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner and Assistant Commissioners. The proposed changes to oversight would further strengthen oversight of this area.
- 3.17 There was a discussion of the role of Continuous Policing Improvement Command (CPIC) and the challenges of taking officers off frontline policing to undertake training. The Panel wished to understand the strategic approach taken by CPIC and how this drove the work of the Command, and noted that DARA would be conducting a review in this area.
- 3.18 The Panel queried the 'improved' trend for Risk 3 "MOPAC fails to hold the Commissioner to account for the legitimacy of the MPS in relation to equalities, community engagement, custody and other areas defined in statute". Kenny Bowie noted that recent events had demonstrated MOPAC's ability to hold the MPS to account in that regard.

**4. ANTI-FRAUD, BRIBERY AND CORRUPTION AND COUNTER CORRUPTION;
AND THE DANIEL MORGAN INDEPENDENT PANEL REPORT**

- 4.1 The Chair noted that the paper provided to the Panel was an interim summary, as it was drafted ahead of the publication of the HMICFRS Report on 22 March 2022. The MPS's final response to the Daniel Morgan Independent Panel (DMIP) report was also published after the drafting of the report to the Audit Panel. The Panel requested that a full report be provided for its next meeting on 4 July 2022. It also wished to understand how MOPAC would oversee the work recommended.
- 4.2 The Panel noted that, as part of its remit, it needed to be assured on the effectiveness of the Anti-Fraud, Bribery and Corruption Strategy and the Counter Fraud and Corruption Strategy and supporting frameworks. The paper provided did not address the points the Panel had previously requested. To enable the Panel to have the required assurance, it agreed that a separate meeting would be arranged for the MPS to fully brief the Panel in advance of the next meeting, supported by a full paper which:
- explicitly outlined how the Anti-Fraud, Bribery and Corruption Strategy and the Counter Corruption Strategy aligned; and
 - set out the plans and framework supporting their delivery and how this was overseen in the MPS.
- 4.3 There was an initial discussion of the findings in the HMICFRS Report. Jon Savell advised that the MPS would be able to implement the recommendations within HMICFRS's deadline.

Actions:

- MPS to provide for the Panel's meeting on 4 July a report setting out the key issues arising from the HMICFRS Report and how it planned to address them, together with how it intended to address the issues raised in the report of the DMIP.
- MOPAC to provide a report to the 4 July meeting which set out how it would oversee that work.
- Secretariat to arrange a date for the MPS to brief the Panel in detail on the issues set out in paragraph 4.2 above.
- MPS to provide a paper for that briefing, covering the issues set out in paragraph 4.2 above.

5. EXTERNAL AUDIT UPDATE

- 5.1 Iain Murray introduced the Grant Thornton report which set out the conclusions of the Annual Audit Report for 2020/21, progress and plans for the 2021/22 audit, the regular Grant Thornton quarterly update, and progress on the re-procurement of the external audit service.
- 5.2 The Annual Audit Report confirmed the statements provided in the Audit Findings Report (AFR) presented to the Audit Panel in January – that Grant Thornton gave an

unqualified opinion on the financial statements for both MOPAC and the MPS, the draft accounts and good working papers were provided in line with the national deadline, and no significant issues were noted. He noted that the recommendations related to improvements, and that there were no key or statutory recommendations. The Panel was advised that planning for the 2021/22 audit was progressing well.

- 5.3 Iain Murray highlighted the recommendations in the report which related to financial sustainability, governance improvement, and improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness. The Panel noted that the section on improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness was very helpful.
- 5.4 The Panel queried the MPS why the report did not contain its management comments in response to the recommendations. Ian Percival advised that the responses had been written and were going through clearance. The Panel requested that they be sent the responses once cleared.
- 5.5 The Panel noted that the Annual Audit Report was very detailed and future reports would benefit from being more succinct.
- 5.6 The Panel noted the summary of the Financial Reporting Council (FRC) review of the work of Grant Thornton, and the assessment of the Quality Assurance Department review by the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales. It noted that in relation to other firms reviewed by the FRC, its assessment was slightly below average. Iain Murray advised the Panel that Grant Thornton was not complacent and would continue to improve. The Panel requested that future reporting on such findings include comparisons with assessments of other firms.

Action: MPS to circulate to the Panel its management responses to the recommendations in Annual Audit Report for 2020/21, once they had been cleared.

Action: Grant Thornton to include in future reporting on assessments it receives, comparisons with assessments of other firms.

Resolved: The Audit Panel noted Grant Thornton's report.

6. MOPAC AND MPS RISK MANAGEMENT QUARTERLY REPORTS

MOPAC Report

- 6.1 James Bottomley introduced the MOPAC Risk Management Report, which provided an update on the corporate risk review and outlined the next steps. The review had identified six key risk themes – resources, relationships, culture, impact, technology oversight and finance.
- 6.2 The Panel noted risk updates but identified that some of the information needed updating. MOPAC undertook to provide the Panel with an update on those items.

Action: MOPAC to provide the Panel with updates on the items in the risk register which contained historic information.

Resolved: The Audit Panel noted MOPAC's risk management approach.

MPS Report

- 6.3 Roisha Hughes introduced the MPS's Risk Management Report, providing an overview of the MPS's corporate risks and the status of its controls. As requested by the Panel, the report provided detail on the Legitimacy risk and on the work being undertaken to address teenage homicides.
- 6.4 There was a discussion of the People risk, and the challenge for the MPS in getting enough applicants to meet the growth target.
- 6.5 The Panel thanked the MPS for the report setting out the MPS's actions for tackling teenage homicides. It asked MOPAC how those actions fitted with its commissioning work and the work of the Violence Reduction Unit (VRU). Diana Luchford advised that the working relationship between MOPAC and the VRU was closer and that they both worked closely with the MPS on violence. Partnership groups were convened, with MOPAC focusing on tackling violence in the short term, and the VRU focussing on longer term solutions. MOPAC's and the MPS's data analysis supported that work.

Resolved: The Audit Panel noted the MPS's key risks and the governance arrangements that were in place to ensure they were being effectively managed.

7. INTERNAL AUDIT QUARTERLY ACTIVITY REPORT

- 7.1 Julie Norgrove introduced the report summarising the work carried out by the Directorate of Audit, Risk and Assurance (DARA) since the Panel last met, including internal audit risk and assurance reviews, advisory work and counter fraud activity. There was also a forward look to planned activity for the coming quarter.
- 7.2 The Panel was advised that seven reviews had been concluded since the Panel last met, one rated substantial, two adequate, two limited and two advisory reports. A further nine reviews were at draft report stage and ten were in progress.
- 7.3 The Panel noted that the follow-up review of the framework supporting the development of SIAM2 had improved from adequate to substantial, and asked if there was learning from that which could be applied more widely. They were advised that the Director of Transformation and the Chief Information Officer were working together on implementing the revised framework for change as highlighted in the Calam report update.
- 7.4 It was noted that the Panel needed to have oversight of the audits of restricted areas of work and Julie Norgrove agreed to develop a process for briefing the Panel on such topics.

Action: Internal Audit to develop a process for briefing the Panel on audits of restricted areas or topics.

Resolved: The Audit Panel noted the outcome of DARA's work undertaken to date and the status of current and planned activity.

8. MPS AUDIT AND INSPECTION REPORT

- 8.1 Roisha Hughes introduced the MPS's quarterly Audit and Inspection Report, advising that since last quarter's report to the Panel, the MPS had received 15 new actions arising from DARA audits that met the monitoring threshold. During the same period, 15 actions were implemented and were now proposed as closed. The HMICFRS PEEL assessment 'final evidence collection phase' began on 21 February and concluded on 18 March. Running concurrently to this fieldwork was an investigation into a super-complaint related to stop and search - the Met is one of a small number of forces participating in the investigation.
- 8.2 The MPS report stated that one of the frequently cited reasons for delay in implementing recommendations arising from DARA audits, was that policy and guidance to be updated took longer than the initial DARA timetable allowed for. The Chair noted that DARA did not set the timescales. Roisha Hughes acknowledged this and agreed that MPS leads needed to be more involved and discuss with DARA the proposed timescales at draft report stage.
- 8.3 The Chair noted that the most common reason provided for actions not being completed in the agreed timescales was either due to being dependent on another review; or the embedding of a new process, policy or governance. The MPS was asked to include in its governance report to the July meeting, what it was doing to address those reasons. The Panel also wished to be assured on action being taken to address the underlying themes arising from review activity highlighted in the report.
- 8.4 The Panel noted that the report identified 48 different governance boards across the organisation. The MPS was asked to include in its governance report to the July meeting, information on those governance boards, what they oversee and how they work together and are co-ordinated.

Actions: The MPS to include in its audit and inspection report to the July meeting:

- what it was doing to address the two most common reasons given for actions not being completed in the agreed timescales;
- what action was being taken to address the underlying themes arising from review activity highlighted in the report; and
- information on the 48 governance boards, what they oversee and how they work together and are co-ordinated.

Resolved: The Audit Panel noted the progress that had been made to track and monitor audit actions centrally that met an agreed threshold.

9. MOPAC AND MPS GOVERNANCE IMPROVEMENT PLANS

MOPAC Governance Improvement Plans Report

- 9.1 Kenny Bowie introduced the report which provided an update on MOPAC's Governance Improvement Plan (GIP). An update on MOPAC's revised oversight framework and its strategic approach to community engagement was also included.

Resolved: The Audit Panel:

- a. Noted the Governance Improvement Plan and the progress made to the end of February 2022.
- b. Noted the areas highlighted where delivery timescales had been pushed back.
- c. Noted the next steps and timescales for the Community Engagement Strategic approach and the Oversight Framework work.

MPS Governance Improvement Plans Report

- 9.2 Roisha Hughes introduced the report which provided an update on the MPS's Governance Improvement Plans (GIP).

- 9.3 There was a discussion of data quality, as the MPS launched in January 2022 the 'Year of Quality'. MOPAC outlined how it undertook oversight of this area, including attendance at the MPS Data Board, an annual discussion at Oversight Board and regular informal discussions. The London Policing Ethics Panel was also used to provide advice on data ethics.

Resolved: The Audit Panel:

- a. Noted the progress made on the Governance Improvement Plans as at Quarter 4 (March 2022).
- b. Noted that in building the Governance Improvement Plans 2022/23, the MPS would carry forward those actions highlighted in the Appendix (and in particular those which have slipped).

Implementing Recommendations from the Stocktake Review of Change in the Met

- 9.4 The Panel discussed the paper which provided an overview of the progress in implementing the recommendations from the Calam Stocktake Review of Change in the Met. The Panel was advised that clear outputs had been produced for over 95% of the 32 recommendations.

- 9.5 The Panel noted that it wanted to understand the impact of the changes on the transformation programme and asked that this be covered in a report to the July meeting.

Action: MPS to report to the Panel's July meeting outlining the impact on the transformation programme of the changes that have arisen from the Calam review.

Resolved: The Audit Panel noted the progress made for each recommendation and

examples of success areas. It noted that a few Calam recommendations were still being progressed due to the longer term nature of their implementation.

Digital Asset Management Procurement Review - Commercial Update

9.6 Katherine King introduced the paper which provided an update on Commercial Services' progress with delivering the recommendations from the DARA audit report 'Digital Asset Management Procurement Review'.

9.7 The Panel was advised that progress continued to be made. There was a discussion of the challenges the MPS was experiencing with filling vacancies, and the impact that was having. DARA are also carrying out a follow up review of Commercial which will be reported to the next meeting.

Resolved: The Audit Panel noted the report.

10. AUDIT PANEL WORK PLAN 2022-23

10.1 The Panel agreed to review its draft work plan for 2022/23 and discuss it at its July meeting.

Action: The Panel to review its work plan for 2022/23 and provide a revised version for consideration at its July meeting.

11. AOB

11.1 The Chair advised that she would be writing to the Commissioner and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, setting out the Panel's approach for 2022/23. She noted the value to the Panel of having a senior member of the MPS's operational team present at the Panel's quarterly meetings.

Action: The Chair to write to the Commissioner and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, setting out the Panel's approach for 2022/23.

11.2 The date of the next meeting is 4 July 2022.

28 March 2022 Actions

Ref	Agenda Item	Actions	Who	Status
1	2	MPS to arrange to discuss the development of an Assurance Map with Jon Hayes and Julie Norgrove ahead of the Panel's next meeting on 4 July.	MPS	Completed – 10 June
2	3	MPS to share with the Panel following the meeting, the metrics referred to in paragraph 3.8	MPS	Shared on 25 April.
3	3	The MPS's metrics would be discussed at the Panel's July meeting.	MPS	As above
4	3	Secretariat to arrange a date for MOPAC to brief the Panel on the implementation of its new oversight framework.	Secretariat	Held on 22 June
5	4	MPS to provide for the Panel's meeting on 4 July a report setting out the key issues arising from the HMICFRS Report and how it planned to address them, together with how it intended to address the issues raised in the report of the DMIP.	MPS	Agenda item 4
6	4	MOPAC to provide a report to the 4 July meeting which set out how it would oversee that work.	MOPAC	Agenda item 4
7	4	Secretariat to arrange a date for the MPS to brief the Panel in detail on the issues set out in paragraph 4.2.	Secretariat	Held on 20 June
8	4	MPS to provide a paper for that briefing, covering the issues set out in paragraph 4.2.	MPS	Agenda item 4
9	5	MPS to circulate to the Panel its management responses to the recommendations in Annual Audit Report for 2020/21, once they had been cleared.	MPS	Shared on 19 May.
10	5	Grant Thornton to include in future reporting on assessments it receives, comparisons with assessments of other firms.	Grant Thornton	Ongoing

AGENDA ITEM 2

Ref	Agenda Item	Actions	Who	Status
11	6	MOPAC to provide the Panel with updates on the items in the risk register which contained historic information.	MOPAC	Shared on 18 May
12	7	Internal Audit to develop a process for briefing the Panel on audits of restricted areas or topics.	DARA	Completed
13	8	The MPS to include in its audit and inspection report to the July meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what it was doing to address the two most common reasons given for actions not being completed in the agreed timescales; • what action was being taken to address the underlying themes arising from review activity highlighted in the report; and • information on the 48 governance boards, what they oversee and how they work together and are co-ordinated. 	MPS	Agenda item 10
14	9	MPS to report to the Panel's July meeting outlining the impact on the transformation programme of the changes that have arisen from the Calam review.	MPS	Agenda item 11
15	10	The Panel to review its work plan for 2022/23 and provide a revised version for consideration at its July meeting.	Chair	Agenda item 15
16	11	The Chair to write to the Commissioner and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, setting out the Panel's approach for 2022/23.	Chair	Sent.
