

**JOINT AUDIT COMMITTEE (JAC)
Public Minutes**

Notes of the meeting held on 26th June 2025 at 09:30

Attendees:

Sue Davis	Chair
Faye Lloyd	Committee Member
Jon Darling	Committee Member
Paul Donnelly	Committee Member
Rachel Barber	Committee Member
Jane Heppel	Chief Finance Office, PCC
Lynn Joyce	Head of Internal Audit - PCC
Jonathan Jardine	Chief Executive - PCC
Peter Gillett	Director of Commercial Services – WMP
Sue Dehal	Head of Financial Accounting and Tax – WMP
Joanna Aichroth	Head of Fleet & Logistics - WMP
Melissa Horton	Senior Assurance and Risk Manager – WMP
Fiona Fletcher	HMICFRS Liaison Officer - WMP
Fiona Pook	Deputy Head of Corporate Development - WMP
Richard North	Head of Corporate Development - WMP
Laurelin Griffiths	Grant Thornton

Plus, one notetaker, one webcaster and one observer

694	<p>Item 1 - Apologies</p> <p>Apologies were noted for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deputy Chief Constable Scott Green • Zoe Thomas
695	<p>Item 2 – Declarations of Interest</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest raised.</p>
696	<p>Item 3 – Minutes from Previous Meeting</p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting held on 27th March 2025 were agreed as an accurate record of proceedings.</p>
697	<p>Item 4 – Matters Arising (Not on Agenda)</p> <p>Scheme of Governance Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jane Heppel explained that this item was expected to feature on the agenda for this meeting but was taking longer to revise than initially expected.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Code of Governance outlines how to bind organisations together and to make decisions. It is an important document and so it must accurately reflect what the organisations do and say. • Work is ongoing with the Force to ensure that the new Procurement Act is fully reflected within the document. It is a slow process to date with all parties wanting all statutory officers to have the chance to be fully engaged and give agreement on a single proposal before delegations are given. • It is hoped that all work can be completed and ready to present at the September meeting. <p>- The Chair suggested that the Committee should do more than just rubber stamp the document and suggested that this could be shared with them in advance to have an input into the work.</p> <p>Jane agreed and suggested that a short covering paper explaining the changes be prepared and distributed over the summer. There would also be a Working Group that Members would be invited to ahead of the next Committee meeting in September.</p> <p>ACTION: Members to be invited to a Code of Governance Working Group meeting ahead of the September Joint Audit Committee meeting.</p>
698	<p>Item 5 – Internal Audit Activity Update Report</p> <p><i>Presented by Lynn Joyce</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report covers the last month of 2024/25 and the first part of 2025/26 • 5 audits have been finalised with 5 currently in draft. • National Fraud Initiative (NFI) investigations are ongoing. Investigations into overpayments to deceased pensioners is being carried out with the Pensions team and these need to be handled sensitively. • NFI work is also taking place with Accounts Payable regarding suspected invoice overpayments, no issues have been uncovered as yet. • There are also NFI Payroll queries being looked into. These can take time, and further details will be reported at a later date. • Lynn offered thanks to Peter Gillett who has helped to progress recommendations across the Force in the last quarter. These have been discussed at several governance boards and the outstanding number has reduced from 35 to 23 high or medium recommendation. A lot of those outstanding are old and can't be closed because they may pending implementation of a new system or policy. • There were a few missed targets in 2024/25. The plan target was 90% but the team achieved 88%. This was expected, embedding the co-sourced arrangement and the associated quality review process is taking longer. Next year it is hoped we will see an improved position. • Two audits received a limited opinion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Section 18 PACE - it was found that record keeping could be better and the Force could do more in terms of their assurance regimes to look for opportunities where they could have used Section 18 searches; and ➢ Uniform Services - The service is on a journey and when assessed to see how far they have come it felt right to give limited, not minimal assurance opinion. The service has moved from a problematic outsourced arrangement to an inhouse service. <p>- The Chair asked how the Section 18 Audit outcome was received and whether management would see it as something to assist with making better use of the powers?</p>

Lynn Joyce advised that a Subject Matter Expert had been engaged throughout the audit from the Op Vanguard team, which is the project working on improving investigations. Feedback was provided on how to improve their own quality assurance regimes to provide better information. The Force recognised they could do better when using Section 18 and it is hoped that following this audit there will be an improved position.

- Faye Lloyd asked Joanna Aichroth about the big change bringing Uniform Services inhouse and asked if the Committee could be updated on the planning undertaken and whether there was anything that could have been done better.

Joanna Aichroth advised that she joined WMP in January so is a relative newcomer. She added that the team are doing well and where things have gone wrong, they have looked at how to put compliance and governance regimes around it. The team are focussed on the practicality of bringing the arrangements inhouse and delivery of uniforms. It is then a case of how the process can be managed and checked which may not have been previously considered. This forms much of what the audit raised around compliance. The Audit was helpful for looking at a control environment and what is needed.

- Jon Darling asked, from the report there was a sense that the process was working well, just the wider oversight on monitoring levels was a problem. Are you confident of the timescales and how to get this running satisfactorily?

Joanna Aichroth confirmed that different aspects will have different timescales. For example, implementation of the HSO system is taking longer than envisaged. This now has project management support and is now being driven forward, so whilst it is behind where I would like it to be, it now has momentum. There was a delay around the dip checking stock and the governance behind it, this is now on track with myself holding the accountability. This is fed back into the Gold Group, and ACC O Hara. The process is working well. The main problem is not having a core structure of what people can have, there was a lack of understanding, so this is now being explained to users to ensure there is no ambiguity moving forward.

- Jon Darling asked whether there is a standard uniform menu for staff to avoid the risk of people having too much or too little?

Joanna Aichroth clarified that WMP have adopted a brochure approach which clearly explains what each operational look is. Users will also be unable to order outside of what is offered within the scale of issue for the role they are currently in as the system will not allow them to order what is not listed for their role.

- Rachel Barber commented that 88% of 2024/25's plan was completed. Being a new member, is this normal performance? Could you put it into context?

Lynn Joyce explained that she hoped to be able to 90% but due to embedding of the co-sourcing arrangement, it was not to be. The completion rate is better than in previous years which were affected by resourcing gaps. It was disappointing not to pass the 90% mark as there was just a single report that did not get completed this year to get to the 90% target. Hopefully this will be achieved this year now the co-sourcing arrangement is embedded.

- Rachel Barber asked, In Appendix 1, under item 6, Stop & Search, there is reference to the College Learn product, but no estimation regards to how the Force will undertake this and in what timescale. Is there an idea of timescale for resolution? Could the report in future provide context around timescales if this is possible?

	<p>Lynn Joyce clarified that this is long outstanding recommendation as Stop and Search is currently going through a massive overhaul. All policies are being revised along with the training and products available. It is understood that the policy is due to be launched at the end of July. It is hoped that a progress update is provided at the end of July so that the recommendations can be closed.</p> <p>Peter Gillett added, that the DCC is keen to ensure compliance and as a result, information is brought to the monthly Risk and Learning board. Further updates will be shared between meetings with Members.</p> <p>For assurance, Lynn Joyce added that when updates are requested for recommendations, dates are requested. For this particular recommendation, the date was omitted from the report in error.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Faye Lloyd noted that 8 of 2024/25 audits are being carried forward to 2025/26, in addition to those planned for the current year, this seems a lot of work to carry into the year. Will you be reviewing this to see if it is possible to continue with the existing plan? <p>Lynn Joyce confirmed that she will be reviewing the audit plan, though at this time it is too early to do so. A view is taken around the half year stage as to the capacity, it can be difficult as you won't know what you will come across when undertaking an audit and how this will impact on time. Regular meetings are held with the Force and meetings are held half way through the year to establish if the plan is still relevant. The likelihood is that it will change, and if so, all changes will be relayed to the committee following discussion with Chair.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jon Darling asked about the follow ups carried out. One relating to health and safety seems to have a referral to management for acceptance of risk which looks to be about overdue health and safety actions not being pro-actively chased up. Is there any background to what risk has been accepted and further work taking place as well as the assurance that this significant matter is being assessed appropriately? <p>Lynn Joyce confirmed that this risk has not been accepted yet and that she is due to meet with Peter Gillett to discuss this risk. The audit found that H&S actions/recommendations weren't always proactively chased. There is a desire for the central team to be more proactive in reporting to H&S local committees so there is a formal structure in place.</p> <p>Peter Gillett added that he is the new chair overseeing the Health and Safety committee. The first meeting is being used to go through the Terms of Reference and determine monitoring of the achievement of the recommendations. Peter welcomed the work that Lynn's team has done to put the spotlight on this which will help me chair the Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jon Darling noted that with regards to the Museum there is mention of the manager having a credit card and the card being used without approval. The use of the card without approval could be seen as inappropriate. <p>Peter Gillett confirmed that with the help of the audit team and the ACC who leads on this work, the finance team will provide an additional backstop, as using a credit card is necessary on occasion and so it is good to have a backup.</p>
699	<p>Item 6 – Internal Audit Quality Assurance and Improvement programme</p> <p><i>Presented by Lynn Joyce</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report sets out how Internal Audit services performed during the year, and complied with the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards, with the Service fully complying, as per previous years. • An improvement plan is included, with progress being made against a number of the actions, some are continuing actions. • New activity has been identified from the new standards. It is expected that by the end of the year a lot will be completed. • The appendix sets out what the quality assurance process is for next year. There is not much change in our approach as there was little change in the new standards around the Quality Assurance frameworks. <p>- Jon Darling asked if the use of Microsoft 365 within the Team could be elaborated on and how it will be used in future.</p> <p>Lynn Joyce explained that historically the team used Galileo, but it was felt that the tool was no longer fit for purpose, so the decision was taken to utilise existing systems. Working papers work well using Word and Excel. For recommendations, the audit plan and training records, Microsoft Lists is being used. It is not as integrated, but it's easier to share information and chase the recommendations. The new approach does allow the option to export information to put into graphical form. There is the potential to use Power BI in future. The Force is on a journey with this technology. It's early days, but we like its adaptability.</p> <p>- Rachel Barber asked for the rationale with regards to why a lower target has been set for this year when the team have overachieved in the year just gone? Are you challenging yourselves enough?</p> <p>Lynn confirmed that this is purely a cautionary step. The team do score highly but with the co-sourcing arrangement there is additional quality assurance, this is an added step in the process, which means reports take longer to issue. It is expected that things will remain borderline this year. It is accepted that the team could challenge themselves more, but 97% performance is already quite high.</p>
700	<p>Item 7 – Internal Audit Annual Report 2024/25</p> <p><i>Presented by Lynn Joyce</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report summarises the work of Internal Audit during the year. It has been to the Financial Governance Board and the Risk and Learning board earlier this week. • The opinion for both organisations is reasonable assurance based on the fact that a majority of audits were either reasonable or substantial. There was one issuance of a minimal assurance and 6 limited assurance opinions in the year. • It is fair to say that the governance and risk management control frameworks are adequate to support the objectives. • Some audits that have been carried out before, such as RASSO and IT, have come out more positive than previously. • When the key themes were presented to the Risk and Learning Board, the DCC requested these be fed into the DCC's performance panel. • There is a much better position now regarding audit recommendations than 6 months ago. <p>- The Chair was impressed that when the Team went into 2 Local Policing Areas, they both came back with a Substantial opinion which is doubly reassuring as it means that underlying process and culture is where you need it to be and not relying on people double checking.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paul Donnelly asked, looking at the plan going forward for 25/26, is it likely to change? It would be good to understand the decision making and prioritisation and how this links to the strategic plan? <p>Lynn Joyce advised that when the plan is set, it was always made clear that that it is not set in stone. The team do take account of the changes in the risk environment and will work with the OPCC and WMP and regularly meet with Peter Gillet to discuss any items he has to feed back into the plan. There are always constant discussions taking place. If there is anything urgent there will be a route to expediate this through the Chair. Absence management is an example that can be shared from last year. Members are also able to raise concerns too.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rachel Barber offered congratulations on the translation of Appendix B into 6 key themes and the link into the AGS. She went on to ask for more understanding of the actions that go against the themes and timescales to have more transparency through the governance structure. <p>Lynn Joyce confirmed that work is to take place with Fiona Pook to look at how to take forward the themes, which is an action that has been given to them by the DCC following the Risk and Learning Board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Faye Lloyd added that it was an excellent approach using Appendix B and one that will be helpful to continue to use with new reports so as not to just see at the end of the year. <p>Lynn Joyce explained that using the Microsoft package, the team are able to track themes much easier. Presenting the detail in this format highlights the issues much more than in previous years, which was more narrative focussed. Some thematic areas may take time to come off the list and resolve, these may be common themes next year too.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jon Darling said that the Survey results reflect good numbers and lots of green. With regards to the comments received, are those all of them, might there be others? Would it be possible to include all comments? <p>Lynn Joyce confirmed that those featured in the report were the majority received. There were only 2/3 left out as they were similar to those included. In relation to a question asked 'anything you like or dislike about the audit' there were a couple of comments that mentioned financial audit being completed at the same time as external audit were in, the other was that the audit was time consuming, but this was unavoidable as systems were not centralised.</p>
701	<p>Item 8 – Annual Governance Statements 2024/25</p> <p><i>Presented by Jane Heppel</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are two Annual Governance Statements. Some organisations provide one and others two, though there is no gold standard. As we are two large organisations, doing two is not unhelpful. • Some consultation guidelines came out earlier this year and a slightly different approach was taken. In coming up with the OPCC AGS, the office took the direction of travel from the consultation. The Force have not done the same this year but will do so next year. • The process was a rigorous one to pull together, We create our assurance map through the use of other boards and this year when attending those boards we will explain to them how we are relying on their work in bringing the AGS together. • In general, it is hoped that this will give a flavour of what concerns there should be and what should be worked on.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jon Darling asked, with regards to the Managing Data element, which is currently amber, as it is currently in a positive direction of travel, how far from green this may be? <p>Peter Gillett said that the Op Stemson Gold Group is reviewed storage and review and retention of files across the organisation. Lots of money is spent by the organisation to put physical items in storage, the Force want to keep this to a minimum. ACC Welsted is leading on this project. The Team working with ACC Welsted. have made a lot of progress over the last 6 months, but it's going to take approximately 12 months further work. It is an important investment to make so that a future Force Exec Team doesn't inherit such issues.</p>
702	<p>Item 9 – Draft Statement of Accounts</p> <p><i>Presented by Jane Heppel, Sue Dehal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jane offered thanks to those who prepared and made the calculations. • The covering paper gives detail that the true outturn position was an underspend of £18m for 24/25. • The Force put in place monitoring arrangements to focus on overtime. • The larger variances can be explained as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a £4.9m underspend on Premises costs is due to reductions in gas and electric; - a £5.4m overspend on collaborative working is due to 3rd party costs. - The largest two parts of the overspend relate to Public Liability Insurance payments and £3m of compensation to officers as a result of the McCloud pension judgment. • The main changes in the Balance Sheet included are Property, Plant and Equipment has increased by £27m, £13m of this is leases newly being recognised from IRFS16, £20m is a revaluation gain. • The net loss or gain on sales was a gain of £951,000. The intangibles line has reduced slightly, this is to reflect that this is just coming through the books this year. • In terms of cash and cash equivalents, it has been a successful year. By the end of the year, investments were £30m up, largely supported by the pension payroll timing. There was also a £4m BACS payment which had been posted but had not been paid by the bank. • The overdraft was £2.5m higher which was processing timing. • The cost of Inventory is slightly higher, showing the change of process of uniform coming in house. • In terms of lease changes, there are two new lines, they do not match the value of the leases, this means that the difference has gone to the capital adjustment account. • Sue Dehal added that when carrying out a final check on the papers ahead of publishing, in Note 27 - appreciation had been overstated by £269,000 as a result of the wrong valuation for a property from last year. - Faye Lloyd congratulated the Force on the outturn in a challenging environment. Note 11 – Compulsory Redundancies – are we there now from the restructure point of view? <p>Peter Gillett explained that the largest area of redundancies related to the review of the People department, which has now been implemented. The future savings requirement for the next few years is at least £18m so there may be further pressures so there is a need to carry out reviews. The majority of redundancies are complete, and the Force is now in a position to consolidate the team and build capacity to support the Force. This doesn't mean that there won't be future reviews.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jon Darling referred to the mention of AI and technology in future, and said that it would be useful for the Committee to know if any risks and opportunities were highlighted moving forward. - The Chair agreed and suggested that when the Force were in a position to share any updates on any work related to AI and technology. <p>Peter Gillett agreed to this suggestion.</p> <p>ACTION – Presentation to be provided to the Committee at the point at which the Force has made sufficient progress to inform Members of the direction of travel, risks and opportunities associated with AI and future technologies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paul Donnelly asked how the underspend from delays in implementing delivery of IT last year that is carried into this new financial year will impact and create a pressure on capital? <p>Peter Gillett commented that the majority of tech spends will be carried forward into 2025/26's plans to have those investments in place. This will be kept under review however as they are constantly challenging providers and the whole mode of investments and capital.</p> <p>Jane Heppel mentioned that accounting hasn't caught up with reality as yet, though it will be interesting to see how it moves forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Chair thanked Sue Dehal for her time with the committee over the years as this is her last meeting before she moves to pastures new.
703	<p>Item 10 – External Audit Plan 2024/25</p> <p><i>Presented by Laurelin Griffiths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan is similar to previous plans. When doing external auditing work, it is carried out to materiality, on this occasion using a threshold of £15m. There is also a clearly trivial threshold of £750,000 set. • Significant risks of materiality being the presumed risk of management override of controls; risks of error in the two largest estimates in the financial statements, firstly in the Chief Constable's pension liability and secondly the value of the PCC's land and buildings. There are large numbers present and there is a possibility of error in calculations. • The rebuttable risk of fraud in revenue streams is also considered, though this is not seen to be a risk here. There is also no risk considered within expenditure. • The implementation of IFRS16 has been flagged. This is not thought to be significant enough to express concern. • There is one risk around the Value for Money work, following up on the recommendations of last year's reporting. There are no additional risks identified. • The audit has started. The intention is to be finished in September with an opinion being able to be issued by the end of September all being well. This relies upon assurances being received from the Pensions Fund. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jon Darling asked if an explanation of the IT systems risk assessment and level of risk assessed could be given. <p>Laurelin Griffiths clarified that under the Audit Standards, it is required to consider the process of such considerable transactions. Where a process is supported by an IT system, it</p>

	<p>is necessary to look at the control systems and look at any deficiencies with the control environment that would cause the way the audit is carried out to change. In general, in the public sector, there is no reliance on the controls in place. Any found would be included in the report. Historically there have been a few here, though this is largely relation to access levels and has never led to a limited finding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jon Darling also asked about the makeup of the External Audit Team and how they manage a balance of continuity with fresh eyes. <p>Laurelin confirmed that there is a good mixture of both continuity and fresh eyes in the team. Colleagues will carry out no more than five years on the same audit. There is a good mixture of staff in the team to carry out other outside work, those in the organisation who have fresh eyes bring out new questions when conducting audits.</p>
704	<p>Item 11 – HMICFRS Update</p> <p><i>Presented by Fiona Fletcher</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Force continue to operate in the default phase of monitoring. A huge amount of work went in to get out of Engage status. • There are some timelines expected soon which will show what the next PEEL inspection will look like in 2026. • There have been two recent inspections, one around youth out of court disposal inspections of which WMP was one of six forces involved. The second was around child protection services which was WMP specific. Initial debrief headlines have been received with formal findings awaited. These are anticipated mid-August. • There have been three reports published since the last Committee meeting. • Due to the ever-improving picture, following the DCC's June meeting there have been an additional 12 recommendations closed. • The focus moving forward is around the PEEL Areas For Improvement (AFIs) received. There are 16 AFIs outstanding, so there is some work to do in this space. There is a plan to get these closed ahead of, or during, the next inspection. The DCC is asking for these to be front and centre to manage the progress. • Looking ahead, there is no formal inspection activity in terms of thematic inspections as the next PEEL inspection will take place in July 2026. Work is underway to start looking at what the timetable and activity will entail. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Chair noted that the way in which the recommendations are being actioned and closed is worthy of great thanks. After a long period of what felt like stagnation, it is clear that the DCC has taken this area as a personal affront and moved it on.
705	<p>Item 12 – WMP Risk Management Update, including Force Risk Register</p> <p><i>Presented by Melissa Horton</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assurance was given that all of the previous work and delivery made by the Risk team is still being delivered. Documents are still going out including inputs into SLT and governance boards as required. • In relation to the risk appetite, these have been reviewed and applied in totality across the risk register. All decisions have been updated, any risks that fall outside the appetite have been mitigated and are part of ongoing risk management processes. • In terms of KPI delivery, there has been a marginal uptick in reporting risks. Though marginal, it is hopefully the start of a turn for the Force. • There is continued product development to support the organisation in its journey, the team are working on developing an NCALT package, which will be mandated to

	<p>all Sergeant and equivalent posts and above. This will feature basic risk identification training. The storyboard has been devised and is being built for delivery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Team has hosted lunch and learn sessions and drop-in sessions. There has also been inputs on relevant topics to SLTs to encourage engagement and support across the wider organisation. All sessions are recorded and uploaded to SharePoint for. • The team are active in the national risk management space being active participants within this forum, ensuring that there is two-way communication in the national arena and how this would be interpreted within the Force. • An assurance framework has recently been drafted; this is in its infancy but has been drafted using the national 4 lines of defence model. The Team is in the process of enabling this against the highest risks. Risks that are closed and those that have been closed for six months will be reviewed within this assurance programme. • In terms of project risk, there have been two closed. The first, Speed Enforcement which has been closed with no risk transferring to the risk register. The second, related to Axon and digital storage highlighted 2 risks which are in the progress of being drafted and worded appropriately for inclusion within the risk register. • There are 11 strategic risks on the register, further updates will be provided at the next meeting. • There are no new corporate risks escalated to this level and no corporate scores increased or reduced. • In terms of those open and active corporate risks, the financial management risk sits at medium, relating to WMP's finances being unsustainable over the medium term. • Mental Health detentions risk remains high. Right Care, Right Person has been fully implemented though the number of Section 136s seen prior to the programme have returned. • The Connect and nominal match and merge risk sits at medium, Further in-depth testing has taken place and is being completed in phases. • In terms of departmental risk and issues, a high risk is open for the regional IT connectivity for Citrix. IT have removed test users to the new Azure virtual desktop version. Rollout has been extended to Warwickshire and this is being explored across the Force. This is currently in test phase. • The Joint Legal Service attrition and demand is still high, although some roles have been recruited into. The civil lawyer role did not highlight any new recruits, there is also the onboarding of candidates and their probation period which keeps the risk at high. • In terms of the covert flags in the Connect system linked to intelligence, there are a number of leads in areas working to scope and assess potential openings for resolution. Additionally, the Met Police have been reached out to further understand how they are managing a similar situation. • No new risks scored as high; this is unchanged. • One departmental risk has been reduced from high to medium, The College Learn Single Platform will cease in 2027 and WMP will need to utilise their learning management moving forward. A business case has been approved and work is underway to understand the technical requirements. • One Departmental Risk has been closed, to do with the current funding for the County Lines Taskforce, which was due to end in March 2025. This was at low and closed as funding was granted for the following 12 months. <p>- Faye Lloyd asked, with regards to Mental Health detentions, despite all phases being completed, the MOU is still yet to be signed off, could more information be shared on this?</p>
--	---

	<p>Melissa Horton clarified that the Right Care, Right Person service has been implemented in terms of WMP activity, the MOU however is currently with partners who provide the service and sign off is awaited. This all impacts on the provision of beds and the service to support individuals in Mental Health crisis when in the care of the police.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Chair added that as there are a number of NHS Trusts across the patch as well as a number of private providers who have beds and none of them have enough resources. It is not an easy one, though hopefully the agreements will come soon.
706	<p>Item 13 – OPCC Risk Management Update, including OPCC Risk Register</p> <p><i>Presented by Jane Heppel</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that as there is now a new Police and Crime Plan for 2025-29, the Senior Management Team have taken the time to break down the Plan and prioritise and task into the business delivery plan. All individual tasks have been assigned an SMT lead and responsible officer and are in the process of assigned RAG statuses and delivery dates. • The Plan is available online in a Storybook format which means that each of the KPIs can be reviewed, which is part of the public, transparent approach. <p>Jonathan Jardine added that he has had very strong assurance from the Chief Constable with regards to the plan, and is satisfied that the various strategic documents prepared by the Force are responsive to the targets set by the PCC in the Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Chair asked whether a potential update on the progress of the KPIs could be brought to a future Committee meeting. <p>Jonathan Jardine confirmed that there will be a 6-monthly report produced for the PCCs Accountability and Governance Board meeting which can be brought to JAC.</p>
707	<p>Item 14 – Joint Audit Committee Annual Report 2024/25</p> <p><i>Presented by Sue Davis</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report will be presented by the Chair at the Accountability & Governance Board. • There were no additional comments raised on the report. <p>Peter Gillett added that the Chief Constable and Deputy Chief Constable asked for their thanks to be shared with the Committee for all of their efforts to date.</p>
708	<p>Item 15 – JAC Work Programme</p> <p><i>Presented by Sue Davis</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This item is just for noting, there are no proposed changes.
	<p>Date of the next meeting:</p> <p>Thursday 25th September 2025 - 09:30am</p>