### THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR NORTH YORKSHIRE AND THE CHIEF CONSTABLE OF NORTH YORKSHIRE

Follow Up of Previous Internal Audit Recommendations - Visit 2

**REVISED FINAL** 

Internal Audit Follow Up Report 7.17/18

22 February 2018

This report is solely for the use of the persons to whom it is addressed. To the fullest extent permitted by law, RSM Risk Assurance Services LLP will accept no responsibility or liability in respect of this report to any other party.



### CONTENTS

1 Executive summary
2 Findings and management actions 4
Appendix A: Definitions for progress made
Appendix B: Scope
Appendix C: Actions completed
Appendix D: Actions Superseded
For further information contact

Debrief held Draft report issued	2 January 2018 6 January 2018	Internal audit team	Dan Harris, Head of Internal Audit Angela Ward, Senior Manager Philip Church, Client Manager Dulcie Hakin, Lead Auditor
<b>Responses received</b>	2 February 2018		
Final report issued	5 February 2018	Client sponsor	Acting Chief Executive Officer Deputy Chief Constable
<b>Revised final issued</b>	22 February 2018		Service Review Manager
		Distribution	Acting Chief Executive Officer Deputy Chief Constable Service Review Manager

As a practising member firm of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales (ICAEW), we are subject to its ethical and other professional requirements which are detailed at http://www.icaew.com/en/members/regulations-standards-and-guidance.

The matters raised in this report are only those which came to our attention during the course of our review and are not necessarily a comprehensive statement of all the weaknesses that exist or all improvements that might be made. Management actions raised for improvements should be assessed by you for their full impact before they are implemented. This report, or our work, should not be taken as a substitute for management's responsibilities for the application of sound commercial practices. We emphasise that the responsibility for a sound system of internal controls rests with management and our work should not be relied upon to identify all strengths and weaknesses that may exist. Neither should our work be relied upon to identify all circumstances of fraud and irregularity should there be any.

This report is solely for the use of the persons to whom it is addressed and for the purposes set out herein. This report should not therefore be regarded as suitable to be used or relied on by any other party wishing to acquire any rights from RSM Risk Assurance Services LLP for any purpose or in any context. Any third party which obtains access to this report or a copy and chooses to rely on it (or any part of it) will do so at its own risk. To the fullest extent permitted by law, RSM Risk Assurance Services LLP will accept no responsibility or liability in respect of this report to any other party and shall not be liable for any loss, damage or expense of whatsoever nature which is caused by any person's reliance on representations in this report.

This report is released to you on the basis that it shall not be copied, referred to or disclosed, in whole or in part (save as otherwise permitted by agreed written terms), without our prior written consent.

We have no responsibility to update this report for events and circumstances occurring after the date of this report.

RSM Risk Assurance Services LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales no. OC389499 at 6th floor, 25 Farringdon Street, London EC4A 4AB.

# 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### 1.1 Introduction

As part of the approved internal audit periodic plan for 2017/2018 we have undertaken a review to follow up progress made by you to implement the previously agreed management actions. The audits considered as part of the follow up review were:

- Commissioning
- Mobile Phone Examination
- Governance Structure, Reporting, Challenge and Decision Making
- Community Safety Partnership Funding
- Follow Up of Previous Internal Audit and HMIC Recommendations

The 10 management actions considered in this review comprised of one high, six medium and three significant priority actions. The focus of this review was to provide assurance that all actions previously made have been adequately implemented. For actions categorised as low or merits attention we have accepted management's assurance regarding their implementation.

#### **1.2 Conclusion**

Taking account of the issues identified in the remainder of the report and in line with our definitions set out in Appendix A, in our opinion **The Police and Crime Commissioner for North Yorkshire and the Chief Constable of North Yorkshire** has demonstrated **good progress** in implementing agreed management actions.

We have raised one new management actions; further details are in section two of this report.

#### 1.3 Action tracking

Action tracking enhances an organisation's risk management and governance processes. It provides management with a method to record the implementation status of actions made by assurance providers, whilst allowing the Audit Committee to monitor actions taken by management.

Action tracking is undertaken at the Police and Crime Commissioner for North Yorkshire and the Chief Constable of North Yorkshire and reported to the Joint Independent Audit Committee (JIAC) by exception via an Internal Audit Recommendations Tracker, which shows how many recommendations are completed and outstanding for each internal audit.

We confirmed for the Governance audit and the previous Follow Up audit the tracker was correct for the recommendations that we followed up.

All actions from the Commissioning audit had been completed on the tracker, however our audit found that one of these actions was ongoing.

The Internal Audit Recommendation Tracker did not detail actions from the Mobile Phone Examination audit or the Community Safety Partnership audit.

#### 1.4 Progress on actions

Implementation	Number of	Status of management actions				
status by review	actions agreed	Implemented (1)	Implementation ongoing (2)	Not implemented (3)	Superseded (4)	Completed or no longer necessary (1)+(4)
Commissioning	3	2	1	0	0	2
Mobile Phone Examination	3	1	0	0	2	3
Governance	1	1	0	0	0	1
Community Safety Partnership	2	2	0	0	0	2
Follow Up of Previous Internal Audit and HMIC Recommendation s	1	1	0	0	0	1
Totals	<b>10</b> 100%	<b>7</b> 70%	<b>1</b> 10%	<b>0</b> 0%	<b>2</b> 20%	<b>9</b> 90%
Implementation status by	Number of actions		Status of manage	ement actions		
management action priority	agreed	Implemented (1)	Implementation ongoing (2)	Not implemented (3)	Superseded (4)	Completed or no longer necessary (1)+(4)
Medium	6	5	1	0	0	5
Significant	3	1	0	0	2	3
High	1	1	0	0	0	1
Totals	10	7	1	0	2	9

### 2 FINDINGS AND MANAGEMENT ACTIONS

This report has been prepared by exception. Therefore, we have included only those actions graded as 2 and 3. Each action followed up has been categorised in line with the following:

Status	Detail
1	The entire action has been fully implemented.
2	The action has been partly though not yet fully implemented.
3	The action has not been implemented.
4	The action has been superseded and is no longer applicable.
5	The action is not yet due.

Com	Commissioning						
Ref	Management action	Audit finding	Current status	Management Action			
1	Understand utilisation and capacity of team to ensure evidence based recruitment and performance management of staff.	Discussions with the Commissioning and Partnerships Manager found that the In-House Supporting Victims Team installed a new telephone system in September 2017 which has the ability to monitor call times, however since the installation of the new phone system the Team has not had the facilities or resources to monitor the data the system can collect.	2	Analyse data collected by the new telephone system to performance manage staff and resources.			
		The corresponding software that enables monitoring of calls by the Team Leaders and Service Delivery Manager (SDM) has not been installed correctly on desktops. This has been followed up with the IT Communications Team. The Team have now been assured the associated software and training will be delivered by end February 2018 but likely that effective analysis will not be complete until end June 2018.		Commissioning and Partnerships Manager <b>Priority:</b>			
				Medium			
		A new Team Leader was appointed in October 2017 and has been undergoing training since then. Once they are settled into their role, the team will have resources to start analysing the data that the new telephone system can produce, so that the team can be performance managed and resources within the team can be managed more effectively.		Implementation date: 30 <sup>th</sup> June 2018			

Risk Exposure			Root causes		
Operational risk as the utilisation and capacity of the team is not known in detail.			Limited analysis of utilisation vs demand.		
Probability	Financial	Reputational	Operational	Legal	Rating
Probable	Significant	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	3:13

# APPENDIX A: DEFINITIONS FOR PROGRESS MADE

The following opinions are given on the progress made in implementing actions. This opinion relates solely to the implementation of those actions followed up and does not reflect an opinion on the entire control environment

Progress in implementing actions	Overall number of actions fully implemented	Consideration of high actions	Consideration of medium actions	Consideration of low actions
Good	> 75 percent	None outstanding	None outstanding	All low actions outstanding are in the process of being implemented
Reasonable	51 – 75 percent	None outstanding	75 percent of medium actions made are in the process of being implemented	75 percent of low actions made are in the process of being implemented
Little	30 – 50 percent	All high actions outstanding are in the process of being implemented	50 percent of medium actions made are in the process of being implemented	50 percent of low actions made are in the process of being implemented
Poor	< 30 percent	Unsatisfactory progress has been made to implement high actions	Unsatisfactory progress has been made to implement medium actions	Unsatisfactory progress has been made to implement low actions

### APPENDIX B: SCOPE

#### Scope of the review

The internal audit assignment has been scoped to provide assurance on how Police and Crime Commissioner for North Yorkshire manages the following objective:

#### Objective of the area under review

We will confirm the actions closed on ARM are supported by appropriate evidence to reflect what has been reported to management and the Joint Independent Audit Committee.

When planning the audit, the following areas for consideration and limitations were agreed:

#### Areas for consideration:

- Internal Audit have undertaken a review of agreed high and medium priority management actions which had been closed on ARM.
- We also considered recommendations classified as 'fundamental' or 'significant' raised by the previous internal auditors which have been closed on ARM.
- We have reviewed closed actions on ARM two weeks prior to our audit visit in January 2018.

#### Limitations to the scope of the audit assignment:

- The review only covered audit recommendations previously made, and we have not reviewed the whole control framework of the areas listed above. Therefore, we have not provided assurance on the entire risk and control framework.
- We have only considered closed high and medium priority management actions and closed fundamental and significant recommendations.
- We have ascertained the status of recommendations through discussion with management and review of the recommendation tracking.
- We have not considered HMIC recommendations.
- Where testing was undertaken, our samples were selected over the period since actions were implemented or controls enhanced.
- Our work does not provide any guarantee or absolute assurance against material errors, loss or fraud.

## APPENDIX C: ACTIONS COMPLETED

From the testing conducted during this review we have found the following actions to have been fully implemented and are now closed:

Assignment title	Management actions
Commissioning	Obtain copies of the providers employees DBS vetting and CAADA qualifications.
Commissioning	Obtain copies of provider's insurance certificates.
Mobile Phone Examination	Assessment should be undertaken of the current resourcing requirements of the District Investigation Hubs, reviewing where training updates may be required and where the training of new examiners may be necessary.
Governance - Structure, Reporting, Challenge and Decision Making	The PCC, Chief Constable and the Chair of the Independent Audit Committee will continue in their efforts to recruit additional members to the Joint Independent Audit Committee.
Community Safety Partnership Funding	The Commissioning and Partnership Services department will ensure that all contracts and SLAs are signed in a timely manner. The signing of Community Safety related contracts will now be delegated to the Head of Commissioning and Partnership
	Services up to £250,000. Those above £250,000 still require sign off by the PCC's CEO and will be progressed on a monthly basis as required as part of JN one to ones with CEO.
Community Safety Partnership Funding	The department will:
	<ul> <li>Review all the grants to ensure that a grant return has been received with a view to take action against any outstanding ones.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Ensure grant returns are monitored / returned on a regular basis.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Review receipts and evidence of expenditure on a sample basis every year</li> </ul>
Follow Up of Previous Internal Audit and HMIC Recommendations	The Force will review the decision of the College of Policing and the forthcoming HMIC inspection to assess the training requirements of staff.

## APPENDIX D: ACTIONS SUPERSEDED

The table below lists the management actions that were not yet due during the time of this follow up audit assignment being carried out:

Assignment title	Management action	Superseded reason	
Mobile Phone Examination	The Mobile Phone Unit should undertake regular dip sampling of District level examinations, focussing on the types of crime reviewed and the appropriateness of the District undertaking them.	The process for examining mobile phones has now changed, previously mobile phone examinations could only be carried out by the mobile phone unit, with examinations being carried out at a - district level in exceptional	
Mobile Phone Examination	Policy should include exceptional circumstances whereby the Districts can review more serious crimes when the MPU is not available.	circumstances. Now mobile phone examinations can be carried out at a district level, except where there are images of indecent exposure.	
		We confirmed this had been updated in the Digital Forensic Unit Quality Manual.	

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT

Dan Harris, Head of Internal Audit Tel: 07792 948767 Daniel.Harris@rsmuk.com

Angela Ward, Senior Manager Tel: 07966 091471 Angela.Ward@rsmuk.com

Philip Church, Client Manager Tel: 07528 970082 Philip.Church@rsmuk.com