

<b>Security Classification</b>	
NPCC Policy: Documents <u>cannot</u> be accepted or ratified without a security classification (Protective Marking may assist in assessing whether exemptions to FOIA <u>may</u> apply):	
<b>OFFICIAL</b>	
<b>Freedom of information (FOI)</b>	
This document (including attachments and appendices) may be subject to an FOI request and the NPCC FOI Officer & Decision Maker will consult with you on receipt of a request prior to any disclosure. For external Public Authorities in receipt of an FOI, please consult with <a href="mailto:npcc.foi.request@npfdu.police.uk">npcc.foi.request@npfdu.police.uk</a>	
<b>Author and Contributors:</b>	Elliot Sydney / Vicky Reay, NPCC Business Support
<b>Force/Organisation:</b>	NPCC HO
<b>Date Created:</b>	4 <sup>th</sup> October 2024
<b>Coordination Committee:</b>	NPCC Central Office
<b>Portfolio:</b>	Audit and Assurance
<b>Attachments @ para</b>	N/A
<b>Information Governance &amp; Security</b>	
In compliance with the Government's Security Policy Framework's (SPF) mandatory requirements, please ensure any onsite printing is supervised, and storage and security of papers are in compliance with the SPF. Dissemination or further distribution of this paper is strictly on a need to know basis and in compliance with other security controls and legislative obligations. If you require any advice, please contact <a href="mailto:npcc.foi.request@npfdu.police.uk">npcc.foi.request@npfdu.police.uk</a> <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/security-policy-framework/hmg-security-policy-framework#risk-management">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/security-policy-framework/hmg-security-policy-framework#risk-management</a>	

**MINUTES**  
**AUDIT AND ASSURANCE BOARD (AAB)**  
**17<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2024**

**ATTENDEES**

Robert Light (RL)	AAB Chair
Gavin Stephens (GS)	NPCC Chair
David Bowles (DB)	Independent Member
Harjinder Kaur (HK)	Independent Member
Katy Bourne (KB)	PCC Sussex
John Champion (JC)	PCC West Mercia
Jo Coles (JoC)	Deputy Mayor for Policing, Fire and Crime, North Yorkshire
Gareth Wilson (GW)	CPOSA
Seonaid Taylor (ST)	Home Office
Angela Wilson (AW)	Home Office
Phillip Golding (PG)	APCC
Louise Bailey (LB)	DARA Internal Audit
Sanjay Thakkar (ST)	DARA Internal Audit
Gemma Stannard (GeS)	NPCC Head of Strategic Hub
Tracy Holyer (TH)	NPCC Head of Organisational Development & Change
Angela Connolly (AC)	NPCC Business Support Lead
Inderjit Malhi (IM)	NPCC Finance Committee Coordinator
Hannah Hart (HH)	NPCC Head of Strategy, Planning & Performance (online)
Padraig Twomey (PT)	NPCC Finance Analyst
Lorna Humphrey (LH)	NPCC Business Planning and Risk Officer
Nikki Butt (NB)	NPCC Senior ODC Manager (Presenter - Agenda Item 6.2)
Elliot Sydney (ES)	NPCC Business Support Officer, AAB Secretariat
Vicky Reay (VR)	NPCC Business Support Assistant (Minutes)

**APOLOGIES:**

Andy Begent (AB)	NPCC Data Protection Officer
------------------	------------------------------

### **1.) WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES AND CONFLICT OF INTERESTS**

RL welcomed all to the meeting and introduced the new board members, Harjinder Kaur - independent member; Jo Coles - Deputy Mayor for Police, Fire and Crime for York and North Yorkshire and Angela Wilson - Home Office Board member. This was followed by introductions from all Board members and attendees.

RL commented that the agenda and the papers have been streamlined with a new slide pack and a supplementary additional papers pack. He invited feedback from Board members on this new approach.

RL mentioned the recent new NPCC branding and commented on the changes which took place over the summer including the new government and ministers, the public disorder and the early release of prisoners which have all had an impact on both national policing but also the reputation of the organisation.

**Apologies – See above**

#### **Conflict of Interests**

- No Conflict of Interests Reports were received

### **2.) PREVIOUS AAB MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING**

The AAB minutes were agreed with no matters arising.

### **3.) ACTION LOG**

RL reported that there were a number of items to be closed down on the action log.

JoC raised a query on underspends (Action no.2 24.05.2024), asking whether they are returned to PCCs or carried over into NPCC next FY budget. A discussion took place between several members. GS explained the current process which differs depending on the level of underspend and also where the funding comes from i.e. if Home Office grant, underspends are reported throughout the Financial Year and returned to the Home Office. For the National Operating Budget there is little underspend and all areas funded through the National Operating Budget have to adhere to the agreement that comes with the allocation of funding that makes it clear any underspends cannot be used for activity that hasn't been agreed and should be returned to the central National Operating Budget 'pot'. This then allows for in-year cost pressures that arise. General reserves are in line with the reserves policy and strategy and should large underspends occur, this would be returned to forces or help reduce the level of funding required by forces to the National Operating Budget for the following year.

RL concluded that the AAB's position as a board is to have assurance that, should there be an underspend of a significant amount, the processes exist to ensure that they are reallocated either back to PCC's or other agreed areas.

RL asked the board if they were happy to close the items marked as 'Recommended for Closure,' to which there was no dissent.

## 4.) STRATEGIC

### 4.1 CCC Report

GS presented slides as part of this agenda item and the questions and additional points below are in response to these:

- GS commented on the significant operational pressures over the Summer and thanked all members of the NPCC, in whatever role, for their help in the response to the violent disorder and the prisons crisis. These two pressures have highlighted with the incoming government the need for police reform, something that has been discussed with Chiefs' Council.
- GS also highlighted the lack of financial resilience of policing and how the resilience survey has shown a deficit in policing of £3bn and that borrowing is increasing, reserves are decreasing and there are gaps in medium term financial plans of circa £1bn. Workforce challenges and ability to brigade capabilities to meet evolving threats is significant challenge. This all also supports the case for reform.
- GS informed the board that there have been substantive discussions last week with the Home Secretary, operational police leaders, PCCs, and other national agencies to discuss policing reform. This could represent the largest reform to policing since the Royal Commission.
- GS detailed that NPCC has provided some thoughts to the Government and it is expected there will likely be a white paper. Some of the key components of national reform may include:
  1. The creation of a stronger national centre for policing:
    - To brigade some of the national policing services together and to keep pace with the strategic finance issues and negotiations in comprehensive spending reviews
    - To look at the workforce development issues and address the recommendation from the Home Affairs Select Committee to have a long-term Workforce plan
    - To support National technology development
    - To look at effective provision of those services that need to be consumed by all but only provided once.  
By doing it in this manner, effectiveness and efficiency can be achieved by doing things only once.
  2. Looking at the embedded capabilities and identifying what is best provided at a local level (recognising the importance of local policing delivery), what at a regional level and what at a national level. The long-term vision for this is that some of the big services could come together such as the NCA and Counter Terrorism Policing as there is an overlap in the threats that they are tackling. GS envisaged that they may not be separate services in 5-10 years' time.
  3. Identifying what coordination is needed for effective service delivery at the local level and the sort of provisions you would want to consume from elsewhere with stronger definitions of roles and responsibilities. This may include the reform of police funding.
  4. Reviewing governance and decision making. Currently, in the national system, there are lots of decision makers who have the ability to change the direction, the investment and policy decisions affecting policing.
- GS reminded the board that the NPCC is a relatively young organisation and since the time of its formation, its current function bears no resemblance to what was set out in the Parker Review particularly in terms of the functions and range of services NPCC now provides. GS detailed that discussions would continue with the new government over the autumn, as well as with other system leaders, including PCCs, and it will also be discussed with colleagues at the Chiefs' Council. GS highlighted that whatever the outcome of the talks, there will be a period of transition that will impact on NPCC and this AAB. He stated that there are a number of other national functions in the system currently hosted by local forces who want to move them to NPCC. As a result, there will be some decisions to make and assurances to be given about these varied functions as to whether to transition them, whether to wait for detail around potential reform, and how we

approach the management of risk and the finances around that. This will bring plenty of work for the AAB and will affect what we consider 'Business as Usual.'

- GS concluded that he believed the best way to proceed is to get as much get cross party support as possible and to try and gain long term consistency over what comes next. He said that the current model has been unsustainable for some time and even if we were given a large financial rescue package, which is unlikely, a different design built through consensus that removes frictions and tensions in order to keep communities safe and keeps pace with the threats is the way to proceed.
- RL commented that this will be discussed further in the AAB workshop next month. He reiterated that needed to remember the role of AAB in these discussions and as the work develops – not to question the political decision made but to consider impact and implications for NPCC and how NPCC are dealing with this and also to look at the big picture and not individual perspectives on reform. AAB needs to have assurance that the right thinking is taking place.
- A discussion took place between members in response to GS report, GS explained how reform was received by other chief constables and the process for decision making during CCC.

**Action: Police Reform Agenda to be discussed in October's AAB Workshop**

#### **4.2 Hub Review**

- TH presented slides and highlighted that this item does not refer to the funding of the NPCC Hub Core Team but about the Home Office Grant Agreement for the Strategic Hub funding.
- JoC sought clarity on the 'Efficiency Proposal: Funding Flow' slide. TH explained that it highlighted that there is at least £105million of grant award funding allocated from different parts of the Home Office that is tagged to the NPCC but only a small proportion of which the Hub and Central office have oversight. The rest is often awarded directly to forces to deliver various national functions and capabilities for NPCC. This presents risks in terms of inefficiencies and duplication and doesn't enable the 'once for many' concept the Hub has built and is delivering around enabling services. NPCC is discussions to try and improve this situation and drive efficiencies for policing.
- ST outlined that the Home Office is currently conducting Spending Review Phase 1 and Phase 2, with Phase 1 covering this and next year's funding and focusing on what is needed now and not transformation. The expectation is that departmental budgets will be settled by the Budget Statement on 30<sup>th</sup> October 24. However, it is expected that this process will be difficult, and ST envisaged that the additional 1.9% requested by the NPCC Hub will be challenging to achieve. She then explained that Phase 2 is for a minimum of two years covering 2026-2028 and may be longer, but this will be announced on 30<sup>th</sup> October. It is then expected that it will start quickly after this and run through to the time decisions are made in Spring 2025. Phase 2 will focus on 'mission areas.'. She expected that these conversations will be difficult but will cover more long-term spending. ST concluded, particularly to provide information for the new AAB members, that it was viewed that the Home Office funding for the Hub was something that would be provided for a number of years to allow it to get established but had envisaged moving to mixed funding model rather than assuming the Home Office will continue to fund it.
- JC stated that, when the NPCC hub was formed, we needed to clearly outline why it was essential for the efficiency and effectiveness of policing in force areas. In light of this, he asked if the submission articulated the impact and public benefits of spending this money to the PCCs in order to convince them of the worth of continuing. GS clarified that is what NPCC and Hub are trying to achieve, to provide the services listed once to all forces without them having to do it individually and this is something we have reinforced repeatedly.
- RL commented that the slide on 'Increased Demand and Value Place on the Hub' gives great examples but does not monetise the benefits to demonstrate the values and then reinforce the argument for funding for a Hub to provide services once. TH replied that we have previously done

this but have not been able to do it this year due to reduced resources that has meant we have not been able to drive some of the efficiencies and benefits work that we wanted. This said, we have identified some of the key benefit areas we need to focus on to show value and this is being done.

- DB said that the slides and papers today presented a powerful case for funding the organisation but he felt it was very difficult to monetise things as they deal with policies, strategies and preventative systems.
- PG asked that, during the discussions in the Home Office around funding requests, a balanced approach is taken to ensure that, if extra money is awarded to one area it is not at the detriment of another.
- RL continued by highlighting the problems with a one-year funding model where a viewpoint may be taken that, if my priorities are not being met this year, why should I continue to fund it. Multi-year funding allows for buy in and he used the example of the changes in local authorities where this has proved successful.
- GeS supported PG's point on balanced funding and stated that the £105 million is all we know about at present and this will probably increase as we find out more, so efficiencies could be harnessed from this with the resourcing to do so. She also stressed that when the Hub business case was written in 20/21, it was about supporting Chiefs and working in partnership and collaboration. However, we now support a large number of requests and requirements from Home Office and Government and there is no capacity having made £1 million of savings in the last financial year. GeS provided examples of how the Hub resources provided pivotal support and work to aid the national coordination around the summer unrest and prison issues and there was nowhere else this support could have come from. This included providing gold support, coordinating national comms, collating and analysing daily data on what demand looked like around arrests related to the disorder and the impact on workforce welfare and well-being. In addition, there was daily data requests on prison capacity. All of this was this was to the detriment of being able to undertake other work and had impact on staff resilience and wellbeing as Hub has limited capacity.
- JoC asked about the balance between national coordination and London-centric coordination in terms of the allocation of staffing resources around the country and the costs of these, and how we ensure national representation. GeS replied that approximately 65-75% of the NPCC workforce are people on secondment from forces around the UK, so don't receive the London allowance. The vast majority of the rest are on fixed term contracts, hosted by the Met under the Section 22a agreement, and do have the London allowance. This may be different if we were a legal entity in our own right, not hosted and were not funded on a yearly basis but she confirmed that it is a challenge complicated by these factors.
- HK asked about our recruitment policy and GeS replied that NPCC advertises externally on NPCC website, LinkedIn and the shares with College of Policing networks too. We have also been looking at attachments funded by an individual's home force to allow them to gain some development within the NPCC for specific projects and build interest. One further thing we have been using is the Civil Service Fast-Track Streamer Scheme.
- Referring back to discussion that was held over the funding model, GS stated that, should the NPCC not receive the funding, we have been working on an alternative model where the only way we can provide current services and those that forces are wanting to hand back to us is to charge for them in order to fund the central functions. GES added that there is a problem that when the functions are handed back to NPCC, due to our hosting agreement, it ends up on the Met's and MOPAC's books and, should the funding stop, they would still be financially responsible for HR and legal processes, so there is push back from them too. This is particularly the case when you consider resources needed to potentially TUPE the staff, and what will happen with them if the funding is continued or, conversely, having to do the redundancy process and payouts if it is not.

### 4.3 Delivery Plan Progress Update

HH introduced the item by stating that the information in the slides will be presented to the committee chair meeting later this week and stated that the summer's events and the agenda for reform work has put a little delay on the progress of the delivery plan trackers. LH then presented slides as part of this agenda item and the questions and additional points below are in response to these:

- KB asked where Opal sits, as there seems to be no information on this in the presentation. GeS replied that Opal is a function that is funded through the national operating budget, is hosted by North Wales and is not formally part of the Hub. It comes under the governance of the Crime Committee. KB then asked, in the light of this, who has oversight of this funding, to which GeS replied that Opal would receive a funding agreement in the same way as every function funded through the national operating budget does. IM, as the Finance Committee coordinator, drafts the agreements on behalf of GS and Paul Sanford, the chair of the Finance Committee, which states that Opal is given an amount of funding this year and this is what they can and cannot do with it. They are then expected to provide an update on spending around the budget area, which is overseen by the Finance Committee, and then, like the other 25+ budget areas, would have to put in a bid for funding for the next year, should they require it. This would then be assessed against their original bid, what has been spent against it and whether there are any over or underspends. Therefore, ultimately, the financial governance would sit under the Finance Committee.

## 5.) DELIVERY

### 5.1 NPCC Quarterly Statement & Reserves Position

PT presented slides as part of this agenda item and the questions and additional points below are in response to these:

- With reference to the slide on the Q1 Financial Statement for the Central Office, GeS added IM is coordinating Op Navette on behalf of policing to understand the costs associated with the summer disorder for policing to make submissions into Home Office. GeS stated that she is ensuring that the NPCC costs are included as part of that submission to the Home Office, due to unbudgeted costs being accrued for NPCC around overtime, travel, expenses, software, hardware, etc.
- RL asked about the lead time and legal provisions for inquiries and if we can factor this in. GS answered that there is always likely to be some form of national inquiry that the NPCC is servicing, and current ones include Undercover Policing, and the National COVID Inquiry.
- DH asked how confident the NPCC is in managing the staffing levels in order to meet the budget target in light of the Home Office budget cut. He also highlighted the need for clear documentation of implications should delays occur so that stakeholders are fully aware. GeS answered that the NPCC are currently maintaining a 'Missed Opportunities Register' that documents the things we have been unable to do because of the budget cuts or a lack of resources. It also aids in driving efficiencies and evidencing why we are not able to carry out a task. In response to DH's first point about confidence, GeS stated that it depended on the amount of notice given by the Home Office. GeS gave the example of the commencement and subsequent pausing of the Delivery Landscape Reform Program (DLRP) and the removal of the funding but liability costs that have to be factored in which had been raised with the Home Office (notice periods, redundancy, if applicable, etc.)
- With reference to the Reserves Balance Slide, PG asked whether we were expecting PCC contributions to go up next year due to the offsetting of £1.345m reserves. IM replied that we are currently working through the cycle for 2025/26. PT further pointed out that the stance is that we want to remain in the 0.13 NRE contributions but it will depend on what forces require based on their own medium term financial planning.

- RL asked what the decision-making process for the budgets was and whether the PCCs were involved and it was confirmed that the decision was made at Chief Constables' Council after each individual chief has consulted with their PCC.

## **5.2 Annual Compliance / Assurance Letters**

AC stated that the letters are from various sources including the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), Police Digital Services (PDS) and from within the NPCC and said that there were no issues impacting the NPCC that we are not already managing. However, she then highlighted that the only new issues/risks concerned the PDS Assurance letter (Appendix J) and confirmed that there are due diligence meetings taking place around this. There was also one letter outstanding that the Data Protection Officer is working on with the MPS' Information Security Officer, which is a new Information Security Letter of Assurance and Service Level Agreement.

- In light of the insurance terms covered in the MPS Liability Letter of Assurance, DH asked if the NPCC was certain that there were no gaps in terms of insurance covered. AC answered that extensive discussions have been held and we have been assured by Director of Financial Accounting and Operations for the MPS, that we are covered. GeS added that the Section 22a Agreement sets out the home force requirements.
- HK requested that in the discussions for the new MPS assurance letter on Information Security, the NPCC ensures that it adequately covers suppliers and third party suppliers in the light of their publicised recent data breach.
- JoC asked what assurances have been taken to ensure value for money, that this value for money was in evidence and that the NPCC were not exposed to whatever has/had happened around the issues that led to the PDS Assurance Letter. GeS answered that some of this would be covered in Agenda Item 5.3 but that we had met with PDS' commercial leads and SLT members to undertake due diligence whilst we continue to go through our contract renewal process. As part of this NPCC and Blue Light Commercial, whose ICT is also provided by PDS, asked if there was any threat to the financial viability or reputation of PDS that might prevent us going into a new contract and we were assured that there currently are no threats. The fact that the Home Office continues to provide funding to PDS is also reassuring.

## **5.3 ICT Contracts Update**

TH presented a slide as part of this agenda item and the questions and additional points below are in response to this:

- TH added that, following the enquiry at the last board, that amount and value of the ICT contract was £2.8m over 3 years with the ability to terminate it with the appropriate notice period.
- TH also stated that the next submission would not be ready for September as stated in the slide but should be for the October deadline.

## **6.) AUDIT AND RISK**

### **6.1 DARA Internal Audit Update**

LB presented slides and the questions and additional points below are in response to these:

- With reference to the NPCC Internal Audit Plan 2024/25 slide, LD stated that DARA have new audit standards coming in that focus more on the insight and foresight elements of their work that links to the advisory focus that DARA does now that looks at the impending risks and what can be done about them.

- HK asked whether the people strategy was included and GeS answered that we can share the Plan on a Page that was presented to the People Delivery Group

**Action: ES to circulate the Plan on a Page delivered to the People Delivery Group to all board members.**

## **6.2 DARA Recommendations Tracking Update including SyAP**

TH gave details on all of the open actions of the DARA recommendations tracker and made recommendations as to which ones should remain open and which ones should be closed. These recommendations were accepted by the board and the tracker will be updated accordingly.

With reference to the Security Assurance for Policing (SyAP) update, NB presented a slide of the current progress and updates to it and the following additional point is in response to this:

- PG wondered if there were potential efficiencies and savings to be had around the NPCC, APCC and College of Policing sharing learning, experiences and development around core functions such as information security and data handling, which could reduce duplication. GeS stated that she meets regularly with PG so this can be picked at one of these meetings.

**Action: GeS to meet with PG to discuss efficiencies and savings around shared Information Security processes and policies.**

## **6.3 NPCC Quarterly Risk Update**

LH presented and the questions and additional points below are in response to these:

- With reference to the Hub Risk Overview slide, ST asked if and how risks move in relation to their actual score and their target score, what is their 'tolerate score' and was there confidence that the mitigations would allow them to be achieved? She also commented that she believed the AAB should be more proactive in devising what are the top risks and then assuring the board that these are being managed through different parts of the organisation. RL commented that it may be something that we do subconsciously but this could be discussed further. GS agreed and thought that it would be a good topic for discussion in October's AAB Workshop.
- DB commented that he was impressed by the overall approach to risk management and the confidence he has due to the fact that the risk register is challenged internally by the NPCC before reaching the AAB but wanted to know if the reduction in staff has affected the degree to which the board can rely on the information. GeS stated that there has not been a reduction in resourcing for risk or the internal processes but where there might be a reduction is in the NPCC's ability to do proactive work to mitigate risk.
- RL asked if due to the staff reductions, the NPCC are taking on more risk as an organisation. GeS agreed and stated that, particularly in the light of events that took place over the summer, there will continue to be operational demands that will need to be resourced but there is associated risk about our capacity to deal with that demand, continue to deliver BAU and the resultant resilience, cost and well-being pressures. GS further added that he sees that there are three things conflating risk and causing pressure in the centre both in terms of capacity and financial security:
  - Operational Pressure
  - Requests to transition services into the NPCC that others no longer wish to host
  - The current reform programme.
- PG added that, as part of conversations already held with GeS that perhaps resources should be looked at more cross-sector and whether the APCC can provide staff for some of the crisis management issues. GeS agreed and highlighted conversations held with the Home Office that go to the fundamental point that is if there is no funding for the Strategic Hub then there is no

resource or function to deal with these risks. However, she went on to state that we should be more flexible cross function.

**Action: Risk issues to be discussed as part of AAB Workshop in October**

## **7.) UPDATES**

### **7.1 NPCC Impact Report 2023/2024**

HH presented a slide as part of this agenda item, as well as providing the draft version of the Impact Report in the Additional Papers pack.

- HH highlighted that the Report is not published yet but when it is, it will be made available in the public domain and, therefore, was looking for feedback.
- DB thought that the report was a good and a coherent document and gave some suggestions for next year's report that included adding a section on finance that focuses on the budget and where the finance comes from, and also a section on improvements that point to crime statistics etc. that will give it a sharper edge in the future and increase the NPCC's transparency. HH replied that on the finance point, it was refined from last year and may have taken too much information out. In terms of the improvement data, HH commented that the team can now offer greater analytical capabilities and this can be included in next year's report. DB added that the organisation tends to undersell itself and gave the example where the report does not capture the sheer scale of civil disorder when compared to GeS's description given in this meeting.
- JoC commented that the report does not contain any information about devolution or working with devolved mayors beyond London and believed that this should be reflected in the report particularly around coordination and criminal justice. HH agreed and noted this.
- RL asked if there was any difference in the relationship between direct police and crime commissioners and the authorities that have a deputy mayor for police. GS replied that it depended on the locality. There have been discussions in Chief Constables' Councils where some have been able to pull together stronger local investment and coordination of services in a mayoral model, hence giving them more resilience.

### **7.2 Staff Survey Update**

GeS presented and the questions and additional points below are in response to these:

- GeS highlighted some of the areas to be further discussed at the People Delivery Group meeting that includes a well-being strand with well-being leads, specific inputs such a postvention, well-being days and the recent recognition of Disability Inclusion Week.
- RL reminded the board of the need to be mindful of the impact of police reform, finances and uncertainty on staff.
- HK asked if this year's survey contained the same questions as the last one. GeS answered that some have repeated so we can monitor trends but new ones also introduced to allow specific focus on particular areas.
- JC raised the issue of Diversity and Inclusion as the NPCC has a responsibility for this not only in its own organisation but as a leader in the sector and how can these long-term changes to culture be delivered when leadership can sometimes be transient, especially when it did not seem to be a category on its own in the staff survey but rather included under the Wellbeing category. GS replied that it is something the NPCC help with, particularly with the Diversity, Equality and Inclusion (DEI) Coordination Committee, by pushing for the adoption of DEI policy across the service. It also occurs in thematic areas including National Operational standards that focus on the responses to things like the Casey Report and the Angiolini Report and has strong links to operational delivery.

- GeS added that NPCC have also been running some accredited supportive leadership training that has been given not only to NPCC staff but also in conjunction with other forces as well. Other initiatives mentioned were 2-day coaching and mentoring sessions, and the appointment of a mental health first aider and peer supporters.

**Action:** GeS to ensure that plan on a page document on the People Strategy that will be delivered to the People Delivery Group is circulated among the board members.

### **7.3 Update on Performance Sub-Committee**

RL introduced this agenda item by stating that the Performance Sub-Committee is a sub-committee of the NPCC with a role to set and evaluate the NPCC Chairs objectives and performance. He detailed that he has met both with GS and with Rod Hansen, the chair of the Performance Sub-committee and has discussed the approach for setting objectives, how they are monitored and how they are evaluated. All agreed that there is an effective process in place and that there will be regular updates to ensure that the Board has an oversight of the process. RL added that targets are set over a three-year period and that there are four objectives set for the present year.

## **8.) ANY OTHER BUSINESS (AOB)**

### **AAB Workshop Planning Day – 25<sup>th</sup> October 2024**

RL detailed the core areas that he would like to focus on in the Workshop and they were:

1. Developing thinking about Police Reform, funding and how we make it all work and understanding the options for the direction of where we could go.
2. What does the above mean for the Board and how we operate? What does each of the members want from the board, from each of their own particular viewpoints and their home organisations.
3. Assurance and Risk, with a particular focus on assurance and to better define the terms of assurance.
4. Setting the overall agenda for the Board to give it a new feel going forward

JC thought it would be an ideal space to examine the basis of the Terms of Reference as it is what the Board is built on. RL agreed that it was an important point, particularly due to the fact that there are several new members to the board and this will be included in the workshop. RL also thought it would be a good idea if PCCs could host future workshops to show more about their particular areas and to get the Board out of London. JC stated he would be happy to host in West Mercia.

### **AAB Teams Channel**

AC asked the Board whether they would agree to set up a Microsoft Teams Channel for the AAB to improve the efficiency of the administration of the group. By setting it up, we would be able to create a repository of papers and cut down the number of emails being sent.

The board were in approval of this suggestion.

### **Board Papers**

RL asked if there were any other AOB points and JC raised the new papers pack used for this Board meeting. He felt that, although he understood the rationale for cutting down the number of papers, he felt that the papers pack are the primary vehicle to support the meeting with the presentations being the additional work and would prefer this method in future.

Conversely, DB approved of the new papers pack particularly in relation to the Risk Register but wondered if there could be a solution halfway between the old and the new with a Presentation Pack

and an Information Pack.

RL accepted both of the members' feedback and stated he will open to other thoughts ideas on the papers.

RL reminded the attendees that the workshop is due to take place on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2024 at 50 Broadway, with the exact timings to be confirmed.

RL then thanked all the attendees both in the room and online and closed the meeting.