



AUDIT PANEL Friday, 30 June 2017

Met Audit and Inspection report

Report by: The Director of Strategy & Governance

Report Summary

Overall Summary of the Purpose of the Report

This report provides information on the exercise underway to "cleanse" our internal audit data to enable a full report of blockages to progress to be provided to the Panel at the September meeting. It provides information on the recent HMIC efficiency and legitimacy inspection, HMIC's first quarterly report on our progress to deliver against the findings in the Child Protection report and the governance and oversight in place around this.

Key Considerations for the Panel

- Panel may wish to consider whether the exercise underway to "cleanse" our internal audit data will enable reporting as requested at the March meeting.
- Panel members should consider the conclusions of HMIC's latest update regarding the Child Protection inspection published in November and comment on the significant amount of governance and oversight in place around this.

Interdependencies/Cross Cutting Issues

- Actions being taken to address the findings of HMIC's Child Protection report are significant controls for the safeguarding risk reported in the Met's risk report.
- Anticipated areas for improvement in HMIC's recent efficiency and legitimacy inspection have been factors in the addition of a leadership risk to the Met's corporate risk register and amendments to the change risk.

Recommendations

The Audit Panel is recommended to:

- a. Note progress to "cleanse" our internal audit data;
- b. Note anticipated areas for improvement from the recent efficiency and legitimacy inspection;
- c. Note progress to deliver against the HMIC Child Protection report and the large amount of post inspection governance and oversight in place.

1. Supporting Information

1.1. At the March meeting Audit Panel discussed the provision of assurance information and requested that they be informed of the overall position in terms of progress made to implement HMIC and internal audit recommendations and the reasons for any delays in implementation with a particular focus on the more significant recommendations in high risk areas.

Internal Audit Update

- 1.2. The Insight Team track all open actions from DARA audits there are currently 356 of these in progress. 153 of these were overdue as at 31 May 2017, we think that there are a number of reasons for this:
 - Flaws in the data: we don't always get updates from the audit owner so things stay open after they should be closed.
 - Updates and actions not related to the risk: we get lots of lengthy
 updates that don't really tell us about progress. We need clear, succinct
 updates with a direct link to the action so that we can tell when there is a
 blockage to delivery. Some actions don't have a target date and are
 "ongoing".
 - Decision making processes: lots of actions await a decision from a
 meeting, this could be because reports get moved to a later meeting, the
 meeting gets moved or the decision does not support the original agreed
 action.
 - **Dependencies**: some actions are "delayed" by dependencies on other things. Often this is because audit owners sign off actions without understanding the dependencies or resources required to deliver the action at the outset.
 - Things have moved on: the original action is no longer relevant and we have not agreed a process of closing these with DARA after a follow-up has been completed.
- 1.3. On 16 June we provided a report of outstanding actions to each business group following a discussion of the issues at Risk & Assurance Board on 06 June. We are working with business groups and DARA to address this and ensure that we really understand where there are significant blockages to the delivery of agreed audit actions that will present a significant risk for the Met.
- 1.4. This exercise to "clean our data" will enable an accurate picture of overdue actions to be provided to the Met's business groups in the next quarter and to Panel at the September meeting. The September update will focus on outstanding recommendations linked to significant business areas and corporate risks and the action being taken to address outstanding these.

HMIC Update

1.5. During this quarter HMIC have been in force conducting the PEEL efficiency and legitimacy inspection. This concluded with a hot debrief on 05 June which set out HMIC's immediate findings. The headline finding from this inspection is that morale across the Met is noticeably lower than seen before. HMIC recognise this is likely to be due to the huge amount of change taking place, nevertheless they found evidence of a lot of disgruntlement on the

frontline. This could result in an area for improvement around change engagement or leadership and has been a consideration in the addition of a leadership risk to the Met's corporate risk register and amendments to the definition of the change risk.

- 1.6. Whilst we are not yet aware of the areas for improvement as a result of this inspection (the final report is due for publication in the autumn) some areas that may be raised in the report are:
 - Compliance with NPCCs use of force standard: we will be compliant from April in line with other forces nationally but were not at the time of inspection.
 - Compliance with national vetting standards: a comprehensive plan of action is in place to address this which was discussed at Risk & Assurance Board on 06 June.
 - Rollout of the 3As PDR process: This has been piloted and will commence from summer 2017, HMIC may comment on speed of progress.
 - Concerns with regards to MetCC performance. There has been an increase in 999 calls but a corresponding drop in service. MetCC is below its complement of staff and is struggling to recruit which is having a negative impact on service and morale i.e. 101 calls is at 49% against 90% target: Again, a comprehensive plan is in place to address this which HMIC saw as positive but was not impacting at the front line at the time of inspection.
- 1.7. We are beginning to prepare for the PEEL effectiveness inspection which is likely to be in October. Action plans from the previous inspection published in March are being progressed and there are no significant concerns to raise.

HMIC Child Protection Report

- 1.8. HMIC's Child Protection report of the Met was published in November 2016. The HMIC's press release at the time stated that there were "fundamental deficiencies in the way that the Met understands and responds to child abuse and sexual exploitation and that this was putting children in London at risk". Understandably work to address this has attracted a significant amount of governance and oversight activity.
- 1.9. At the March meeting of Audit Panel members requested an overview of the governance that had been put in place regarding this work. This is set out below:
 - Child Protection Gold Group (Chair DAC McNulty): This group meets monthly and drives the delivery of actions to address the findings of the inspection report. It has representatives from MOPAC and key London partners.
 - Child Protection Delivery Group (Chair Supt Chandler): This group is formed of practitioners within the Met and meets monthly to consider the detail of the child protection action plan. It ensures actions are being addressed within appropriate timescales and considers any key risk areas for escalation to the Gold Group.

- Missing Persons Diamond Group (Chair DAC Newcomb): This group meets quarterly, it is formed of Met practitioners and considers the Missing and Absent action plan. It ensures actions are being addressed within appropriate timescales and considers any key risk areas for escalation to the Gold Group.
- MOPAC London Child Protection Policing Improvement Oversight Group (Chair Deputy Mayor): This group meets monthly and includes external representatives from the College of Policing, the national NPCC child protection lead and holds the Met to account on progress against its action plan. As leads for this area both DAC McNulty and AC Hewitt attend to address challenges.
- MOPAC/Met Oversight Board (Chair Deputy Mayor): This is MOPAC's regular oversight meeting of the Met and is attended by the Commissioner. This is the formal forum to which MOPAC can escalate issues around child protection to the Commissioner. The group is currently receiving quarterly updates on progress.
- External Advisory Panel: This Panel is comprised of partners including NSPCC, Howard League and Social Care. They provide challenge on progress and advice on how to address actions. Supt Chandler attends.
- External Scrutiny Panel: This Panel comprises CPS, social care, NSPCC; it reviews the findings of case file inspections and provides an outsider's view on themes/solutions in partnership. Supt Chandler attends.
- London Safeguarding Children's Board request written updates on progress.
- HMIC provide a quarterly written update on progress as requested by the Home Secretary (the first report was delayed due to purdah and published on 20 June 2017). HMIC's report concludes that the Met "recognises its problems and previous failings and what is needed to ensure that the force works towards providing a consistently good child protection practice across London.
 - It is clear the force has understood the recommendations of the 2016 report and the weaknesses which underpin them. The action plans and improvement processes are both comprehensive and sophisticated, and provide the force with an adequate framework through which improvements can be made". The full report can be found at (web address).
- A re-inspection of the Met's child protection provision will take place in November 2017.

1.10. Audit Panel is asked to note:

- progress to "clean" our internal audit data;
- anticipated areas for improvement from the recent efficiency and legitimacy inspection;
- progress to deliver against the HMIC Child Protection report and the large amount of post inspection governance and oversight in place.

2. Equality and Diversity Impact

This paper outlines the findings of audit and inspection activity across the Met. Any significant programmes of work undertaken to implement recommendations will be subject to equality impact assessment.

3. Financial Implications

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. Any additional financial implications from the findings of audits and inspections will be subject to Met investment processes.

4. Legal Implications

There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

5. Risk Implications

Audits and inspections can highlight significant corporate risks. These are analysed by the Insight Team and included in the Met's risk management framework where applicable. This paper has no direct health and safety implications.

6. Contact Details

Report author: Jo Collins, Strategy & Governance email: jo.collins@met.pnn.police.uk tel: 020 72302705

7. Appendices and Background Papers

None