

# **Audit and Risk Assurance Committee Meeting Outputs**

Thursday 24 January 2019, 10:00am at CJI offices

### Attendees:

Independent member:

Derek Anderson (DA)

(Acting Chair)

Independent member:

Mairead McCafferty (MMcC)

**DoJ Sponsor Division:** 

Jane Holmes (JH)

**DoJ Internal Audit:** 

Tracey Devlin (TD)

NIAO

Karen Beattie (KB) NIAO, Assignment Director

**FSD** 

Joanne Jamison (JJ)

Criminal Justice Inspection (CJI):

James Corrigan (JC)

Meloney McVeigh (MMcV)

Stephen Dolan (SD)

**A&RAC Secretary:** 

Linda Boal (LB) CJI

Agenda No	Description / Comments
1	Introduction / acknowledgements
	DA welcomed everyone to the meeting.
2	Apologies
	Brendan McGuigan (BMcG); and
	Amanda Oliver (AO).
3	Declaration of interest / Conflict of interest

None.

- 4 Minutes of previous meeting 18 October 2018 and matters arising
  - The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed and signed.
  - PT 7. KB advised that letters had been sent to the Contractors and Deloitte have been appointed. Security clearance has yet to be confirmed. KB has spoken with Richard Logan (FSD) to help mitigate any issues with security



clearance. There will be contact with CJI in the next few weeks regarding timelines.

 KB advised that she is moving on and Gary Curry, NIAO will monitor Contractors due to rotation in the NIAO. KB will arrange a handover meeting to include KB, GC, Deloitte, JC, MMcV and JJ.

**Action: KB** 

 Audit timescales should be similar to prior years and can be discussed at the meeting.

# 5 Update on JEGS exercise for CJI Inspectors

- JC summarised actions arising from the decision to undertake a JEGS exercise.
- Discussions had taken place with the Inspection Team following which Inspectors sent a letter to JC detailing their issues. They are content to have the role evaluated but have concerns on timing; the implications of the outcomes; and any possible disadvantages.
- Inspectors also raised their concerns following previous experiences of JEGS
  evaluations on other CJI roles. They feel that the uniqueness of their role within
  a small organisation may not be fully appreciated by the NICS evaluation unit.
- Inspectors have suggested that another provider be sourced.
- JC had contacted an external provider who has undertaken Inspection/Oversight
  JEGS evaluations in England and Wales as well as work with the PPS and OPONI
  in Northern Ireland.
- JC and BMcG met with Sponsor Department, a representative from the NICS
  Grading Team and DoF to discuss the possible use of an external provider for
  the CJI Inspector evaluation. There was a discussion around the cost and DoF
  have yet to come back with a figure for Business Case purposes.
- JH advised that she has spoken to DoF to ascertain the cost involved and added that using the NICS internal assessors would incur no cost.
- DA stated that the term 'no cost' was misleading as there would be an 'opportunity cost'. He added that he has seen this a lot, although an external provider would hard charge.
- JH noted that at the previous meeting, JC had stated that Sponsor Department would meet the cost of the JEGS evaluation.
- JC confirmed that he believed this would be the case if the NICS internal
  assessors carried out the exercise. He would however have to also consider how
  the evaluation is undertaken given the specialist nature of the CJI Inspector role,
  and ensure that whatever the outcome, it would be accepted by staff.
- DA stated that a case would have to be made with a need to justify any additional cost and that any evaluation would need to be robust.
- MMcC added that staff need to have confidence in the process from the outset and so specialist knowledge is important.
- MMcV added that it was also important to maintain the independence of the Inspectorate.



- JC agreed that specialist knowledge is important and reflected that previous experience has shown that the NICS methodology does not lend itself to small organisations and is geared to larger teams and organisations.
- DA asked if the PPS and OPONI had to justify the use of an external company.
- JC replied that yes they did. An external provider doesn't work directly with the
  organisation, but rather are commissioned by DoF to carry out the work. A
  robust Business Case would be produced to support such a proposal.
- DA asked if there was a timescale for this.
- JC hoped it would have been quicker but he is still awaiting a figure from DoF to complete his Business Case.
- JH confirmed she has logged a call to establish this and would follow-up.
   Action: JH / DoJ Sponsor Dept.
- JC thanked JH for this and reiterated that this was needed to complete the Business Case. CJI Inspectors have commenced work to prepare for a JEGS evaluation.
- DA asked if Trade Union had been informed.
- JC replied not yet, as no Inspectors were members, but this would be done.
- MMcC agreed that it was important to get a decision on this so CJI could progress the matter.
- DA suggested there was a risk that dragging this out could cause resentment among staff.
- MMcV reminded the Committee that as we approach year-end, there is an
  urgent need to have the information on the cost to plan effectively and accrue if
  necessary.
- JH asked if there could be a salary accrual and MMcV said that this would have to be considered along with any potential costs linked to the JEGS exercise.
- JH also asked if JC had sought legal advice regarding Inspector's salary. JC has not done this as yet.
- JJ pointed out that CJI could be hard charged for an internal evaluation if Sponsor Department did not meet the cost and MMcV confirmed that in the past CJI had been both hard charged and had notional costs covered by sponsor in relation to JEGS exercises.
- DA summarised that this issue needed to be bottomed out and kept on the agenda.

Action: LB

# 6 Update on recruitment for CJI Chief Inspector

- JH advised the Committee that the paperwork for the recruitment of a new Chief Inspector was in place in preparation for the formal process.
- DA asked if the role would be publically advertised.
- JH confirmed it should be ready to be publicly advertised next month.

# 7 Report summarising any significant changes to the CJI Risk Register



MMcV spoke to the CJI Risk Register which had been reviewed by CJI staff at the General Staff Meeting in December and distributed to members in advance of the meeting.

- Most points remained unchanged.
- No specific risk has been added in relation to JEGS.
- MMcV drew attention to risk 4.2 Processing of staff salaries. Issues have again been encountered in relation to the payment of the 2017 pay remit. A number of anticipated payments had not been processed as anticipated, but should now be paid in January. There was a breakdown in communication between CJI, NICS HR and HR Connect. MMcV has asked for a specific list of information to ensure this doesn't re-occur.
- JH stated that there should be a standard process and asked if Sponsor Department could do anything to help.
- MMcV agreed to advise Sponsor if issues continue to seek their support.
- DA stated that this was hugely disappointing given the previous instances and asked if this could result in an automatic account qualification.
- KB confirmed that it could be an issue subject to materiality.
- JH advised that NICS HR would want to know as they keep a log of instances.
- MMcV has previously been informed that there is a tolerance level in the contract and action would only be taken when that is reached.
- DA referred to risk 2.2 Delivery of the Inspection Programme and remembered having a conversation around this point before.
- JC confirmed that resourcing was still an issue, the challenge being that the CJI budget wasn't known until the last minute.
- JH confirmed that they are still going through the budget process.
- JC stated that the programme can change and he has flexibility to carry out fewer inspections than previously. CJI have also taken a more pragmatic approach to follow-up reviews, carrying out fewer than in previous years. The number of Permanent Secretary / Agency requests continue to increase which has an impact on the programme causing delays.
- DA suggested that unforeseen emergency work will always happen and that CJI
  could be a victim of its own success. The challenge was in terms of planning and
  if the Permanent Secretary needs a piece of work done then that becomes the
  priority.
- JC agreed, and BMcG tried to be as co-operative as possible as this work is particularly relevant.
- DA was pleased to hear that CJI was reviewing its processes in order to accommodate this work.
- MMcC asked in terms of budget and Business Plan can CJI submit an indicative budget.
- JC confirmed that CJI were asked for indicative cuts in advance, but are given to believe there won't be significant changes this year.
- JH confirmed that budget talks are still underway and once the Executive block grant is confirmed, this will then filter down to Departments.



- JC advised that CJI have made a very robust case for the impact of any cuts as the discretionary spend is very little.
- MMcC referred to risk 3.4 CJI responsibility as a body of the UK NPM and asked
  if there has been consideration of potential risks arising as a result of Brexit or
  whether this is being addressed at the UK level.
- JC advised that there was no mention of Brexit in this context as yet.
- JH pointed to the new DoJ Risk Management Framework document and accompanying Risk Register. All ALBs are being encouraged to use this format.
- MMcV advised that CJI already include the majority of the key areas in their existing Risk Register.
- DA agreed he could see the advantages of using a consistent format.
- MMcV will look closely at the document in terms of its use for a smaller organisation and its proportionality.

Action: MMcV

# 8 Internal Audit Plan for 2019-20 (for noting)

- TD spoke to the paper which had been distributed to members in advance of the meeting. The plan includes the areas of HR Support and IT Support.
- MMcV confirmed that a previous audit of HR support was very useful.
- DA suggested the times of auditing these areas is perfect and asked if JC would like to add on any further areas.
- JC was content with the programme and agreed the audit of HR Support was needed. He went on to state that IT Support had bedded in well and moving to the shared service has been a success. It has also outsourced risks and given more resilience to IT support.
- MMcC noted that the FSD SLA was due for review which would time well with the audit.
- There were no further queries regarding the Plan and the Committee were happy to approve.

## 9 Review the overall CJI Assurance Framework

- DA commended the work carried out on this document and suggested the DoJ document would help inform the CJI version.
- MMcC agreed that the CJI Assurance Framework document was very comprehensive.
- DA stated that DoJ have developed their document to pull together a number of Bodies and was very impressed with the CJI document. He suggested that this item be periodically reviewed by the Committee and kept on the agenda.

Action: LB (October meeting agenda)

### 10 Consider the Committee's own effectiveness in its work

- DA reviewed the Self-Assessment checklist which he found a very positive document with all items featuring on the agenda.
- MMcC stated she had reviewed the document and agreed it was both comprehensive and robust.



- JH queried part of the assessment under principle I which indicated linkages with the DoJ A&RAC was maintained via the attendance of a representative of CJI's sponsor body. JH will make enquiries to determine this point.
   Action: JH / DoJ Sponsor Dept.
- Dependent on the information received from JH, MMcV to adjust the document.

**Action: MMcV** 

 DA stated that there had always been that link to Audit Committees but didn't see it as being practical. He suggested it may be good practice once or twice a year but that it shouldn't necessarily fall to JH or the Head of Internal Audit.

# Consider areas in which the Committee will particularly promote cooperation between auditors and other review bodies in the coming year

- KB agreed this was a matter of good practice but given the small number of days of internal audit undertaken in CJI and the areas covered, it would not be possible to take assurance from this work in the financial audit. It is unlikely that much could be done in such a small body, although if there was evidence of weak control from internal audits, cognisance would be taken of this.
- DA asked if KB was copied into reports and KB confirmed that this was the case.
- DA suggested that if occasional meetings were taking place, then this was good practice and this was usually included in Terms of Engagement.
- KB confirmed that co-operation was there and there were no difficulties.
- DA suggested it would be useful for Audit Committee members to chat with internal and external audit in camera to ensure an open and transparent forum.
- MMcC informed these meetings take place with her own organisation and while no issues are anticipated, it is good practice.
- JC confirmed he would be happy for this to take place.
- The Committee agreed to schedule the first of these meetings prior to the June A&RAC meeting at 9:30am.

Action: LB to send out meeting request.

# 12 Report summarising nine-month set of accounts

• IJ confirmed that the nine-month accounts have been completed and reviewed by Richard Logan (FSD) with no issues to address.

# 13 CJI Anti-Fraud and Bribery Policy and Response Plan

- MMcV presented the revised plan to the Committee which was updated to reflect the Doj Plan and included Bribery.
- DA asked if there had been any instances and MMcV confirm there hadn't been.
- DA stated it was good to see the Plan in place.
- JH suggested including Anti-fraud and Anti-bribery within the CJI Induction Process.
- MMcV agreed she would add this and confirmed that all new staff completed anti-fraud training on-line.



Action: MMcV

- Report from management on whistle blowing and fraud issues

  MMcV advised of a nil return.
- Report from management on any Direct Award Contracts

  MMcV advised of a nil return.
- Report summarising the expenses submitted by the Chief Inspector and the Deputy Chief Inspector.

MMcV provided the relevant figures as undernoted:

• Since the last meeting - CI and DCI:

Government Procurement		Travel & Subs		
Card				
CI	£12.60	CI	£160.20	
DCI	£44.70	DCI	£23.40	

# 17 Review of CJI's gifts and hospitality register

Since the last meeting:

the following gifts and hospitality have been received;

Nil return

the following gifts and hospitality has been extended;

- Working lunch for Chief Inspector £14.65.
- Working lunch: visit to Leeds Bradford WCU for Victims and Witnesses inspection £11.47.
- Business Dinner: (as above) £60.05.

MMcV confirmed that all items above were in relation to legitimate business purposes.

These matters were noted by Chair and other members of Committee with no concerns.

### 18 AOB

- JC advised that CJI had successfully retained accreditation for the ISO:9001 2015 Quality Management System following a Surveillance Audit by SGS on 10 January 2019. The audit identified no non-conformances or areas for improvement, with just two minor observations.
- The Committee congratulated CJI on this achievement adding it was good to have external verification for the CJI processes and procedures.

## 19 Dates of next meetings

Dates of meetings for the next year are as follows:

Thursday 11 April 2019 @ 10:00 am



Thursday 6 June 2019 @ 10:00 am

All meetings will be held in Block I Knockview Buildings, Stormont Estate.

Mairead McCafferty

Acting Chairperson