

Audit Title	Assurance Level and Summary of Opinion	Date by which all recommendations due to be implemented:
<p>Risk Management (DP & DCP)</p>	<p>Throughout this review we have sought to align our assessment and audit opinion with the Institute of Internal Audit guidance on Assessing Risk Maturity. Given the close interdependencies between the four organisations, a single assessment and audit opinion has been provided. On this basis, our review suggests that the organisations as a whole are most closely aligned with a ‘Risk Defined’ position (with some exceptions such as the lack of a defined risk appetite but more regular review of risks). Our review has identified examples of good practice in a number of areas, although the effectiveness of such good practice is undermined by the fact that this is not being applied universally throughout the organisations.</p> <p>In our opinion, the challenge to raise the overall risk maturity to a ‘Risk Managed’ state is to achieve a greater level of consistency and alignment in processes used throughout the Strategic Alliance and OPCCs. It should be noted that a clear plan was in place to align risk management processes, particularly between both Forces, in anticipation of their proposed merger. However, given the decision made in October 2018 not to progress this merger, a new approach to align risk management arrangements has been sought and this audit has coincided with the subsequent period of reflection and reassessment. The Head of Alliance Audit, Insurance and Strategic Risk Management (AISRM) has committed to review and amendment of the Strategic Risk Review Timeline by July 2019 and it is hoped that the findings and recommendations of this report will serve to inform that review.</p> <p>Of utmost importance is to ensure that all departmental registers are created within the Pentana risk management system as currently at least nine registers do not exist, compared to the 14 registers which were made available during this review. It is clear that there are some internal reservations, particularly within the Dorset Force, over the suitability of Pentana to facilitate risk arrangements that are effective and sustainable for each organisation, including independent links from Alliance departments to each Force’s Corporate Risk Register. It has been evident that the current structure in Pentana is resource-intensive to populate fully and this may account for some of the discrepancies detailed in the subsequent sections of this report but in summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circa 10% of departmental risks not being assigned a risk approach; • Circa 7% of treated risks not being linked to a mitigating action; • Circa 14% of Devon & Cornwall Force or Alliance risks being linked to expired incomplete actions; • Circa 5% of risks not being assigned to an owner. <p>However, this is inevitable given the complex organisational structures and interdependencies which are inherent within the Strategic Alliance. Therefore, it is important that, unless a viable, equally robust and mutually agreeable/preferable alternative is readily available, all stakeholders commit to expedient and consistent use of Pentana in adherence with the Alliance’s Risk Management Policy framework.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31st March 2020

	<p>With handover of responsibility for day-to-day risk management in the Dorset Force from the Alliance AISRM Department to Corporate Development due to be completed imminently, it appears that the revised practical roles and responsibilities of all practitioners are yet to become embedded. We believe that, along with clear distinction between the remits of operational and strategic risk management, appropriate designation and training of Pentana Administrator(s) should serve to clarify and encourage ownership of risk management across the Alliance moving forward.</p> <p>Finally, whilst a single assurance opinion has been provided for the reasons outlined above, it should be noted that review of the Corporate Risk Registers of both OPCCs, whilst inherently less complex than those of the Forces, has found them to meet all standards used as the benchmark for audit fieldwork. Risks are clearly articulated and owned with regular updates provided in alignment with the Audit Committee Cycle.</p>	
<p>Agresso Reconfiguration (DP & DCP)</p>	<p>Our review of the Agresso Reconfiguration Project has resulted in a partial assurance opinion, supported by a detailed review of project documentation and system testing. The project has been subject to implementation delays due to changes in key personnel; the impact of organisational change and the reperformance of user testing but most project objectives have now been delivered and go some way towards ensuring the legal entities' accounts are robustly separate and not subject to data integrity issues.</p> <p>Elements of the original project remain undelivered, however. This is partly due to the increased resource and evaluation that is required in order to address more complex elements of the original brief. For example, the format of the current Alliance recharge process could be reconsidered and simplified in the light of the system improvements introduced to date but this is preferable to be addressed once the current changes have embedded and any related issues have been identified. Issues also remained outstanding in rectifying stock balances and the posting of associated journals, and this has impacted upon our assurance opinion.</p> <p>Despite changes in key personnel, project governance was evident at each milestone and due scrutiny and challenge had been ensured. Integra, the project consultants, quoted and invoiced £25,500 to perform initial analysis and design work. A cost of £45,000 (based on 50 days' work) was projected at tender stage for the subsequent development phase, however, this was based on the potential need to split the one client environment into two clients. This has not occurred, as amendments to the single client environment have sufficed, and therefore second phase costs have totalled £15,300. A total project cost of £40,800.</p> <p>A final determination of the success of the project will only become apparent after a period of using the updated system has passed and period end routines have been successfully executed and key control/ suspense account reconciliations reviewed. This has been reflected in the assurance level given but has been partially addressed in the management responses and evidence provided prior to issuing the final report. These documents have not been subject to a detailed review.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31st July 2019