



CÙRAM IS SLÀINTE NAN EILEAN SIAR

INTEGRATION JOINT BOARD

AUDIT COMMITTEE

MINUTE OF MEETING
23 FEBRUARY 2023
HELD AT 09:30AM
VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS

Voting Members Present:

Gillian McCannon	Non-Executive Director, NHS WI / IJB Vice-Chair
Jocelyn McConnachie	Non-Executive Director, NHS WI
Susan Thomson	Councillor, CnES

Non-Voting Members Present:

Debbie Bozkurt	Chief Finance Officer, IJB
Nick Fayers	Chief Officer, IJB

In Attendance:

Martin Devenny	Auditor, Audit Scotland
Stephanie Hume	Senior Manager, Risk Assurance, Azets
Michelle McPhail	Corporate Business Manager, NHS WI
Gillian Woolman	Audit Director, Audit Scotland

1. WELCOME

Gillian McCannon took the Chair and led the meeting, welcoming all those attending to the meeting, advising that the special meeting was convened to allow the committee to review the audit recommendations which could not be achieved on the 08 February 2023 due to the Chief Officer being absent.

2. APOLOGIES

Carolyn MacPhee	Third Sector Interface Representative
Donald MacSween	Councillor, CnES

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declaration(s) of interest(s) were raised in relation to any of the agenda items to be discussed.



4. PERFORMANCE

4.1 Internal Audit Recommendation Tracker – Jan'23

The Chair emphasised the importance that the Committee fulfils its duties in reviewing the audit recommendations. The executive summary and the format of the report was pulled together by Michelle McPhail, which will enable the Committee to assess and monitor the status of the recommendation through to completion and removal from the tracker.

The outstanding recommendations relate to audits undertaken between 2019 and to 2022.

The Chair asked Nick Fayers, Chief Officer advised that given the length of time which has elapsed between audits there is significant overlap and repetitive recommendations, however these will be addressed as members discuss individual recommendations.

The Chief Officer took member through the individual risk to ascertain its status. The following was noted:

Grading: Grade 1 – Critical / Grade 2 – Contingent/Insurable Risk / Grade 3 – Housekeeping / Grade 4 – Value for Money.

T1 19/20 – Risk Management Grade 3 ~ *Risk management strategy & policy to be reviewed with updated version made available to staff.*

Response: The Chief Officer advised:

1. It was noted that the Strategy was note presented in Dec'22 to the full IJB.
2. There is a Corporate Risk Register in place, which was reviewed following consideration of the 11 risks being revised to 5 corporate risks. The 5 risks will be supported via the NHS Risk Manager and will be stored on the Datix system.
3. The proposal for the Risk Management Policy is to adopt the NHS WI methodology.

Michelle McPhail explained that there is limited capacity within the IJB to support the development of a register and therefore support and professional advice has to be obtain from the appropriate parent body.



The Chief Officer noted that the risks and scoring of a risk was primarily just the Chief Officer's process and autonomy for adding directly onto the Corporate Risk Register. However to enable a level of scrutiny, any new risk being added to the Corporate Risk Register will be presented to the Audit Committee to obtain a greater level of understanding and assurance.

The development of a Risk Management Strategy and Policy are outstanding.

It was noted that slippage of the timescale was not met originally due to their not being a Chief Officer in post until January 2020 and thereafter a period of time was required for the Chief Officer, Nick Fayers to become familiar with the process. The inability to meet the deadline of January 2023 has been due to work pressures and prioritisations and in light of the lack of individual capacity to support the operational aspect.

Stephanie Hume advised that the Committee need to be pragmatic given the some of the recommendations were from 2019 and if a risk was graded at 2 or 3, are they still the same relevance today. The issue would be the need to focus on the risk management strategy and policy ensuring the foundation is strong. Grade 1's need to be given the priority. It was noted that there is a need to think about the appropriate timescale appointed given the issues noted around capacity in supporting delivery.

The Chair reflected on the discussion and advised that the timescales noted should be held to account unless there is evidence to support the expended timescale, however once extensions have been agreed, where appropriate, there will be no further extensions provided.

Michelle McPhail advised that the timescale in relation to T1 denotes that there will be the revised Risk Register template available by June 2023, however the production and presentation of a Risk Management Strategy would be September 2023. This will provide some time for the Chief Officer to discuss the strategy with both Chief Executive's to ensure they are content.

Gillian Woolman reflected on her views noted at the meeting on 08 February, which was for the committee to obtain the right sense of proportionality. She welcomed the Corporate Risk Register which will assist in managing the business of the IJB and matching the required resources to address them. In relation to the Risk Management Strategy and Policy, she advised that they are more generic in nature and she would share with the Chief Officer other examples of good practice.



Gillian Woolman explained that it was good to have a working risk register, however there is a need to expedite the work to obtain the strategy and policy to underpin the work which is being taken forward.

The Chair supported the actions noted by Gillian Woolman.

The Committee approved to expend the completion of the recommendation to September 2023.

Action / Agreement:

- **Timescale agreed extended to September 2023**
- **Audit Scotland to support the Chief Officer in establishing a generic strategy & policy.**

***T2 19/20 – Risk Management** Grade 2 ~ Risk register to be reviewed to include the absence of key staff and other similar scenarios as well as updating responsible officers where appropriate.*

Michelle McPhail advised that the management response update to that recommendation is not appropriate and the background relates to raising the risk to the IJB in light of the then Chief Officer leaving and the significant amount of time before the new person started. This was added to the register and following the appointment of Nick Fayers, it was removed. However there was cognisance of the risk to the IJB if other important positions became vacant and the knock-on-effect this may have to the delivery of services. It was suggested given the response that the recommendation should be removed.

The Chair sought agreement from Stephanie Hume.

Stephanie Hume considered the update and was content being advised that the risk register then held the vacancy as a risk and then removed, she was content to note the recommendation as complete.

Michelle McPhail advised that she could provide as evidence copies of the IJB risk register where the risk is noted and then when the risk was removed. Ms. Hume agreed.

Action / Agreement:

- **Remove the recommendation from the tracker**
- **Michelle McPhail to present evidence to Stephanie Hume.**



T3 19/20 – Risk Management Grade 2 ~ Unified risk register to be implemented showing all risks across both parent bodies.

Gillian Woolman raised that the recommendation was around having a unified risk register, seeking clarification.

Michelle McPhail recalled the discussion by the then internal auditor, Paul MacAskill, who expressed benefits in having the parent body risks, which are relevant to the IJB, included on its risk register.

At the time it was noted that this was not appropriate given that the risk is with the parent body. However as the Chief Officer sits on the Integrated Corporate Management Team, (ICMT), he is aware of the potential or accepted parent body risks relating to the delivery of any directions set by the IJB and therefore has the professional knowledge to consider if it is a corporate risk for the IJB.

Debbie Bozkurt reflected on the audits undertaken by Stephanie Hume and her team for the NHS, and they have noted that the lack of administration support can impact on the ability to deliver actions or improve controls. It was noted that Nick Fayers has no admin support to help him in delivering his objectives.

Nick Fayers commented he did not support having a unified risk register and this would cause duplication.

Stephanie Hume agreed that it was not necessary to have a unified register. It is for the Committee to support and review new risks.

Gillian Woolman advised that the closing comment on T3 should read that the IJB Strategic Risk Register takes cognisance of the risks held by the parent bodies. Consequently the recommendation is now null and void.

Action / Agreement:

- **Remove the recommendation from the tracker.**



T4 19/20 – Risk Management Grade 2 ~ *An updated workforce strategy along with closer joined up working will be required to consider and plan to mitigate the current and medium-term staffing matters affecting both parent bodies in the provision of services to the IJB*

The Chief Officer noted that the parent bodies have their respective workforce strategy or plan. The NHS is complete however the Comhairle is still working on their strategy.

The IJB has no direct employees other than the Chief Officer, and therefore the IJB Workforce Plan or Strategy will assess the risks across the parent bodies and pull the challenges and objectives into one paper. However currently there is a lack of H.R Directors within each parent body to support the delivery of a joint plan.

Gillian Woolman considered the update and was empathetic to the update provided however no IJB and no health and social care partnership is an island. It was suggested that the Board Integrated Strategic Plan and the IJB members knows the extent of the challenges in their respective workforce plans. As a result of the challenges in the parent bodies will directly prevent fulfilment of the ambitions noted in your Strategic Integration Plan. Therefore pulling an overarching plan advising and taking cognisance of the two perspective plans and how in sync they are with the IJB ambitions and plan and having that noted might raise a risk for the register or not following due consideration. It was noted that if a risk was raised then both parent bodies need to be approached to deliver the mitigations required to remove the risk from the IJB register.

Nick Fayers noted that delivery, noting the position within the parent bodies, would not make the March 2023 but June 2023.

Action / Agreement:

- **Agreed to have an overarching report to advise on the challenges and actions within the parent bodies workforce plans.**
- **Agreed to extend the timescale to June 2023**
- **Linked to recommendation T10**



T5 19/20 – Risk Management Grade 2 ~ Implementation of integrated strategic risk management group.

Nick Fayers advised that there has not been an integrated risk management group, and given the information of the working of the ICMT he would not support the establishment of such a group.

Gillian Woolman made the distinction between governance and practitioners' risks should be considered amongst the executive team in relation to risk management and then it is the function of the Audit Committee to be assured that the group is operating satisfactorily and not replacing the role of the senior officers.

The Chair noted that the governance and obtaining assurance of process will be via the Audit & Risk Committee and the officer aspect is via the ICMT.

Michelle McPhail advised that the ICMT discuss operational issues where both the Chief Officer and Chief Finance Officer sit, however there is no other group where strategic risks are discussed. Therefore it is the role of the Chief Officer to evaluate the information provided to him to ascertain if there is any relevant strategic risks which is then presented for additional scrutiny via the Audit Committee which in turn would provide assurance to the full Board.

Mrs. Woolman agreed with the concept and response noted.

Action / Agreement:

- **Agreed to remove the recommendation from the tracker.**

T6 19/20 – Risk Management Grade 2 ~ The Chief Officer should consider the signed statement of assurance on receipt & consider any significant matters along with other regulatory reports and audit reports in order to inform the disclosures in the Corporate Governance Statement.

Gillian Woolman noted that she thinks the Board is placing assurance on the internal and external audit whereas the internal process needs to provide assurance to the external auditors via your governance statement that processes are in place. The Auditor General is completely independent from that of the Scottish Government.

Stephanie Hume advised that this is the process of the Board obtaining assurance from the two parent bodies that they are undertaking their processes appropriately.



Gillian Woolman noted her meeting next week with Nick Fayers and she would take this aspect forward. It was also noted, in relation to the appropriate management response, that the Board should be seeking to obtain assurance from the two parent organisation's via their assurance statement, so where the annual reports are signed-off by the Accountable Officers within the NHS and Local Authority.

Action / Agreement:

- **A discussion on assurance to be had between Nick Fayers and Gillian Woolman**
- **Management Statement to be amended to “ the Board should be seeking to obtain assurance from the two parent organisation's via their assurance statement, so where the annual reports are signed-off by the Accountable Officers within the NHS and Local Authority”**

T7 19/20 – Financial Planning, Management and Savings Grade 3 ~ *Strategic plan / refresh to be reviewed as required and current plan to be made available online.*

Nick Fayers noted that he held a development session with Board members on strategy development. He is working with Scottish Government colleagues, Eleanor MacCallum who is a policy adviser to assist in the production of a Strategic Plan, in draft, and the week of the 6th of March is booked out to complete this piece of work. This will then be shared with the Board in March 2023.

Nick Fayers indicated that the Plan will take cognisance of the population and staffing concerns as highlighted by Debbie Bozkurt, however it may not have the granular detail in relation to population health as the forensic analysis is still to be completed.

Action / Agreement:

- **Retaining the March 2023 deadline.**
- **Linked in part to T12**
- **Agreed to merge the recommendation together but noted the need to retain, which ever grading was higher as the principle grade for the merged action.**



T8 19/20 – Financial Planning, Management and Savings Grade 3 ~ *Spending plans, annual accounts and annual reports to be published on the IJB website.*

Michelle McPhail advised that the recommendation relating to the website, is noted across 3 audits, referring T8, T11 & T17. It is the intention to take all of these under one development and therefore the request to provide more time to complete the 3 recommendations.

Action / Agreement:

- **Approved to extend the timescale to September 2023.**
- **Linked to T11 & T17**
- **Agreed to merge the recommendation together but noted the need to retain, which ever grading was higher as the principle grade for the merged action.**

T9 19/20 – Financial Planning, Management and Savings Grade 3 ~ *Communication / Engagement Strategy to be updated.*

The noted that to achieve the recommendation is linked to the guidance on Planning with People to be completed by the Scottish Government. Initial indication is that the Scottish Government are looking at the autumn of 2023 to circulate the new guidance and thereafter implementation with the IJB.

Action / Agreement:

- **Approved to extend the timescale to November 2023.**



T10 20/21 – Workforce Planning and Organisational Development Grade 1 – *An integrated workforce plan is implemented with progress on action points communicated regularly to the Board.*

The response is linked to T4, and therefore the Committee has already agreed a new timescale of June 2023.

Action / Agreement:

- **Approved to extend the timescale to June 2023.**
- **Linked to T4**
- **Agreed to merge the recommendation together but noted the need to retain, which ever grading was higher as the principle grade for the merged action.**

T11 20/21 – Workforce Planning and Organisational Development Grade 3 ~ *Strategic documentation published on the website to be updated with the latest versions.*

It was noted that the response is linked to T8 as well as T17. It was agreed to merge the 3 recommendations into one, and retain the grade of which ever single recommendation had the higher grade as the new principle grade.

Action / Agreement:

- **Approved to extend the timescale to September 2023.**
- **Linked to T8 & T17**



T12 19/20 – Workforce Planning and Organisational Development Grade 2 ~
Strategic plan and integration scheme to be reviewed.

It was noted that this is linked to the previous discussion at T7 on the development of a Strategic Plan with a timescale of March 2023.

Nick Fayers noted that for the review of the Integration Scheme he is in discussion with Tim Langley, Legal colleagues within the Comhairle and he is taking forward 3 areas of recommended change to the existing Integration Scheme.

Action / Agreement:

- **Approved to retain the Strategic Plan as March 2023 timescale.**
- **The review of the Integration Scheme noted as March 2023.**
- **Linked in part to T7 – Strategic Plan and Linked to T18/T19 & T20 for the Integration Scheme review**

T13 21/22 – Consultation, Participation and Engagement Grade 3 ~ *the review of the Participation and Engagement Strategy takes cognisance of the updated guide on the National Standards for Community Engagement and associated review form.*

The Committee noted that this is linked to T9 and agreed to merge the appropriate recommendations together and retain as the principle grade the higher grade from the individual recommendation.

Action / Agreement:

- **Linked to T9 & T14, with a November 2023 timescale.**
- **Agreed to merge the appropriate recommendations retaining the higher grade as the new principle grade.**



T14 21/22 – Consultation, Participation and Engagement Grade 3 ~ *The outcomes of consultation and engagement exercises undertaken should be clearly communicated on the website along with a link to the relevant partner body website where relevant.*

Action / Agreement:

- **Linked to T9 & T13, with a November 2023 timescale.**
- **Agreed to merge the appropriate recommendations retaining the higher grade as the new principle grade.**

T15 19/20 – Business Continuity Planning and Disaster Recovery Grade 2 ~ *Implementation of Business Continuity policy statement along with formal annual assurance being sought from partner organisations that Business Impact Assessments have been carried out and appropriate Business Continuity arrangements are in place.*

Nick Fayers advised that he is meeting with both parent body Chief Executive's next week and will be flagging up the requirement to obtain assurance of their business continuity planning.

The Chair asked where Civil Contingencies sits around business continuity. Nick Fayers advised that it does.

Michelle McPhail asked Stephanie Hume as the recommendation notes a policy statement, would this be a form of words which is added to the annual assurance statement or is there a need for a more in-depth document.

Stephanie Hume advised that given this was a recommendation from the previous auditors, unsure of their specific thoughts around this. However there would be a need to obtain an assurance statement from the parent bodies that business continuity is in place and obtaining from the parent bodies copies of the business impact assessments as to how their continuity plans have been tested.

Nick Fayers noted that recently a "table-top" exercise was undertaken with multiple agencies to test the processes around a particular scenario.



Action / Agreement:

- Agreed to retain the existing timescale March 2023.
- Linked to T16
- Agreed to merge the appropriate recommendations retaining the higher grade as the new principle grade.

T16 19/20 – Business Continuity Planning and Disaster Recovery Grade 2 ~
Formal annual assurance should be given by each partner organisation confirming whether the necessary IT systems and controls have been tested and are operating effectively and whether adequate budgetary provision has been made to enable this to take place.

Michelle McPhail recalled the historical discussion which was around the IT systems and the retrieval of the back-up data. NHS holds a copy of its data on the Comhairle server and the Comhairle holds a back-up on the NHS server and it was the testing of both organisations ability to retrieve the data and be able to reconnect it fully. As Mr. Fayers noted he is in discussion with Carol MacDonald, Information Governance Manager, to obtain assurances.

Action / Agreement:

- Extend timescale to March 2023.
- Linked to T15 on business continuity
- Agreed to merge the appropriate recommendations retaining the higher grade as the new principle grade.



T17 – Information Governance and Data Sharing Grade 3 ~ *Publication scheme to be reviewed and updated with consideration given to publishing the updated scheme on the website.*

It was noted that the response is linked to T8 as well as T11. It was agreed to merge the 3 recommendations into one, and retain the grade of which ever single recommendation had the higher grade as the new principle grade.

Action / Agreement:

- **Approved to extend the timescale to September 2023.**
- **Linked to T8 & T11**
- **Agreed to merge the appropriate recommendations retaining the higher grade as the new principle grade.**

T18 21/22 Scheme Review Grade 1~ *Consideration is given to whether a full review of the integration scheme is still required as per the original requirement of the IJB.*

Action / Agreement:

- **The review of the Integration Scheme noted as March 2023.**
- **Linked to T12/T19 & T20 for the Integration Scheme review**
- **Agreed to merge the appropriate recommendations retaining the higher grade as the new principle grade.**



T19 21/22 Scheme Review Grade 2 ~ *An update should be provided to the IJB and Scottish Government regarding the status of the scheme review with any future amendments approved, as necessary.*

Action / Agreement:

- Approved to retain the Strategic Plan as March 2023 timescale.
- The review of the Integration Scheme noted as March 2023.
- Linked to T12/T18 & T20 for the Integration Scheme review
- Agreed to merge the appropriate recommendations retaining the higher grade as the new principle grade.

T20 21/22 Scheme Review Grade 3 ~ *Where any amendments are made to the current scheme, any successor scheme should be placed on the website.*

Action / Agreement:

- Approved to retain the Strategic Plan as March 2023 timescale.
- The review of the Integration Scheme noted as March 2023.
- Linked to T12/T18 & T19 for the Integration Scheme review.
- Agreed to merge the appropriate recommendations retaining the higher grade as the new principle grade.
- Linked to T8 / T11 & T17 on the review of the website
- Agreed to merge the appropriate recommendations retaining the higher grade as the new principle grade.



T21 21/22 Scheme Review Grade 3 ~ *Financial Regulations to be reviewed and submitted to the Board for approval with annual reviews implemented thereafter.*

It was noted from the management response that the revised financial regulations were presented to the Board in June 2022.

Action / Agreement:

- **Approved to remove as complete.**

The Chair expressed her thanks to colleagues for going through each recommendation in detail, however she thought that this has enabled everyone to obtain a greater level of understanding of the recommendations

4.2 External Audit Recommendation Tracker – Jan'23

Gillian Woolman, reflecting on the detailed discussion of the Internal Audit Recommendations, there are 3 External Audit Recommendations which are slightly different and those are:

- T4 – 3-year Strategic Plan
- T6 – funding gap and the need for transformational plan
- T9 – annual best value assessment.

Gillian Woolman asked if she could handover to Martin Devenny as she had to leave the meeting.

T4 ~ Nick Fayers indicated that this is in relation to the production of the Strategic Plan as discussed during the review of the Internal Audit Recommendations.

T6 ~ Debbie Bozkurt noted that she does not think that the IJB can undertake a major redesign of services due to the lack of available workforce and the lack of available funding.

Ms. Bozkurt advised that throughout Scotland all IJBs are in the same or a worse position due to being underfunded. To undertake a major redesign review will take additional resources over and above those required to deliver the existing service. The recommendation is aspirational however the reality will be presented to the full IJB this morning in relation to the stark position of the IJB budget planning and the £7m gap contained within. Highlighting the funding shortage and funding pressures noting Comhairle flat cash for the next 6 years, 7% pay rise with only half of the money being made available centrally which produces in 2 years, a £1.5m gap just on social care pay.



To enable a review of services, the main driver is to identify what level of staffing we can secure to make the necessary changes, not all changes will be a reduction in staffing. However providing a service in a different way may require additional staffing which would be an increase in cost, but saving may be achieved because the patient may not be required to be in an acute setting.

Nick Fayers and Debbie Bozkurt asked that T6 is removed as not achievable / not accepted.

Jocelyn McConnachie recognised the issue being raised and the request to remove, however is there a need for the Board to discuss and recognise the contentious issue.

Debbie Bozkurt noted that all the audit recommendations have come from the Annual Accounts Report completed by Audit Scotland. So there has been detailed discussion by the full IJB and not just the Audit Committee. Ms. Bozkurt advised that the pressures will be discussed in detail later today when presenting the draft budget to the full Board e.g. flat cash, no resources to meet the pay awards

Ms. Bozkurt referred to T5 in relation to workforce, which she noted as not accepted, which states that the IJB will do something about the workforce is the plan is implemented. It wasn't accepted because there isn't the population of the workforce available on the island to make the changes required. As a single entity this is not something any one organisation can address it requires all public and private bodies to come together to address.

Nick Fayers, referring to T6, indicated that the development of Goathill or Mental Redesign will not close the funding gap and therefore not achievable.

The Chair asked Martin Devenny for his views on T6 discussion and the proposal to remove the recommendation as "not accepted" following the detailed discussion.

Martin Devenny, without the knowledge of the previous audit teams points, this is about having the workforce plan in place but recognising the current pressures being experienced due to the lack of available workforce and the associated pressures and the development of medium to longer term financial plan.

Debbie Bozkurt explained that a 3-year plan is always produced for the IJB as well as NHS and the draft plan will be discussed shortly with the full IJB and then further in March when the final draft is presented.



T9 – Michelle McPhail explained that following the Accounts Commission letter dated 10.08.22 from William Moyes noting that IJBs were no longer required to produce a best value self-assessment and that other processes will be implemented, however we are still waiting on confirmation as to what the new process looks like. This was discussed earlier in the week with Asif Haseeb and Martin Devenny.

Martin Devenny advised that he would discuss this with Gillian Woolman, out with the meeting to obtain her views and apply a direction as to the way forward.

Michelle McPhail advised that this recommendation should be obtained until there is clarity and the opportunity to discuss it at the next Audit Committee when Mrs. Woolman is available.

Committee members agreed to this.

Michelle McPhail, asked members for clarification in relation to all the recommendations on the tracker. Therefore it was agreed to:

T1 21/22 ~ Integration Scheme ~ The IJB's Scheme of Integration was approved in 2015 and was scheduled to be reviewed every five years. This has been delayed due to the Covid pandemic and a 'light touch' review was instead undertaken. The Scottish Government has written to IJB's advising that a full review of the Scheme of Integration should be undertaken at pace notwithstanding the NCS consultation.

Risk – the current Scheme of Integration may no longer accurately reflect services to be delivered by the IJB and key governance arrangements of the scheme. The IJB should complete a full review of the Scheme of Integration.

NOTED: This is on the Internal Audit Tracker with a timescale delivery of March 2023

T2 19/20 – Risk Management ~ Risk register to be reviewed to include absence of key staff and other similar scenarios as well as updating responsible officers where appropriate.

NOTED: This was discussed during the review of the Internal Audit Tracker and that this has been completed and subsequently removed from the tracker. COMPLETE



T3 20/21 Medium Term Financial Planning ~ The IJB should prepare a revised medium-term financial plan to consider the financial impact of the COVID-19 global pandemic.

NOTED: Debbie Bozkurt advised that this should be noted as complete as she produces a 3-year financial plan in line with Scottish Government request. The aspiration of a 5-year plan is not in line with Scottish Government. COMPLETE

T4 20/21 Strategic Planning ~ A three-year strategic plan should be published to bring together the Board's financial plans, workforce plans, and service redesign priorities.

NOTED: Discussed during the presentation of the Internal Audit Tracker and noted with a delivery date of March 2023.

T5 20/21 Workforce Challenges ~ Publication of an integrated workforce plan should be a priority for the IJB to address acute workforce challenges.

NOTED: Discussed during the review of the Internal Audit Tracker and noted a delivery date of June 2023. An overarching paper based on both parent body's strategic workforce plans will be established. UPDATE

T6 19/20 Unidentified Savings ~ In order to bridge the funding gap and achieve the required level of efficiency savings, the IJB should develop a transformational plan for the redesign of services. This should be developed alongside the medium-term financial plan and be consistent with the Health Board's Transformational Plan.

NOTE: From the discussion Debbie Bozkurt will update the management response to advise on the draft budget position for the next 3-years as presented to the IJB in February and then the final budget plan being presented in March. UPDATE

T7 22/23 Transparency ~ Further progress is required to publish committee papers and minutes and to make key documents available on the IJB website

NOTED: From the discussion on Internal Audit Tracker the website review will be completed by September 2023. UPDATE



T8 22/23 Risk Management ~ A refreshed Risk Management Strategy and Policy should be approved to ensure that the Board’s arrangements effectively manage risks to achieving its objectives. This should include unifying the risk register and forming a strategic risk management group.

NOTED: The Internal Audit Tracker was updated with a timescale delivery of September 2023. UPDATE.

T9 22/23 Best Value Self-Assessment ~ An annual Best Value self-assessment should be undertaken and approved by the IJB Audit committee.

NOTED: Will discuss at the next Audit Committee, March’23, and obtain the views of Gillian Woolman. UPDATE

5. EVALUATION

	YES	NO	COMMENTS
Were you satisfied that the agenda items presented covered the current significant areas?	✓		
Was there sufficient time to review the papers between receipt and the meeting date?	✓		
Was there sufficient time allocated to all agenda items?	✓		
Were the Executive Summaries an accurate reflection of the detailed paper?	✓		
Were you able to reach a satisfactory conclusion from the information presented on each item?	✓		
Were you able to contribute to the discussions and have your views considered?	✓		
Did you consider that the Board discharged its duty in respect of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proper scrutiny • Relevant questioning • Constructive challenging 	✓ ✓ ✓		



The Chair thanked everyone for the scrutiny and input into the discussion, specifically thanking internal and external auditors for their expertise.

6. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Location: Microsoft Teams
Time: 10.00am
Dates:

Meeting Date	Submission of Papers
08.02.23	27.01.23
15.03.23	02.03.23
14.06.23	01.06.23
13.09.23	31.08.23
15.11.23	02.11.23

The Chair thanked everyone for their contribution to the discussions and the pertinent scrutiny of reports in a very constructive manner. The Chair brought the meeting to a close at 11:00am.

END