

Minutes of Meeting:

Title of Meeting	Civil Nuclear Police Authority Board Meeting	Date(s) Meeting Held & Venue	25 November 2020 Skype teleconference
Meeting Called By	Vic Emery, Chair	Start Time	10.00 hrs
Reference Meeting No.	CNPA_20201125	End Time	13.13 hrs

MEMBERS:

Vic Emery	Chair, CNPA	
Mike Calloway	Industry Representative Member, NDA	
Sir Craig Mackey	Independent Member	
Mark Neate	Industry Representative Member, Sellafield	
Neelam Sarkaria	Independent Member	
Sue Scane	Independent Member	
Rebecca Weston	Industry Representative Member, DRSL	

In ATTENDANCE:

Jerry Haller	Industry Member, EDF (Designate)	-
CC Simon Chesterman	Chief Constable/Chief Executive	
ACC Louise Harrison	ACC / Operations Director	
Richard Cawdron	Director of Governance, Compliance and Legal Services	
Patsy Northern	Director of Corporate Services	
Richard Saunders	Director of People & Organisational Development	
	Head of Engagement and Comms	
	Head of Finance & Business Efficiency	
	Chief of Staff, Executive Office	
	Board & Committee Secretary	
	Board & Committee Manager	
	Security Manager	
	Definition & Benefits Manager	
	Strategy & Assurance Manager	

APOLOGIES from attendee(s):

DCC Chris Armit	DCC / Capability Director	
	Head of Governance & Assurance	

(A CNPA Members Only Session was not held on this occasion.)

1. WELCOME & CHAIR'S UPDATE

On the meeting agenda, it had been advised that unless there was an objection, the meeting would be recorded to assist with the writing of the meeting minutes and that the recording would be deleted once the minutes had been created. No objections to recording the meeting were raised.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting including [REDACTED] the Industry Representative Member for EDF (Designate), who was attending as an observer.

1.2 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were as detailed above.

1.3 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest were declared.

2. 2.1 UPDATE OF EVENTS SINCE THE LAST MEETING ()

Document Reference: Not applicable.

[REDACTED]

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**3.1 & 3.2 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30 SEPTEMBER 2020 ()**

Document Reference: Draft Minutes 30 September 2020 and [REDACTED]

The Chair asked Members if they were content that the draft minutes of the CNPA Board Meeting held on 30 September 2020 [REDACTED] represented accurate records of the meetings.

No comments or amendments were put forward.

DECISION:

The draft minutes of the CNPA Board Meeting held on 30 September 2020 and the [REDACTED] were APPROVED as accurate records of these meetings.

4. REVIEW OF CNPA ROLLING ACTION LOG ()

Document Reference: Action Log

The Chair observed that most of the Action Log matters arising were on the agenda that day and he asked [REDACTED] if he or the other members of the Executive Team wished to raise any particular points at this juncture.

No points were raised by the Executive and no comments or questions were put forward by Members.

DECISION:

- (i) Members APPROVED the closure of the actions that had been logged in the CNPA Rolling Action Log as 'Proposed Complete'.
- (ii) Members NOTED the written commentaries regarding the 'ongoing' actions.

5. CHIEF CONSTABLE/CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT ()

Document Reference: PAB(20)R87

This report was submitted to update CNPA Board members on the headlines of routine and new business at an "Official" level from 19 September 2020 to 16 November 2020.

[REDACTED]

[illegible]

██████████ further outlined his report and highlighted that the CNPA Board Meeting agenda included an item on Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) Inspection of CNC 2020. The Inspection had taken place in October 2020, although the Constabulary did not expect to see the report itself until it was asked for a factual accuracy check in mid-2021. The Chair asked why it would take the HMICFRS so long to issue the report. ██████████ responded that in undertaking inspections, the HMICFRS conducted extensive validation work. The organisation that taken circa 1,000 documents in connection with the inspection and it was very thorough in checking the factual accuracy of what it was told.

[illegible]

██████████ congratulated the Executive on the progress that had been made regarding the Strategic Ambition in the last 12 months. She also requested that formal congratulations to ██████████ ██████████ be minuted in respect of his award of an OBE, having delivered years of dedicated public service and an outstanding contribution to the Constabulary and nuclear security. The Chair concurred.

[REDACTED]

[illegible]

██████████ queried the reference in ██████████ report to meeting “*with EDF corporate security to discuss the CNC’s role in Op Talla (police service response to Covid)*” and whether this was just relevant to EDF. ██████████ clarified that Government was considering its response in the event of public disorder, particularly in relation to repeated Covid-19 lockdowns. ██████████

██████████ ██████████
██████████
██████████ The CNC had developed contingency plans that
had been shared with them, should the requirement materialise, but legislation was also an issue. ██████████
██████████ ██████████,
although the CNC was just a contingency at this stage.

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

██████████ recommended that the Constabulary should seek to remain BEIS' police force, as BEIS rightly saw the Constabulary as unique and special. ██████████

██████████ highlighted two items for further reflection later in the agenda, firstly, whether there might be procurement risks in connection with the recommendation of the Digital Services project team for the use of a structured tender process rather than an OJEU (Official Journal of the European Union) process. Secondly, ██████████

DECISION:
Members NOTED the Chief Constable/Chief Executive's Report.

6. ITEMS FOR DECISION

[illegible]

(b) (7)(C),
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[illegible]

[REDACTED]

FINANCE REPORT – 1ST DRAFT BUDGET 2021-22

Document Reference: PAB(20)R88b

This report was submitted to present the first draft of the potential budget for CNPA for the 2021-22 financial year, details of which had been presented to the ARFC for scrutiny on 23 November 2020. [REDACTED] outlined key issues, including the significant cost increases related to capital projects and the 2.5% nationally agreed pay award.

The paper requested Members to:

- I. Note the overall budget position for 21/22 and how this will be used to build the rest of the medium-term financial plan.
- II. Note the key reasons for increase/reduction in the proposed 21/22 budget (Section 3.4)
- III. Note the emerging issues section (3.7) that identifies the key issues to be aware of.
- IV. Approve this 1st draft for discussion with the SLCs in early January.

The Chair opened the item up for comments and questions.

policing model].

██████████ was pleased to note that the Constabulary was almost up to establishment, but she highlighted that it was an area that would need to be monitored as post-Covid, the recruitment situation might change. She also queried the possibility of income generation at the Griffin Park Tactical Training Centre. ██████████ advised that work was being undertaken with the Capability Team regarding future commercial opportunities, but none had been built into the first draft budget for 2021-22 as the current training plan was in the process of being stabilised.

██████████ and ██████████ commented that they had reviewed the report at the ARGC budget Scrutiny Panel Meeting on 23 November 2020 and were content to recommend it for approval for further discussion with the SLCs. ██████████ observed that the primary issues were the projects and funding that may/may not be received from BEIS.

The Chair extended his thanks to ██████████ and his Finance Team for all the work that they had undertaken in relation to the Financial Charging Principles and the first Draft Budget 2020-21.

No further questions or comments were raised.

DECISION:

- (i) Members NOTED the overall budget position for 2021-22 and how this would be used to build the rest of the medium-term financial plan;
- (ii) Members NOTED the key reasons for increases/reductions in the proposed 2021-2022 budget (Report PAB(20)R88b, Section 3.4)
- (iii) Members NOTED the emerging issues (Section 3.7), that identified the key issues to be aware of.
- (iv) Members APPROVED the first draft Budget 2021-22 for discussion with the SLCs in early January 2021.

6.2 SIRO's (SENIOR INFORMATION RISK OWNER's) REPORT to CNPA Board

██████████) Document Reference: PAB(20)R89

This paper was submitted to provide the CNPA Board with an overview of the CNC's compliance journey with regard to Information Governance (IG) and Security, including Cyber Security, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018. The intention was to inform the CNPA Board of progress made, the extent of the work outstanding, including the development and embedding of an effective Information Governance Framework and Information Security Management System, and other information risk issues.

The paper requested Members to:

- 2.1 Note progress regarding the remedial work being undertaken by the project team, and
- 2.2 Note the current challenges facing the delivery of the information governance agenda, and risks for compliance.
- 2.3 APPROVE the Cyber Security Strategy.

The Chair opened that the Cyber Security Strategy (presented as part of the report), required further work. [REDACTED] advised that the SIRO report was an update and explained the Cyber Security Strategy had been developed for the short-term capture of the current cyber security approach / journey, with more focus on a longer-term strategy during 2021, when the Constabulary's IT landscape was scheduled to be clearer. The Chair advised that he was content with the direction of travel of the Cyber Security Strategy, although he considered that as a strategy, it required further work. [REDACTED] suggested that the Cyber Security Strategy be re-submitted to the January 2021 CNPA Board Meeting with a gap analysis against the Centre for Internet Security (CIS) 20 critical controls, a review against the risk profile and a delivery plan for addressing any gaps.

The Chair opened the item up for comments and questions.

[REDACTED] indicated that it was helpful to see the cyber security work that had been carried out to date in one document and whilst it was recognised as a "living" document, a delivery plan with timescales would be welcome.

[REDACTED] supported the direction of travel regarding the Cyber Security Strategy and a sharing and learning approach going forward.

[REDACTED] highlighted the necessity of clear strategic delivery plan and clear strategic outcomes. He also asked whether the Cyber Security Strategy related to solely what the Constabulary would do, or whether the Constabulary was taking a strategic lead on behalf of the whole industry in ensuring that there was a robust cyber security strategy and approach. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] responded that clarity was required in the Constabulary's Cyber Security Strategy as to how it dovetailed into SLC's Cyber Security Strategies and the overall nuclear industry's Strategy.

Whilst taking onboard both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] points, [REDACTED] commented that dialogue was ongoing with the NDA and wider nuclear industry, as to how the Constabulary could support the individual cyber strategies. [REDACTED] agreed with [REDACTED], but advised that there was more that the Constabulary could do from a supporting perspective. [REDACTED] confirmed that there had been meetings between the Constabulary, the NDA and the National Cyber Security Centre (NCSC) regarding threat intelligence. He advised that the Constabulary was not seeking to dictate strategies, but in view of the intelligence it received, the Constabulary was looking into joining up cyber intelligence, physical security and vetting security i.e. a holistic support approach. This work was very much in its infancy. [REDACTED] had been leading on this and considerable work and negotiation was ongoing to fully understand requirements and whether the Constabulary was in a position to be able to assist. [REDACTED] advised in his opinion, the Constabulary was the main focus of the Cyber Security Strategy, although he acknowledged that there was "a nod" towards supporting the wider industry.

[REDACTED] asked how the intelligence could be provided if there was not an understanding of the threat – not from a cyber perspective, but in terms of consequence. He advised that he was nervous of the Constabulary venturing into this arena. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] advised that that was why discussions were on-going, as it had been recognised that whilst there might be a threat, there was also the need to understand how that threat applied to each industry. The Constabulary was therefore trying to understand if there was a requirement and if so, what that requirement was. [REDACTED] confirmed that he completely agreed with [REDACTED] observation and that as an organisation, he did not think that there was any intention by the Constabulary to be "the answer"; the NCSC was "the answer", as it was the cyber lead for the UK. Through the Constabulary's intelligence processes however, the Constabulary could obtain a higher level of information than was standard. [REDACTED] reiterated the need for clarity in the Constabulary's Cyber Security Strategy, as to what it was looking to achieve/deliver.

ACTION PAB251120-02: [REDACTED] to ensure that the Constabulary's Cyber Security Strategy clearly sets out how it dovetails into the cyber security strategies of the SLCs and

overall nuclear industry, whilst also clarifying what the Constabulary sought to achieve/deliver, with timescales. Paper to be re-submitted to January CNPA Meeting.

██████████ observed that the Constabulary's Cyber Security Strategy probably required re-drafting to reflect a level of integration, but not an aspiration to lead in this area. She also highlighted that there were November 2020 dates in the Strategy timeline and queried when these items would be delivered.

██████████ responded that the Cyber Security Strategy would be re-submitted to the CNPA in January 2021, when it should be clearer as to where the Constabulary stood, the direction of travel and the steps that needed to be undertaken.

██████████ indicated that the Constabulary's Cyber Security Strategy represented a good statement of the current position, but as had been previously mentioned, clarity was required on what the Constabulary sought to achieve together with a delivery plan.

The Chair summarised that the Constabulary's Cyber Security Strategy would not be approved at this stage.

██████████ highlighted that he was sympathetic in terms of what the Constabulary sought to achieve, in enabling the business and also in producing the Strategic Cyber Strategy. In case it was helpful, he queried whether a Strategy was required, or whether a Plan would suffice. ██████████ advised that he was conscious that the CNPA had not signed-off an approach/strategy/plan regarding the way in which the Constabulary was dealing with cyber security. The Cyber Security Strategy had therefore been formulated as a mechanism to bring the direction of travel before the Authority. ██████████

██████████ nevertheless took ██████████ point and indicated that the situation could be reflected on.

No further comments or questions were put forward.

DECISION:

In connection with the content and recommendations made in the National Computing Centre (NCC) report and the review of internal auditors RSM (which had previously been reported to CNPA Board Members):

- (i) Members NOTED progress regarding the remedial work being undertaken by the project team.
- (ii) Members NOTED the current challenges facing the delivery of the information governance agenda, and risks for compliance.
- (iii) Members did not approve the strategy as presented but AGREED the direction of travel and that the Cyber Security Strategy and/or Delivery Plan should be submitted to the January 2021 CNPA Board Meeting.

6.3 PEOPLE STRATEGY 2020-23 ██████████)

Document Reference: PAB(20)R90

The draft report was submitted to provide the CNPA Board with an opportunity to review and approve the new People Strategy 2023 for publication.

██████████ outlined the consultative journey of the People Strategy 2020-23 and advised that it was presented for approval and subsequent progression into a final publishable format.

As the Chair of the People Committee, ██████████ further commented that so many projects were being managed in different parts of the business, with different strategies under ██████████' leadership and direction, that the People Committee had sought to capture the projects under the umbrella of the People Strategy 2020-23, and in order to maintain oversight of them. ██████████ acknowledged that the delivery timetable had been set out in broad terms and she suggested that dates should be included within People Strategy 2020-23 prior to publication. She also took this opportunity to thank ██████████ and his team for all their work in producing this document.

The Chair advised that he was very keen to ensure that sub-strategies consistently reflected the agreed CNPA 3-Year Strategy and that there were no conflicts. [REDACTED] confirmed that the need for full alignment had helped to shape the development of the People Strategy 2020-23, so that it would enable and underpin the CNPA 3-Year Strategy.

The Chair opened the item up for comments and questions.

██████████ commented that she hoped that there were sufficient resources to accommodate the high number of People Strategy 2020-23 deliverables. She also pointed out that the Strategy had two documents labelled as “Appendix 2”.

ACTION PAB251120-03:

i) Target Dates to be included in the People Strategy 2020-23 prior to publication and align with the delivery timetable that had been set out in broad terms.

ii) As the People Strategy 2020-23 had two documents labelled as “Appendix 2”, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to arrange for the correction of the Strategy appendix numbering and references thereto.

██████████ confirmed that he had had the opportunity to look at the People Strategy 2020-23 in considerable detail as a member of the People Committee. He also considered ██████████ comment regarding resources to be very “telling”. It was a very ambitious Strategy, that now needed to be progressed to the delivery stage.

██████████ further confirmed that alignment with the 3-Year Strategy had been stressed at the People Committee. As a general point regarding all sub-strategies, he suggested that the CNPA should look for sub-strategy consistency of structure and approach with the 3-Year Strategy, to facilitate delivery tracking. The Chair observed that a document depicting strategy linkage might be of assistance and ██████████ concurred.

ACTION PAB251120-04: As Chair of the proposed Change Board, [REDACTED] to arrange for the development of pictorial representation of the CNPA 3-Year Strategy and sub-strategy linkage.

██████████ had no comments above those already raised.

On a conceptual level, [REDACTED] observed that as personnel were central to the Constabulary, a “People” sub-strategy was necessitated. He welcomed reference in the People Strategy 2020-23 to goals detailed in the 3-Year Strategy as an indication of alignment. As far as sub-strategies were concerned, he favoured references to quarters rather than specific dates, but references to specific dates in delivery plans. He also asked if the means, capacity, finance, and people resources were in place to deliver the People Strategy 2020-23. [REDACTED] responded that attempts to answer that enquiry had been made in the Resourcing section of Strategy. Some of the People Strategy 2020-23 deliverables were directly linked to the CNPA 3-Year Strategy and would involve the presentation of business cases for the endorsement of requirements at the appropriate time. For example, the Police Staff Pay and Grading Review would be progressed through the Change Board and would be subject to a full business case, for submission to the CNPA Board. [REDACTED] also advised that a significant amount of the work would also be delivered via the workstreams in the People Directorate and across the organisation. [REDACTED] thanked [REDACTED] for his response and observed the necessity of initial expectation management. He additionally highlighted dependency on the success of strands being progressed that could cause some deviation.

No further comments or questions were put forward.

DECISION:

Members APPROVED the content of the People Strategy 2020-23 for development into a published version but noting Target Delivery Dates to be included in People Strategy 2020-23 prior to publication.

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

7.2 DRAFT CNPA FINANCIAL & CORPORATE SCHEME OF DELEGATION v 3.7

() Document Reference: PAB(20)R93

This paper was submitted to invite the CNPA to consider a revised Financial and Corporate Scheme of Delegation ('The Scheme'). The Scheme was presented in line with the BEIS/CNPA Framework and Managing Public Money. The Scheme also set out the arrangements within CNC, and between the CNPA and CNC, to enable these bodies to meet their respective obligations under the BEIS/CNPA Framework, and to facilitate a transparent decision-making process to support the overall governance structures in place.

introduced the report and highlighted that it had not yet been submitted to the ARFC for scrutiny, which he saw as the next step. The Chair confirmed that he would like ARFC scrutiny of the document to be undertaken, but he opened the Scheme up for comments and questions.

remarked that the report was helpful, clear and timely in relation to work across the organisation regarding governance, although the views of the ARFC would be welcome.

echoed views. He observed that it was a good and necessary piece of governance work, but he highlighted that Schemes of Delegation sometimes had unintended consequences, so oversight by the ARFC would be helpful.

commented that she had found the Scheme clear. advised likewise and observed that the amounts, levels and details appeared to track through the document. She had not noted anything that she was uncomfortable with and she was unsure what submission to the ARFC would add, other than scrutiny in further detail.

considered that the Scheme represented a very helpful management tool. He suggested that accountability details could be looked at by the ARFC, but that overall, it was a positive document.

concurred that the Scheme was a good piece of work and that he was supportive of the governance that was trying to be achieved, but he requested clarity as, for example, the Finance section appeared to indicate that both the Accounting Officer and also the CNPA Board had "*Unlimited within Budget*" financial limits regarding "*Projects and other activities outside day to day activities*". raised that there was also a similar issue in the Governance section of the Scheme in that it appeared to indicate that the Chief Constable/Chief Executive/Accounting Officer and the CNPA could approve the Annual Report and Accounts. confirmed that further work on the Scheme was required and clarity could be provided on this.

The Chair asked if the Scheme could be submitted to the ARFC and then the January 2021 CNPA Board meeting, but highlighted that the next ARFC meeting was due to be held in February 2021. suggested that perhaps the Scheme could be circulated to the Members of the ARFC out-of-committee for review. , as Chair of the ARFC, indicated that she would be content to progress the Scheme in this way, and that perhaps a short on-line discussion could be arranged if necessary.

No further comments or questions were put forward.

DECISION:

- (i) Members REVIEWED and DISCUSSED the draft CNPA Financial and Corporate Scheme of Delegation v3.7 (Report PAB(20)R93 Annex A).
- (ii) Members SUPPORTED the direction of travel and NOTED that the draft CNPA Financial and Corporate Scheme of Delegation v3.7 was still 'work in progress' and that it would be circulated to Members of the ARFC out-of-committee for review, updated and brought back to the January 2021 Board Meeting for Approval.

[There was then a 10-minute meeting break.]

8. STANDING ITEMS

On the assumption that everyone had read the CNPA Board papers, the Chair indicated that he wished to proceed directly to questions and comments on the standing items, without prior presentation.

8.1 CORPORATE PERFORMANCE

8.1.1 CORPORATE PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD (Executive)

Document Reference: PAB(20)R95

The Corporate Performance Dashboard reported on the CNC's consolidated performance against targets. The Chair observed that these targets related to previous objectives rather than objectives in connection with the 3-Year Strategy 2020-2023. He then opened the Corporate Performance Dashboard up for further comments and questions.

Members found the report clear.

[REDACTED]

No further questions or comments were raised.

DECISION:

Members NOTED the November 2020 Corporate Performance Dashboard and the progress of the Directorates against their key performance indicators.

8.1.2 PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD AND METRICS ([REDACTED])

Document Reference: PAB(20)R95a

This paper was submitted in response to CNPA Board action PAB280120-011 - Performance Framework and Dashboard Reporting. It provided an update on progress regarding improvements and sought comments from Members.

[REDACTED] introduced the paper and the Chair opened the item up for comments and questions.

[REDACTED] was of the view that the Balanced Scorecard Performance Dashboard was moving in the right direction and that it was very helpful to view details on one page. She also took this opportunity to highlight the number of capability projects and the need for monitoring to ensure that the Constabulary was able to meet its objectives. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] He highlighted that whilst the Dashboard graphs had been supplied to the CNPA for some time, the Constabulary was seeking to progress the "Balanced Scorecard" approach. Example Balance Scorecard Performance Dashboards had been provided, which demonstrated how the Constabulary sought to supply the CNPA with visibility of the strategic priorities / risks at a glance, together with the associated direction of travel.

[REDACTED] welcomed the Balanced Scorecard Performance Dashboard, but he queried the colouring mechanism under the "Strategic Risks", "Measure" and "Target" headings.

[REDACTED] advised that of the two styles of Balanced Scorecard provided, he preferred the first option i.e. the "view on a page". He advised that the CNPA would need to work through what it needed see and similarly, the Constabulary would need to work through what it needed to report, but overall, he considered that progress was being made in the right direction. [REDACTED] was similarly supportive.

██████████ welcomed the linkage between the priorities and risks, and she indicated that it was helpful to see this information on one page, together with the associated status details. She noted reference in the report to the use of Power BI and asked ██████████ if she wished to comment on this. ██████████ advised that a cross-directorate working group was in the process of looking to see where Power BI and the drawing together / interrogation of different data sets might add best value to the work of the Constabulary. ██████████ observed that a reduction in input time could allow more time to be spent in analysis and action, and ██████████ concurred.

██████████ asked whether she was correct in thinking that the colouring mechanism in the Balanced Scorecard mapped to the Strategic Goals (which in turn, mapped to the Scorecard Perspectives) and ██████████ confirmed that this was the case. ██████████ also confirmed that the view-on-a-page version of the Balanced Scorecard was her preferred option.

With reference to the Balanced Scorecard, the Chair advised of the need to ensure that the work of one Department did not prejudice another. He also highlighted the need to avoid encouraging thinking in Departmental “silos”, as the CNPA would look at deliverables against the 3-Year Strategy. [REDACTED] agreed with the Chair’s views and she re-affirmed that cross-directorate work was being undertaken.

No further comments or questions were put forward.

DECISION:

- (i) Members NOTED the Performance Dashboard and Metrics report (PAB(20)R95a).
- (ii) Members REVIEWED and COMMENTED on a suggested dashboard format using a Balanced Scorecard approach that reflected the strategic goals (Section 3.5 and Appendix A). The “view-on-a-page” version was the preferred format.

- IV.
-
- | Bar Index | Relative Length (approx. % of longest bar) |
|-----------|--|
| 1 | 100% |
| 2 | 75% |
| 3 | 90% |
| 4 | 100% |
| 5 | 95% |
| 6 | 15% |
| 7 | 98% |
| 8 | 98% |
| 9 | 99% |
| 10 | 85% |

[illegible]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[illegible]

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[illegible]

8.3 STRATEGIC RISK REPORT AS AT 31 OCTOBER 2020 ()

Document Reference: PAB(20)R97

This paper was submitted to present the CNPA's strategic risks as at 31 October 2020 with summarised information on the management of the strategic risks, focusing on areas that might require intervention or additional resources. The paper also included documents for formal adoption in the form of a new, refreshed set of strategic risks, risk framework and risk appetite statement following consideration by the ARFC and approval by the Chief's Management Group.

The Chair asked if there was anything in the report that she wished to highlight. advised that hopefully, the current Strategic Risk Report would be the final edition in this format. She also advised that the refreshed set of strategic risks, risk framework and risk appetite statement were for CNPA approval.

The Chair opened the item up for comments and questions.

was of the opinion that the strategic risks and the strategic risk appetite had built on previous discussions.

was slightly surprised that the Strategic Risk Report as at 31 October 2020 had identified just three risks with limited assurance. confirmed that this was the case and that a phenomenal level of work was being undertaken by the Constabulary at different levels, in terms of ascertaining whether the risks were being managed effectively. She was comfortable that the Strategic Risk Report represented a realistic picture.

advised that she found the new risk documentation easier to interact with and thanked for progressing the risk review.

highlighted that the risk framework etc. had been discussed at ARFC level and that various actions had been raised. He asked if these actions had been fully reflected in the documents presented to the CNPA Board, for example, regarding the spread of health and safety across different risk appetite levels. responded in the affirmative, with the exception of the ARFC action [reference ARFC281020-09] regarding the spread of health and safety across different risk appetite levels, which was work in progress with the Health and Safety Team. This work would be reflected in a note to the risk appetite levels, that was proposed to be reported to the February 2021 ARFC meeting. confirmed that he was comfortable with the situation on this basis and that the risk appetite statement could be revisited particularly regarding health and safety, which he had felt presented potential for confusion. advised that she thought the ARFC had recognised that there were different health and safety risks for different circumstances. confirmed that this was the case, but that his query had been primarily regarding which risk appetite level should be applied to what health and safety risks and why.

No further comments or questions were put forward.

DECISION:

- (i) Members DISCUSSED and COMMENTED on the content of the first part of the Strategic Risk Report on the current strategic risks and as part of this:
 - NOTED the comments against three areas identified as having limited controls and WERE CONTENT with the approach on their management and completion (PAB(20)R97, section 3.3);
 - NOTED the new operational risk that had been added i.e. ORR 37 – Security of and access to Cyber keys (section 3.4);
 - Confirmed that they WERE CONTENT that there was sufficient evidence to show that strategic risks were being appropriately managed; and
 - NOTED that this would be the final time of reporting this set of risks.
- (ii) Members FORMALLY ADOPTED the following, with further information provided at section 3.5.1:
 - Strategic Risks –Appendix A;
 - Risk Management Framework - Appendix B; and
 - Risk Appetite Statement - Appendix C;
- (iii) Members NOTED the work on risk maturity that was underway within CNC, including the first self-assessment with a further assessment to be undertaken in September 2021 [section 3.5.2].

8.4 HEALTH, SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT REPORT

Document Reference: PAB(20)R98

The Health, Safety and Environment Report was submitted to illustrate how the Health, Safety and Environment Policy Statement of Intent objectives were being met.

outlined the report and the Chair opened the item up for comments and questions.

advised that there were a series of targets regarding sustainability, which SLCs were exempt from. He assumed that the Constabulary would be exempt from these as well, but there was nevertheless appetite within BEIS for the progression of work towards the targets, which would impact on carbon emissions, the use of vehicles etc. indicated that he would send information on the targets to and he highlighted that there would be a need for monitoring details going forward. thanked and confirmed that she and were due to meet on 27 November 2020 to look at sustainability, data metrics and the capture of details. requested that the information on the targets be sent to her as well, as sustainability and performance details were being finalised. The Chair queried whether the performance metrics alluded to would include the CNPA/CNC's carbon footprint. confirmed that this would be the case and advised that the metrics would also seek to take into account new information from BEIS.

indicated that the Health, Safety and Environment Report had been clear and that it was good to see the current level of performance and the approach to matters as they arose.

[REDACTED]

No further comments or questions were put forward.

DECISION:

Members NOTED the Health, Safety and Environment Report.

9. ITEMS FOR READING

9.1 PEOPLE COMMITTEE ()

9.1.1 CHAIR'S REPORT

Document Reference: PAB(20)R100

9.1.2 DRAFT MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 21 OCTOBER 2020

Document Reference: PAB(20)R101

The Chair asked () if there was anything that she particularly wished to bring to the attention of Members regarding her People Committee Chair's Report and the draft Minutes of the Meeting held on 21 October 2020. () advised that key point she wanted to make was that the People Strategy 2020-23 had been on the CNPA Board agenda that day.

No comments or questions were raised.

9.2 AUDIT, RISK AND FINANCE COMMITTEE (ARFC) ()

9.2.1 CHAIR'S REPORT OF MEETING HELD ON 28 OCTOBER 2020

Document Reference: PAB(20)R102

9.2.2 DRAFT MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 28 OCTOBER 2020

Document Reference: PAB(20)R103

9.2.3 ()

Document Reference: PAB(20)R104

The Chair asked () if there was anything that she wished to highlight in connection with her Chair's Report, the Draft Minutes of the ARFC meeting held on 28 October 2020 or the Lobbying Policy. () advised that there was nothing she wished to bring to Members' attention as the (), and Strategic Risks had already been discussed.

() confirmed that the () was a refresh of a previous policy that the CNPA Board should be aware of and approve.

No comments or questions were raised.

DECISION:

- (i) Members APPROVED the Lobbying Policy issue 2.1 (Report PAB(20)R104 / ARFC(20)R47a).

9.3 HMICFRS INSPECTION OF CNC 2020 ()

Document Reference: PAB(20)R105

The purpose of this report was to provide Board members with informal feedback following the inspection by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) of

the Constabulary in October 2020.

The Chair commented that the report (including the “How Effective is the CNC response to Deter, Defend, Deny, Recover? Self-Assessment 2020” for HMICFRS) was very good and he asked [REDACTED] if there were any matters that she wished to bring to the attention of the CNPA Board. [REDACTED] advised that whilst the self-assessment had highlighted areas that HMICFRS might wish to comment on further, these areas might not feature as subsequent HMICFRS recommendations. She additionally advised that it had been a very good inspection.

The Chair opened the item up for questions and comments.

The CNPA Members indicated that the HMICFRS Inspection of CNC 2020 paper represented a good report that was reassuring, well set-out, clear and helpful.

[REDACTED] suggested that the report could be used to support briefings etc. as a very useful summary document and the Chair concurred.

No further comments or questions were put forward.

DECISION:

- (i) Members NOTED the report on the HMICFRS Inspection of CNC 2020.

9.4 CNPA DECISION LOG

Document Reference: Decision Log

No comments or questions were raised regarding the CNPA Decision Log.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

10.1 JANUARY 2020 CNPA BOARD MEETING ARRANGEMENTS (Chair)

Document Reference: Not applicable

The Chair highlighted that the next CNPA Board Meeting was scheduled to be held in January 2021 *[on 27 January 2021, via Skype]*.

No comments or questions were raised.

10.2 CNPA BOARD SELF-ASSESSMENT (Chair)

Document Reference: Not applicable

The Chair asked Members if they felt that the papers had provided the required information and if they felt that they had been given sufficient opportunity for open discussion and comment.

[REDACTED] observed that there appeared to have been an improvement in the reports submitted to the CNPA Board. She found the Skype meetings (due to the Covid-19 circumstances) difficult as she preferred to be able to see colleagues, but she acknowledged that there was ample opportunity for Members to provide their views on the agenda items.

[REDACTED] considered that the CNPA Board meetings worked well, with good papers and focussed discussion.

[REDACTED] advised that he valued the verbal contribution of the Executive. He also suggested that consideration be given to avoid data overload against the backdrop of time constraints experienced by some Members. The Chair advised that efforts would be made to seek to address this issue *[under Board Effectiveness Action Plan (5) - Introduce front covers and executive summaries for papers that direct the reader to the purpose of the paper, key issues and required outcomes succinctly]*.

[REDACTED] echoed the previous views and [REDACTED] opined that the collective benefit of work on the 3-Year strategy was beginning to be seen, in that it added value to the CNPA Board discussions.

The Chair thanked everyone for attending the meeting. He shared the view that the CNPA Board meetings were easier face-to-face and he hoped that it would be possible to resume meetings on this basis in the not too distant future.

Meeting concluded at: 13.13 hrs.

Distribution: CNPA Board Members, CNC Executive
Meeting Dates: 02 December 2020 - CNPA Extraordinary Board Meeting (BPVs) via Skype 07 December 2020 - CNPA Extraordinary Board Meeting (MFSS) via Skype 27 January 2021 - CNPA Board Meeting via Skype