



**ethics, transparency
& audit panel**
Building public trust in policing and fire and rescue



Draft V01

Item 1

MINUTES OF THE ETHICS, TRANSPARENCY AND AUDIT PANEL (ETAP) FIRE & RESCUE MEETING

Date: 25 February 2025

Location: Fire HQ, Meeting Room 2

Present:

ETAP members	Officers
Bob Simpson (BS)	Glyn Luznyj – Deputy Chief Fire Officer (GL)
Craig Brown (CB)	David Greensmith - FARS Director of Finance (DG)
Chris Key (CK) CHAIR	Corrina Bradley - FARS Assistant Director of Finance (CBr)
Emma Christmas (EC)	Ralph Butler – Director of Performance & Engagement (RB)
Gurpreet Singh (GS)	Heather Lees – SCO Finance Director (HL)
Hifsa Haroon Iqbal (HI)	Kathryn Grattage - SCO Governance Manager (KG)
Jane King (JK)	
John Wheatley (JW)	External Officers in attendance
	Louise Davies – Associate Partner RSM Auditors (LD)
	Paul Grady - Azets Auditors (PG)
	Azola Dudula - Azets Auditors (AD)
SCO - Staffordshire Commissioner's Office	
Force - Staffordshire Police Force	
FARS - Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Services	

No members of the public were in attendance today.

Prior to the meeting today, ETAP members held their pre-meeting 10.00 - 10.30

1. Declaration of interests, apologies, minutes and actions.

Declarations of Interest: None

Apologies: Rob Barber FARS, Louise Clayton SCO, Chris Gill, Louisa Harrison and Byron Preece all ETAP. ETAP member Paul Atkins was not in attendance today and has resigned due to personal circumstances. CK acknowledged Paul's positive work with the panel and wished him all the best for the future.

Minutes & Actions of the meeting on the 5 December 2024

AGREED - That the minutes of the meeting held on the 5 December 2024, are confirmed as an accurate and true record.

From 27 September 2024

ACTION 1 – CBr to add a review of the Fire Gifts and Hospitality Register. Has been completed and is on the Finance Panel Agenda for the 20 March 2025. **Completed.**

From 5 December 2025

ACTION 1 – RB to update ETAP with ongoing situation re college of Fire – included in agenda for today. **Completed**

ACTION 2 – RB to update ETAP with progress in managing Grenfell Phase 2 Recommendations – included in agenda for today. **Completed**

ACTION 3 – CB to consider adding a review of Falls Response and Home from Hospital initiatives to ERP workplan. Will be discussed later in the agenda. **Ongoing**

ACTION 4 – CB to score Falls Response and Home from Hospital initiatives using the ERP Matrix and report back. Will be discussed later in the agenda. **Ongoing**

ACTION 5 & 6 – In response to the IT and Cyber Security Internal Audit Report, Head of IT is attending the Finance Panel Meeting on 20 March 2025. **Completed**

2. Questions from members of the public

No questions received for this meeting.

3. Verbal Update from Deputy Chief Fire Officer GL

A Fire Reform update will cover previous questions raised by ETAP in reference to a College of Fire.

There were a number of topics to consider the first being the ambiguity around the future role of the fire fighter. Local initiatives are progressing and Staffordshire are trying to amplify these at a national level. There is direct action for Government to take the lead on this, and it has been mentioned in every State of Fire report, it is understood that there is further need for discussion at a national level.

Another topic was around establishing a core Code of Ethics, Staffordshire implemented this a number of years ago, and it is well embedded across the organisation. There was also a push to give Chief Fire Officers independence, that has not yet progressed and currently waiting to see if the new government will push this agenda.

Regarding the creation of a College of Fire, the Home Office have confirmed they are still working towards this. Locally Staffordshire is working with the National Fire Chiefs Council to support how that would look and feel, and what that would mean, not able to provide any timings or more detail at this time.

There has been recent movement regarding Fire moving out of the Home Office and under MHCOG, the housing and local government forum, that Fire used to sit under. The announcement was made by the Prime Minister on 13 February 2025, as a direct response to the Grenfell Phase 2 report. There are advantages of going under a single secretary of state, aligned with housing, particularly with the work that Staffordshire have been doing around protection. There are certain elements of FARS which never left MHCOG, in particular around local forum work, government liaison work and resilience which has always sat within MHCOG. From an operational perspective probably won't see too many changes.

There were other quick updates around the fire safety reform, in particular around sprinklers and the need for care homes to have sprinkles installed.

On 24 February 2025, GL met with three representatives from Ukraine FARS. The object was to continue secure UK Fire support for FARS working in Ukraine. Hundreds of fire fighters have been killed or injured and fire stations have been destroyed during the conflict. Staffordshire remains supportive of a joint partnership between the Home Office, National Fire and Chiefs Council and Fire Aid, and have been able to donate fire equipment to the Ukraine.

CK – thanked GL for his update and there were no questions in relation to this presentation.

4. Internal Auditors –Presented by Louise Davies RSM

i. Internal Audit Strategy DRAFT 2025-26

This paper has been discussed with management, completed and now asking for views on the proposals, and will take any questions.

Q: BS – On page 10 and 11 the table across the years, there is colour coding but no definition of the colours.

A: LD – Confirmed that the colour coding is in relation to the assurance levels.

Action 1 – LD will update the table on page 10 and 11 with the colour coding and definitions.

Q: CK – There is a red on driver training from 2023-24 is there an update on this?

A: LD – Have recently been doing some follow-up on this and there will be an update at the next meeting.

HL – to the Chair, it could be useful when reviewing the Police Audit Strategy draft 2025-26 that there is consideration of the Internal Audits being seen as a harmonious group, across FARS and Force and contribute to a broader view of the two services on one subject.

BS – stated that was part of the original thinking with the Internal Audit covering both services, there are efficiencies and time savings.

CBR – confirmed that there are a number of audits where the scoping was done together, i.e. Financial control, the scoping is generally done together with Force. Capital Framework scoping was also done across both organisations at the same time.

HL – it was important that with the scoping that SCO were involved.

BS – Idea is Internal Audit can't do everything every year, due to resources and cost. Topics come out of the Risk Registers, would not expect all the reports to be green.

HL – However if an area has been consistently not green, then it may be worth reviewing this area more frequently. It is about the Risk Register but also changing times with Devolution.

LD – It is worth being aware that there are other sources available for assurance, and not just Internal Audit.

DG – A good example of a joint audit would be around Fleet Management Audit, and there is additional work being undertaken by CBR at the moment around the fleet management system and the finance system.

CBR – this will affect police and fire, both the fleet and finance system are across force and fire, so this will be done together.

Q: CK – has the scope improved over recent years for joint work between the organisations and is it a deliberate strategy that has been developed with RSM?

A: DG – Yes, have been working together more and it all fits together quite nicely.

ACTION 2: RSM to clarify to ETAP the progress towards greater consolidation of work plans between organisations to ensure RSM is seeking value for money from the internal audit work plan.

DG – One of the audits identified this year is around the Civil Contingencies Unit (CCU). Staffordshire CCU is well developed and is hosted by FARS, staff are employed by FARS and the employment risks sit with FARS. Wanted to pick this area up with Internal Audit to review how this is working and the potentially what the financial risk is.

Q: GS – When was the last time the Charter was reviewed and how often is it reviewed?

A: LD – The Charter is reviewed every year by the technical team.

GS – clarified that he had looked at the Charter and it is as expected, and similar to other organisations.

CK – It is the Annual Internal Charter that ETAP is being asked to sign off, although ETAP are not involved in setting the work stream or agreeing the fees, which is part of the Charter. The Panel is happy with the broad thrust of the Charter, but would it be possible to look at some of the wording and define what is meant by the board in order to be absolutely clear who RSM is requesting to sign off the Charter.

Q: BS - Is the Commissioner the Fire Authority?

A: DG – The Staffordshire Commissioner Fire and Rescue Authority is the statutory body.

CK – so the wording indicates it is the Commissioner who actually signs this off but the document also references ETAP, It really needs to be clear.

ACTION 3: RSM to clarify as to which party is due to sign off the Charter.

ii. Progress Report

No reports have been finalised since the last meeting. The remaining audits will be on time and are either awaiting sign off or completion. On track to deliver the plan as intended.

Q: GS – What is follow-up as this is on the plan?

A: LD – This is the annual follow up of the actions from the audits throughout the year.

Q: GS – Regarding the actions are there separate fixed dates for actions or just March at the year end?

A: LD – The Follow-up Report is done at year end but each action will have a separate date which has been agreed with the organisation.

HL – Commented that the Panel could ask for this at each meeting, to track progress rather than wait to the end of the year for the ratification.

CK – The Cyber Risk report is due to be picked up at the Finance Panel Meeting in March, and the Head of IT will be attending that meeting.

iii. Global Internal Audit Standard amendments from 1 April 2025

It was clarified that this report is for information, to note the RSM position on the changes that will be coming into force from April 2025.

Q: CK On Page 3, 9.4 does ETAP get an overarching annual overall conclusion on governance and risk management from RSM?

A: LD This will come with Internal Audit Opinion and Annual Governance Statement (AGS).

DG: The annual Internal Audit report is a key part of the AGS.

Q: CK does RSM have a Chief Auditing executive?

A: LD This is Dan Harris.

Q: BS If an Internal Audit report is received in the year that receives less than satisfactory, would that be amended on the end of year statement?

A: LD If there is a negative report at the beginning of the year, then the opinion cannot be changed, but comments can be added to the opinion which confirm that issues have been identified and work has been done to correct these issues. This would be taken into consideration with the final Internal Audit Opinion and fed through in to the AGS.

CK – thanked LD for the work on the extensive agenda and the presentation.

5. External Auditors - presented by Paul Grady

Update on the Opinion 2023-24

This Opinion was Issued 3 February 2025, had been waiting for assurance from the Staffordshire Pension Fund, which was received in January. The finding was that within the pension fund as a whole there was a £23million difference, in terms of the value of the assets. The impact of this on Staffordshire FARS was not material. Azets cannot yet issue the Certificate, this will be done once the work has been concluded nationally.

The final report to come will be the Auditors Annual Report. This will include more narrative around what is happening across Sustainability, Governance, Improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness. Have already concluded there are no significant weaknesses, but the report will be completed and will be for publication on the website, in accordance with guidance. The narrative will reflect the good initiatives and partnership working.

Then it will be on to the 2024-25 planning work, this has already started and some queries have been shared with management with a good response. Specific planning visits are due next week, then the plan will be pulled together and brought to the next ETAP Meeting. Will be undertaking 2024-25 Audit from 1 July.

Q: EC There has been a substantial increase in fees this last year. As an organisation there is a need to manage costs with the budget reducing, could you run through this year's costs and how this can be managed going forwards?

A: PG The fees are set by PSAA and the contract is with them. The Scale Fee was increased by 250% which was set by PSAA. There were some specific one-offs, the Isa 215 element for the new auditing standard, the work related to the Pension fund element, and the year on work for the PFI. PSAA has now shared the 2024-25 scale fee and Azets fee will match the fee set.

Q: CK On that point the Panel is just trying to understand the add-ons from the PSAA fee, which is about 45%.

A: PG It is an add-on but the amount is still determined by PSAA, and the PSAA agreed that this work was necessary in order to complete the opinion work. This is shared in advance, but ultimately the decision is with PSAA.

Q: EC This is what the Panel is trying to understand, the audit environment is ever changing and at times it seems like having a blank cheque. The problem is there is not the revenue to keep finding the extra amounts of money. Want to ensure that there is an ongoing dialogue with the organisations and can we push back on requests and where do you draw the line on this? It is frustrating and how do we control this?

A: PG The Government put out a planned policy in December, proposing the establishment of a local audit office to bring together the fragmentation across the sector into one body, covering procurement regulation, setting up the code, and all the activities that are currently done by separate bodies. The aim is that there will be economies of scale having it all in one place, will also be able to constrain some of the regulation and ensure audit as a focus.

In relation to the 2024-25 fees, Azets expect that fees will be higher than the base last year, but overall less than with the add-ons. There is an element of not knowing what the final cost will be if there are any additional problems.

EC – It is not just the External Audit fees but the time of officers, in a very small team. When the organisation is trying to manage budgets at a very difficult time, it is an added fee that cannot be managed. The main thing is to ensure there is a dialogue with external auditors and the team, and try to manage things as closely as possible. ETAP understand if it is a requirement it has to be done, but it is frustrating.

CK – having worked in an audit position for number of years, for an organisation the size of the Fire service it is an extraordinary amount of fees. Are we statutory bound to the PSAA, could this be done for less? It is an extraordinary increase in the times when there are extraordinary budget pressures, and ETAP hope that Azets and FARS are working together as best as possible to keep the fees efficient.

DG – FARS has been on journey with audit fees. Public sector audit appointments did initially drive the fees down significantly, PSAA went out to tender more recently and the fees have increased significantly, but it is important that the 2023-24 accounts have now been concluded, and this has been a considerable amount of work, and a year-one audit, which brings its challenges. CBr and AD have been working together, and a lot of hard work to get these finished. FARS are pleased that it has not been caught up in the backstop issues and are in a good position moving forwards, but would like to see there are not lots of add-ons next year. The accounts have been published and are on the webpages but CBr has hard copies if anyone would like a copy.

BS – Wanted to point out that PSAA are our agents and they could be challenged. But other areas that came out of the PSAA and went private have now opted back in to PSAA.

CK thanked Azets for the work and the reports.

6. Fire Governance Report – presented by GL

The report is for information and discussion, and provides assurance to the panel on areas of work that FARS are delivering on.

Reports and recommendations from HMICFRSS Inspection.

The Thematic Inspection on the Handling of Misconduct was published in August 2024. This piece of work involved 10 FARS, including Staffordshire. It focused on key themes of; toxic behavior, sexist, racist and homophobic language in the watch environment, widespread lack of confidence around misconduct processes, particularly amongst women, lack of training amongst supervisors and managers in managing behavior and need for FARS to learn better from their experiences internally and from other FARS. There were 15 recommendations in full, however the feedback for Staffordshire was really positive, although it is recognised these are issues that exist to different extents in different forces. The full inspection for Staffordshire highlighted the good results in promoting values and culture.

There has been a change in the assessment criteria from HMICFRS, it still looks at services to be measured on behalf of the public, but now has 11 diagnostic elements in the report and a new grading system for 'adequate'. This has caused some confusion, if a service is judged as adequate that is the expected standard, but it has been perceived more negatively. In Staffordshire adequate was the lowest rating received, and this was in just four areas, six were rated as good and one as outstanding. Testament to the training around incident command, major incident exercises, civil contingencies unit and the partnership and multi-agency approaches.

From the full inspection, although FARS did not receive any criteria for improvement or inadequate ratings, there were five areas the inspectorate pointed out where there was work to be done. These have been recognised and categorized as areas for improvement, they have been added to the report to show they are being tracked, time dated and regularly updated. The actions are viewed and scrutinised through the service delivery board, each action has an individual accountable for the delivery, with a tried and tested process to manage this.

The Thematic results for the handling of misconduct identified 15 areas for FARS to address. These areas are managed in the same way as the actions for the full inspection. Many of the areas are training and HR based. Of the 15 actions, 7 have been completed, 4 are close to completion and 4 are progressing but for further work to be done before being signed off.

External Reports

Manchester Arena Enquiry, many actions have come out of this, in particular the shared fire control with West Midlands Fire Service and Staffordshire have made good progress around the actions. The major incident plan has been reviewed, and from the full inspection there was positive feedback regarding this. A key element from the inquiry was the recognition that record keeping was critical down to an individual level, as well as across the service to clarify post event the rationale for actions being taken or not taken in order to aid learning.

There was a lot of information and actions regarding the sharing of site-specific tactical plans. An example for Staffordshire is Alton Towers, which is a complicated site in terms of response plan, with footfall, numbers of visitors. Any incident requires a good understanding of the site and the staff, and this is the type of action plan that needs to be worked on and shared more widely. JESOP (Joint Emergency Services Inter-Operability Programme) relates to working together around shared objectives, priorities and legislation, and making joint decision on the ground with this knowledge at an incident.

The second part of the Manchester Arena Report expanded the initial actions to 40 for Staffordshire FARS. 37 are now completed and there are 3 remaining areas; finalization of response plans, operational discretion (policy term for making decisions outside of policy), and the procedure to record this so there is defensible rationale for any actions taken. There is appropriate challenge and some nervousness around this, and there is more work to be done but it is due to be completed soon. Information is accessible for crews, through electronic devices that shows policies and advice at the scene of incident.

Grenfell Phase 2, was published September 2024. This focused on the cause of fire and how the tower came to be in the condition it was, which caught out firefighters at the time of the incident. 58 recommendations have been issued and many of these are to re-visit the phase 1 recommendations, around response planning to tall building fires and the flow of information around fire control, to check that FARS are confident that these are fully embedded in the regime. This is being worked through at present, a more detailed session could be put on to the next agenda if required.

ACTION 4: ETAP to set aside time to consider actions arising from the Grenfell Phase 2 at a future session.

Strategic Risk Register

The board met on the 6 February 2025 and the next meeting is May. Strategic risks have been analysed and a number of changes made. The three changes are on Page 17 of the report: -

1. Failure to implement the services environmental strategy and reduce the carbon footprint. FARS have invested time into and it is important to the workforce, but work has slowed down due to affordability. With increased budget pressures some investments have been paused e.g. solar panels. The intention is alive but will not see as much investment in these areas, which will slow down the progress.
2. Risk of Public Confidence being impacted, again this is due to budget pressures. Currently working through the transformation program to ensure plans can be delivered without having an impact on frontline services. External factors may mean this could be difficult to achieve if there are further cuts in funding or unfunded pay rises over the next 12 months.
3. Shared Service Performance, and two areas around this. The shared services with Staffordshire Police, which in terms of governance, are being managed really well but there are still pressures around this function, as Staffordshire Police have similar funding challenges. Secondly, is the West Midlands Fire Control and the need to upgrade the software and hardware systems and an upgrade to the back-office

systems, to ensure can have accurate and valid performance data. The updates and investment in this area may cause disruption, and this is a high risk for the service.

Finally around risks, two areas have been consolidated and one risk withdrawn. This is around the Cyber area and Cyber breaches in terms of security, data, door access, CCTV. Amalgamated some of these and withdrawn some risks, so now have a total of 10 strategic risks and mitigations in place.

The focus on Strategic Risk will be more around the Risk Management Framework, with a focus on the risks discussed. But this is dynamic and covers significant risks, such as loss of people, safeguarding issues and damage to public trust and confidence.

CK – Thanks to GL, this is a well written and dynamic report, the Panel get the feel that the organisation is on top of the risks, they are discussed and the structure of report is tailored to ETAP and that is appreciated.

Q: CB Good to see many of the recommendations signed off. How does the service prioritise the handling of the recommendations as a whole, can see that some are ahead of time, and some are on track but these have a deadline sooner than some of the completed recommendations?

A: GL Firstly look at timeline which is largely set by HMICFRS. Some actions are more straightforward than others, not always easy to adhere to timescales, particularly if collaboration is required or learning from other areas.

Q: CB So FARS have taken the approach to tackle the soonest recommendations first but some are more difficult and take longer to achieve. This relates to the theme regarding the position of Project Manager, which may have helped, where is the service with this action?

A: GL Paused on recruitment due to funding pressures on this, it was a difficult decision and it was explored through a recruitment process, but found no suitable candidates.

Q: CB Could implement project management techniques, and empower own workforce, upskill the team and build in processes.

A: GL Agreed this was a fair comment and something that could be taken back.

Q: CB HMICFRS is very orientated around people and standards. With the shared estates there are two organisations coming together in FARS and Force, how does this impact on ethics and culture with two different organisations exposed to each other?

A: GL Originally there were genuine concerns around cultural issues, around operation and station occupancy and behaviours. Extremely confident that when speaking to any officers from fire or force the feedback would be positive, get organic collaboration and understanding of roles. Officers see each other on operational incidents and work more effectively as a result. Not aware of any serious complaints or issues, this was mitigated with the setup of Station Councils, with local representatives from both organisations, who regularly discuss any issues at an early stage. Very pleased with the integration and the positive cultural impact on both force and fire.

RB - agreed and the more shared sites that are created the easier the process becomes.

HL - added it is a better and more efficient use of the estates.

Q: CB Are you comfortable that with things like misconduct and whistle blowing that officers know where to report this?

A: GL Yes, absolutely.

Q: JK Have there been any surprises with the inspections and feedback from HMICFRS, either positively or negatively?

A: GL Yes, safeguarding in the main report, page 5 - all staff understand to identify vulnerability and safeguard vulnerable people. FARS have tried to get a full understanding of what this meant, as know

that the service is in a good place regarding training and has a good track record of referrals. But this was around operational staff not having the level of understanding that managers thought and the service is acting on this, with periodic refreshers.

Q: BS On page 15 on the Strategic Risk Register have a table which is a 4x4 matrix but thought FARS was using a 5x5 matrix?

A: GL Yes, are using a 5x5 matrix.

CK – Thanked GL and confirmed this was a really positive masterclass in dynamic risk management.

7. Precept reports including

- i. Revenue Budget Report Inc. MTFS & Precept**
- ii. Capital Strategy Report and Capital Programme**
- iii. Reserves Strategy Update**
- iv. Treasury management Strategy**

CK – This will be brief for the record, as this was presented in detail to Finance Panel. It has been accepted and passed by the Police Fire and Crime Panel (PFCP). For further information CK recommends that the Panel members watch the recent PFCP recording on the SCO website.

DG – Just to pick up a couple of areas with the Panel. The full papers were presented to PFCP and accepted and FARS have formally received the notice. Precept letters have now been issued to all local authorities.

When the reports were delivered had balanced MTFS, partly down to the settlement and the work done by the transformation team. Disappointing that the settlement when it came through meant that had Staffordshire FARS lost £1million of grant funding, which has been reallocated to other areas of the local sector. This has led to a challenging position, and need to find savings of £1million, which will be vital to ensure a balanced position.

Relying on a number of assumptions in the next two-year settlement, which will be critical to medium term planning. Have had five or six years of single settlements and the yo-yo effect as a consequence. The service is in a reasonable position and confident that despite some challenges the savings can be delivered without making any major changes to operational delivery.

Q: CK GL can you comment on the savings challenge?

A: GL It is really difficult, there is some fatigue across the organisation as the easy things have been done. The worry is if there are any unforeseen budget pressures now that would pose a real challenge. The organisation has done scenario planning around options to make savings quicker, and this would involve choices which would have an impact on response times to the public. The problem with scenario planning is there is a risk it can become a potential distraction. The service is not complacent and some of the internal work will be tough, but will work differently to create savings where needed. It is a good team and there is opportunity in that work, as it forces services to work differently.

DG added that the service is undertaking a number of financial challenge sessions, there is an open invitation to ETAP if anyone wants to attend any of these sessions. HMICFRS said Staffordshire was good at ensuring the service was affordable in the future, this comes from all the work that has been undertaken, need to ensure that the service continues to plan for these changes.

GL when panel members have been involved in the financial challenge sessions previously it has been very valuable with the critical thinking and feedback, so if people are willing to attend that would be really helpful.

CK Thanked David for the feedback on the operation of ETAP, the sub committees and the number of meetings, and recognised the need for ETAP to be effective and efficient going forwards.

ACTION 5: At least 1 ETAP member to attend a “finance challenge” session at a future agreed date.

8. Deputy Chair’s Feedback

i. Chair of the Finance Panel – Emma Christmas (EC)

EC – Met in January and confirmed the papers were excellent for precept, fully supportive and it reflected the hard work. Appreciated and supported the papers and were pleased they went through PFCP.

ii. Chair of the Ethics and Review Panel – Craig Brown (CB)

ERP met on 20 February. The Panel discussed a number of topics including the Falls Initiative and Home from Hospital. CB ran the Falls Initiative and Home from Hospital through the Matrix for a review and it came back with a potential for review, but ERP think an update rather than a review would cover this.

Also discussed the crewing reduction from four to three, and discussed the article showing a high proportion of residents in Staffordshire agreed with the change. ERP would welcome an update on this as well at the next meeting.

Grenfell Phase 2, noted that RB had stated previously that FARS would welcome a review of the process followed, and would be looking to start this in spring 2025.

Q: CB When would be best time to start this and who would be the stakeholder contact?

A: GL can start as soon as ready and the contact would be James Bywater.

Have already discussed around shared estates today and wanted to understand if there was a standardization of the processes around shared culture and code of conduct. From the update it appears that this is in hand and there are good processes in place.

ERP also discussed outside of FARS, the CISP Phase3 review. This was pushed back from the SCO due to various issues, so are now looking to do this starting in May 2025.

Other areas around Police Services were discussed at the meeting, around Predictive Policing and Vetting.

Copy of all ETAP thematic reviews published to date can be found on the SCO website
<https://staffordshire-pfcc.gov.uk/transparency/etap>

CK thanked both for the updated.

9. AOB - None

CK thanked everyone for the meeting, and discussed the change of agenda to bring forward the Audit Reports to the start.

The date and time of next meeting is Monday 16 June 2025 14:00 – 16:00

DRAFT