

Report to	-	Audit and Standards Committee
Date	-	25 March 2019
Report of the	-	Executive Director
Subject	-	Internal Audit Report to 31 December 2018

---

**Recommendation:** It be **RESOLVED:** That the Internal Audit report to 31 December 2018 (including the Audit Manager's draft overall assessment of the Council's internal control systems and draft opinion on the control environment) be noted.

---

**Audit Manager: Gary Angell**

---

### **Introduction**

1. The Council is required to ensure that it has reliable and effective internal control systems in place. The adequacy of these systems is tested by both Internal and External Audit.
2. The Council's Internal Audit Service operates in accordance with the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards. It is a requirement of these Standards that we report to the Audit and Standards Committee on audit matters and any emerging issues not only in relation to audit but also to risk management and corporate governance.
3. The Audit Manager makes a provisional assessment of the Council's control environment prior to the end of each financial year so that his comments may be included in the Annual Governance Statement. Seeing as this opinion is based solely on the first ten months of the financial year 2018/19, only a draft assessment and opinion (shown elsewhere in this report) can be given at this stage. The Audit Manager will therefore review these statements again at the end of the financial year to check that nothing has changed and will confirm his final opinion on 2018/19 at the June 2019 meeting.

### **Current Position**

4. Internal Audit is still on target to complete the majority of the work planned for 2018/19 by 31 March 2019.

### **Summary of Activity to 31 December 2018**

5. Four audit reports were issued in the quarter. Two of these provided good or substantial assurance on the overall governance arrangements. However, the other two audits (Procurement and Housing Temporary Accommodation) only provided limited assurance. An overview of the findings arising from all four audits is given in Appendix A

6. The Procurement audit received a limited rating due to the number of issues found. None of these can be considered to be high risk in isolation, but their combined impact underlines the need for improvements in control. These include some fundamental issues, such as:
  - there being no up-to-date procurement strategy (an issue first raised at the last audit in August 2015);
  - the absence of any contract/service level agreement formalising the arrangements with the East Sussex Procurement Hub; and
  - contract paperwork not always being finalised prior to the commencement of contracts.
7. The Housing Temporary Accommodation audit also highlighted a number of issues, but it mainly received a limited rating because of the shortage of temporary accommodation within the district and the increased cost of the service.

### **Implementation of Audit Recommendations**

8. Each quarter, Members are updated on the progress made on implementing the audit recommendations reported at previous meetings. Appendix B shows a summary of the current position.
9. From this it can be seen that progress continues to be made in both the current and previous years. However, there are still six long outstanding recommendations which need to be resolved. All of these relate to ICT and Data Protection issues and those cases where there has been little or no progress over the past six months have already been escalated to the Executive Director for further investigation.

### **Draft Overall Assessment of the Council's Internal Control Systems**

10. Under the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015, ultimate responsibility for maintaining a sound system of internal control rests with the Council but this has been delegated to the Assistant Director Resources (s.151 Officer). The assessment of the control environment is made in two ways, by reviewing the recommendations made in Internal Audit reports and by the production of the Annual Governance Statement. The Annual Governance Statement will be considered by the Committee later on this agenda.
11. The following areas have been identified for inclusion in the Annual Governance Statement because the internal control environment is not satisfactory:
  - **Homelessness Prevention Grants and Loans** – Whilst some progress has been made to improve procedures since the 2017 audit, only limited assurance could be given at the latest review owing to the number of issues that are still outstanding. In particular, management oversight of the authorisation of payments, private landlord checks and the raising of invoices was found to be inadequate.

- **Procurement** – This review received a limited assurance rating owing to a number of factors. These include the need for an up-to-date procurement strategy, the absence of any formal agreement with the East Sussex Procurement Hub regarding service provision, and the failure of some officers to comply with Procurement Procedure Rules when ordering goods or services under £50,000. The need for a formal agreement was further highlighted by the Hub's failure to finalise the Public Conveniences Cleaning Contract prior to work commencing and the subsequent difficulties experienced in obtaining the required paperwork when the matter was raised with the Hub.
- **Housing Temporary Accommodation** – The limited assurance rating on this audit was due in part to the shortage of temporary accommodation within the district and the increased cost of the service. Steps are now being taken to address these issues and these are outlined in a new Housing, Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy. It should be noted, however, that this is a major piece of work, and any new initiatives may take time to implement.
- **U4BW ERP Finance Modules** – This year's Governance Audits have identified a number of issues with the new Finance modules around access rights, workflow/approval procedures and the accuracy of budgetary reports, etc. This demonstrates that there is still further work to be done to ensure that the new system is properly controlled.

12. Other issues that may impact on the Council include:

- **Joint Waste Contract** – A new contract with Biffa Waste Services Ltd is now in place and is due to commence on 29 June 2019. The Council will be managing the performance of the outgoing contractor up to this date whilst simultaneously overseeing the preparations for the start of the new contract. Even with a relatively smooth handover period, the introduction of a major new contract like this has the potential for some short-term local disruption as the new contractor settles in.
- **U4BW ERP Implementation Project** – This project was originally due to complete in April 2018, but it is still ongoing. The Finance and Payroll modules have been operational since April and July 2018 respectively, but the implementation of the Human Resources and Self Service modules has been delayed due to staff sickness and other factors. Work on the remaining modules is now at an advanced stage and they are due to go live in early 2019/20.
- **Brexit** – Preparations for the possibility of a no deal exit from the European Union are being made but many of the potential issues fall outside the Council's control. It is therefore difficult to estimate what impact a no deal exit would have.

13. Areas of emerging risk include:

- **Property Investment** – The Council has begun acquiring property within the district with a view to stimulating economic activity and generating rental income. Most of this regeneration activity will be funded by borrowing and this is expected to peak at approximately £35 million by

2021. There can be significant financial risks if the Council does not invest wisely or fails to secure the expected rental income. Internal Audit therefore plans to review the governance arrangements in 2019/20.

- **System Administration Support** – The new U4BW ERP system is far more complex than the old Agresso system ever was leading to concerns about whether there are sufficient resources in place to administer the system effectively, and whether the current arrangement of sharing certain duties with the Finance team are resilient enough to cope if the designated system administrator is absent from work for any length of time. There is a risk that the Council will become overly reliant on potentially costly remote support if it does not have sufficient in-house expertise to administer the system itself.

### **Draft Opinion on the Control Environment**

14. All audit reports are given an assurance rating based on the following criteria:

Rating	Description
Good	Strong controls are in place and are complied with.
Substantial	Controls are in place but improvements would be beneficial.
Limited	Improvements in controls or in the application of controls are required.
Minimal	Urgent improvements in controls or in the application of controls are required.

15. Limited/minimal assurance ratings are triggered by the presence of either high risk recommendations or five or more medium risk recommendations – which refer to likelihood and impact of a negative outcome occurring, if the expected controls are not in place.
16. In forming an overall opinion, Internal Audit findings need to be set in context and viewed corporately. The summary of the 2018/19 audit reports completed as at 31 January 2019 (Appendix C) shows that four audit reports (28.6%) have received a “limited” assurance rating so far this financial year. This may seem like a marked increase on the previous year but it should be noted that only three of the 55 control objectives examined during the period had not been “met” at least in part.
17. The quarterly Internal Audit activity reports submitted to this Committee have also shown that the vast majority of the expected controls are in place, although it has been necessary to make a number of recommendations during the year where areas were identified for improvement.
18. Work on the remaining 2018/19 audits was still on going at the time of writing this report and the Audit Manager will confirm the final position at the next meeting in June 2019.
19. Taking all of the factors highlighted in this and the quarterly reports into account, the draft Internal Audit assessment of the Council’s framework of governance, risk management and control is that it is adequate and effective.

Malcolm Johnston  
Executive Director

**Risk Assessment Statement**

A strong, independent and well supported Internal Audit function ensures that the Council does not suffer from poor internal control systems.

**PROCUREMENT AUDIT****ROTHER DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Head of Service: Robin Vennard

Officer(s) Responsible for Implementing Recommendations: Robin Vennard,  
Catherine Jobling and Ola Janowicz

Overall Level of Assurance: **LIMITED**

**Purpose and Objectives**

The purpose of the audit is to provide organisational and departmental management with an assurance as to the adequacy of the control systems based on compliance with the control objectives set out in the table below.

These objectives are designed to assess the extent to which the organisation meets its legal requirements, its own needs and those of its stakeholders and how the control systems in place contribute to the overall governance arrangements and securing value for money from the Council's services and operations.

**Background**

All staff are expected to follow Procurement Procedure Rules when obtaining works, goods or services. These rules are designed to promote good purchasing practice, public accountability, and to prevent corruption.

Since 2014, staff have also been required to liaise with the East Sussex Procurement Hub (managed by Wealden District Council) when letting contracts over £50,000. In most cases, the Hub will then supervise the tendering process and oversee the award of the contract. The Hub also gives advice on, and helps monitor, procurement exercises valued between £5,000 and £49,999.

**Control Objectives**

The audit opinion is based on the extent of compliance with the objectives (below), which have either been met in full (**M**), partially met (**P**) or not met (**N**).

<b>Strategy</b> – There is a formally adopted Procurement Strategy in place which sets out those processes within the Council that are associated with the acquisition of goods, works and services.	<b>N</b>
<b>Procurement Arrangements</b> – Procurement is carried out in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, Procurement Procedure Rules and EU procurement rules and regulations.	<b>P</b>

**Level of Assurance**

Based on the findings from the audit, we have determined that only limited assurance can be given on the overall governance arrangements owing to the number of issues found.

Note – Although this report is directed at the Finance section, some of the findings in it relate to Council-wide issues which will require the cooperation of all procurement staff if they are to be properly addressed.

The audit highlights the need for improved control in several areas, notably:

- **Procurement Strategy** – The Council does not have an up-to-date strategy. This point was first raised at the last Procurement Audit in August 2015 and the Council is still waiting on the East Sussex Procurement Hub to draft a strategy for Rother. (The Hub now plan to complete this work by April 2019.)
- **Service Provision** – There is currently no contract/service level agreement with the East Sussex Procurement Hub. This means that the expected level of service is not defined, responsibility and accountability for certain stages of the procurement process are sometimes unclear, and there is no agreed mechanism for resolving any issues that arise.
- **Transparency Reporting** – The Council is required to publish procurement information on purchase orders over £5,000. However, not all officers are responding promptly to Finance requests for procurement information, meaning that the information published is often incomplete.
- **Competitive Quotes** – The requirement to obtain competitive quotes for orders valued between £5,000 and £49,999 (or a formal written waiver) is not always being complied with.
- **Contract Paperwork** – Contract paperwork is not always finalised prior to the commencement of contracts. It is not clear whether this is down to the East Sussex Procurement Hub, Legal Services, the requisitioning department or a combination of these parties. However, Rother officers still have a responsibility to ensure that there is a signed contract in place prior to contract commencement.

Minor issues were also found around the need to market test suppliers who regularly complete work for the Council, and the inclusion of specific clauses for equality and anti-fraud and corruption in the contract wording.

### Executive Summary

Overall, the control objectives are considered to have only been partially met. We have made five medium and two low risk recommendations to management, all of which are aimed at enhancing the governance arrangements and improving value for money.

Internal Audit Service  
October 2018

**TREASURY MANAGEMENT AUDIT****ROTHER DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Head of Service: Robin Vennard

Officer(s) Responsible for Implementing Recommendations: Catherine Jobling and Angie Edwards

Overall Level of Assurance: **SUBSTANTIAL**

**Purpose and Objectives**

The purpose of the audit is to provide organisational and departmental management with an assurance as to the adequacy of the control systems based on compliance with the control objectives set out in the table below.

These objectives are designed to assess the extent to which the organisation meets its legal requirements, its own needs and those of its stakeholders and how the control systems in place contribute to the overall governance arrangements and securing value for money from the Council's services and operations.

**Audit Coverage**

The Council's new strategy of investing in property to generate revenue income has meant that it has now started borrowing again (after many years of being debt-free) in order to fund these investments. The audit coverage has therefore been expanded to include loans.

The impact of this change has been fairly modest on this occasion since the Council has only recently taken out its first two loans (total sum £900,000) and no repayments have so far fallen due. However, the value of audit assurance in this area will grow in future years as borrowing increases.

**Control Objectives**

The audit opinion is based on the extent of compliance with the objectives (below), which have either been met in full (**M**), partially met (**P**) or not met (**N**).

<b>INVESTMENTS</b>	
<b>Policy and Procedures</b> – Investments are only made in accordance with the Council's approved policy and any amendments are promptly actioned. The Council seeks to maximise the return on its investments where it is prudent to do so.	<b>P</b>
<b>Authorisation and Record Keeping</b> – All investments and withdrawals are properly authorised with all relevant records and accounts updated and adequate documentation kept to support the transfer of funds.	<b>M</b>
<b>Monitoring of Performance</b> – There is regular monitoring and reporting of investment performance.	<b>M</b>
<b>LOANS</b>	
<b>Policy and Procedures</b> – The Council has an approved strategy for external borrowing and borrowing levels are related to the Council's needs.	<b>M</b>
<b>Authorisation and Record Keeping</b> – All loans are properly authorised	<b>M</b>



with all relevant records and accounts updated and adequate documentation kept to support each transaction.	
<b>Repayment and Interest</b> – All loan repayments and interest charges are correctly calculated and properly recorded.	<b>M</b>
<b>INVESTMENTS AND LOANS</b>	
<b>Reconciliation and Other Controls</b> – There are regular reconciliations to ensure that all transactions are accounted for. There is fidelity insurance cover for all staff involved in Treasury Management. Members receive Treasury Management training.	<b>M</b>

### Level of Assurance

Based on the findings from the audit we have determined that substantial assurance can be given on the governance arrangements.

The main issues found relate to:

- **Bank Ring Fencing Arrangements** – Greater clarity needs to be obtained as to whether certain investments are held in ring fenced or non-ring fenced banks. This is to ensure that the correct credit ratings are applied and the Council's Treasury Advisor's recommendations on maximum investment term are adhered to.
- **Authority to Invest** – In December 2017, the Audit and Standards Committee recommended revisions to the Annual Investment Strategy which included giving officers delegated authority to authorise property fund investments in consultation with the Council's Treasury Advisors. However, due to an oversight, the wording in the 2018/19 Treasury Management Strategy (approved in February 2018) still states that all such transactions need the specific approval of Members. The wording in the strategy therefore needs to be amended to bring it in line with the original recommendation made by the Audit and Standards Committee.

A minor issue was also found regarding the audit trail for loan drawdown requests.

### Executive Summary

Overall, the control objectives are considered to have largely been met but we have made two medium and one low risk recommendations to management to further enhance the governance arrangements.

Internal Audit Service  
November 2018

## ROTHER DISTRICT COUNCIL

### HOUSING TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION AUDIT

Head of Service: Joe Powell

Officer(s) Responsible for Implementing Recommendations: Joe Powell, Martin Bolton and Emma Donnelly

Overall Level of Assurance: **LIMITED**

#### Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of the audit is to provide organisational and departmental management with an assurance as to the adequacy of the control systems based on compliance with the control objectives set out in the table below.

These objectives are designed to assess the extent to which the organisation meets its legal requirements, its own needs and those of its stakeholders and how the control systems in place contribute to the overall governance arrangements and securing value for money from the Council's services and operations.

#### Control Objectives

The audit opinion is based on the extent of compliance with the objectives (below), which have either been met in full (**M**), partially met (**P**) or not met (**N**).

Management are taking sufficient action to secure sufficient temporary accommodation to meet its responsibilities under the Homelessness Reduction Act and the quality of temporary accommodation provided to clients is of a sufficient standard.	<b>P</b>
All temporary accommodation provided for the homeless is correctly allocated and paid for, and the costs incurred are recovered where appropriate.	<b>P</b>
All expenditure on temporary accommodation is contained within budget.	<b>N</b>

#### Level of Assurance

Based on the findings from the audit we have determined that only limited assurance can be given on the overall governance arrangements due in part to the limited supply of temporary accommodation within the district and the increased cost of the service.

It should be noted however that most of the day-to-day operational controls appear to be working effectively.

The main issues found are outlined below:

- **Strategy** – The Council's existing Homelessness and Prevention Strategy does not include any measures to address the current shortage of temporary accommodation in the district. Work to develop a new strategy, which will contain provisions for improving the supply of temporary accommodation, is now underway following recommendations made by the Housing Task and Finish Group. However, any new initiatives are likely to take time to implement, and it is

important that the strategy therefore includes a detailed action plan so that progress on their delivery can be regularly monitored and reported to Members.

- **Management of Council-run Accommodation** – The appointment of a company for managing a property leased by the Council did not follow Procurement Procedure Rules. Any future appointment of a company to manage temporary accommodation must be carried out in accordance with these rules.
- **Authorisation of Expenditure** – At the time of the audit, most clients were being placed in temporary accommodation by the same officer who also checked the invoices received from the accommodation provider and approved them for payment. Financial Procedure Rules require invoices to be checked and approved for payment by different officers to reduce the risk of fraud.
- **Recharge of Storage/Removal Costs** – Seven instances were found where no sundry debtor invoice had been issued for the recharge of storage/removal costs. The total sum owed in these cases amounted to £4,692.50. A list of these cases was passed to Housing at the audit in order that the sums owed can now be recovered.
- **Budgetary Control** – The Council reported a budgetary deficit of £377,000 for Housing Administration and Temporary Accommodation costs in 2017/18. A further deficit is also predicted in 2018/19. It has not been possible to contain these costs within budget because of increased demand for temporary accommodation. This situation is likely to continue, at least in the short term, owing to a shortage of social and affordable housing in the district. However, it is hoped that the new strategy mentioned above will go some way towards providing a solution.

One minor issue was also found regarding the payment arrangements for securing emergency accommodation outside of normal office hours.

### Executive Summary

Overall, the control objectives are considered to have only been partially met and we have made one high and four medium/low risk recommendations to management in order to improve the governance arrangements and value for money. The high risk recommendation and management's response to it will be included in the quarterly report to the Audit and Standards Committee.

Internal Audit Service  
November 2018

## HOUSING TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION AUDIT

## High Risk Recommendation and Management Response

Audit Ref	Finding/Risk	Recommendation	Risk	Management Response
1.1	<p><b>Finding</b></p> <p>The current 2014-19 Homelessness and Prevention Strategy makes no reference to the provision of temporary accommodation in the district, but there has been a shortage of supply in recent years which has been compounded by the recently introduced Homelessness Reduction Act.</p> <p>Work is now underway to develop a new strategy which will include improving the supply of temporary accommodation following recommendations from the Housing Task and Finish Group.</p> <p>The newly appointed Head of Service – Housing &amp; Community is exploring a number of different options to improve the situation, but these will take time to implement.</p> <p>Senior management and Members will need to commit sufficient funding, operational resources and officer time to these initiatives if they are to be successfully delivered.</p> <p><b>Risk</b></p> <p>There is insufficient temporary accommodation in the district to meet the needs of local residents resulting in client hardship, complaints and negative publicity.</p>	<p>The new Housing and Homelessness Strategy should incorporate an action plan to increase the provision of temporary accommodation within the district. Progress on its delivery should be regularly monitored and reported to Members.</p>	High	<p>This is already within the Housing Task and Finish Group's recommendation which has been adopted by Cabinet. A report to Cabinet in the New Year will highlight the approach to increasing temporary accommodation supply. The new Housing and Homelessness Strategy will also include a dedicated section to temporary accommodation provision and a detailed action plan.</p> <p><b>Agreed Implementation Date</b></p> <p>April 2019</p> <p><b>Responsible Officer</b></p> <p>Joe Powell</p> <div data-bbox="1563 951 2132 1126"> <p><b>Position Update</b></p> <p>The new Housing, Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy was approved at full Council on 25 February 2019.</p> </div>

---

**ROTHER DISTRICT COUNCIL****JOINT WASTE CONTRACT – CENTRAL ADMIN AUDIT**

Service Manager: Madeleine Gorman

Officer(s) Responsible for Implementing Recommendations: Lucy Yates

Overall Level of Assurance: **GOOD**

---

**Introduction**

A Joint Waste and Beach and Street Cleaning Service has been procured by Eastbourne, Hastings, Rother and Wealden Councils and the contract was awarded to Kier Services Limited in October 2012. The contract commenced at Eastbourne and Wealden on 1 April 2013, Hastings on 2 July 2013, and Rother on 1 April 2014.

Rother District Council was approved as the Administering Authority in May 2012 and the Joint Waste Team (also known as the Partnership Client Unit) are employed to fulfil this role. The Joint Waste Team provides the principal point of contact for the Partnership and handles all invoices, communications, documentation, notices and materials relating to the Contract.

This is the fifth Internal Audit review of the Joint Waste Team's work.

**Purpose & Objectives**

The purpose of the audit is to review the work carried out by Rother in its role as the Administering Authority and to provide assurance to the whole Partnership on the adequacy of its control systems based on compliance with the control objectives set out in the table overleaf.

These objectives are designed to assess the extent to which the Joint Waste Team meets both its own needs and those of its partner authorities and how the control systems in place contribute to the overall governance arrangements and secure value for money from the Council's services and operations.

The control objectives, key risks and expected controls in the report were devised by Rother but all have been shared with the partner authorities and their Internal Audit teams given an opportunity to comment on and influence the scope of the review.

**Limitations on Audit Coverage**

The audit solely focuses on the Joint Waste Team and the adequacy of its procedures. The report is not intended to provide any assurance on the day-to-day operational management of the contract at any of the partner authorities. It is the responsibility of the Internal Audit team at each authority to review the adequacy of its own Contract Compliance Team.

### Control Objectives

The audit opinion is based on the extent of compliance with the objectives (below), which have either been met in full (**M**), partially met (**P**) or not met (**N**).

<b>Contract</b> – The contract has been formally agreed by all partner authorities and the contract documentation is complete.	<b>M</b>
<b>Payment to Contractor</b> – The Administering Authority ensures that all contract payments are correct and within the authorised budget.	<b>M</b>
<b>Financial Contributions from Partner Authorities</b> – All partner authorities promptly pay the Administering Authority for their share of the contract costs plus all additional expenditure directly attributable to them.	<b>M</b>
<b>Performance Monitoring</b> – The Administering Authority monitors the operational and financial performance of the whole contract and regularly updates the partner authorities and the Joint Waste Committee on how well it is operating.	<b>M</b>

### Level of Assurance

Based on the findings from the audit we have determined that good assurance can be given on the governance arrangements as no significant issues were found.

### Executive Summary

Overall, the control objectives are considered to have largely been met and it was only necessary to make two low risk recommendations to management to further enhance the governance arrangements.

Internal Audit Service  
November 2018

## Summary of Progress on Recommendations Made up to 30 September 2018

### Audit Recommendations 2016/17 to 2017/18

Previous quarter's performance shown in brackets

	Issued		Implemented		Work-in-Progress		Not Started	
High	3		3	(3)	0	(0)	0	(0)
Medium	83		80	(75)	2	(6)	1	(2)
Low	68		65	(65)	3	(3)	0	(0)
<b>Total</b>	<b>154</b>		<b>148</b>	<b>(143)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>(9)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>(2)</b>
			<b>96.1%</b>	<b>(92.9%)</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>(5.8%)</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>(1.3%)</b>

Note – The number of recommendations issued and all other figures reported in the last quarter have been retrospectively adjusted to reflect the removal of the 2015/16 audit recommendations from the period under review.

Breakdown of outstanding audit recommendations for 2016/17 to 2017/18 by Head of Service:

#### Robin Vennard (Resources)

- ICT Governance – issued 20/03/17 (1 Low)
- Internet and Email Controls – issued 05/05/17 (1 Medium)
- Data Protection – issued 22/09/17 (1 Medium, 1 Low)
- ICT Governance – issued 06/04/18 (1 Medium, 1 Low)

### Audit Recommendations 2018/19 (up to 30 September 2018)

Previous quarter's performance shown in brackets

	Issued		Implemented		Work-in-Progress		Not Started	
High	1	0	0	(0)	1	(0)	0	(0)
Medium	10	(4)	9	(3)	1	(1)	0	(0)
Low	10	(3)	6	(2)	4	(1)	0	(0)
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>(7)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(0)</b>
			<b>71.4%</b>	<b>(71.4%)</b>	<b>28.6%</b>	<b>(28.6%)</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>(0%)</b>

## 2018/19 Audit Reports Completed as at 31 January 2019

Audit	Control Objectives (Number)	Control Objectives Met	Control Objectives Met In Part	Control Objectives Not Met	Assurance Rating
Audits Brought Forward from 2017/18					
ICT Network Security	4	2	2	0	Substantial
Governance Audits					
Business Rates	6	5	1	0	Substantial
Council Tax	5	4	1	0	Substantial
Treasury Management	7	6	1	0	Substantial
High/Medium Risk Audits					
Asset Management	5	4	1	0	Substantial
Building Maintenance	6	6	0	0	Good
Food Safety	3	2	1	0	Substantial
Homelessness Prevention Grants and Loans	1	0	1	0	Limited
Housing Temporary Accommodation	3	0	2	1	Limited
Joint Waste Contract – Client Admin	4	4	0	0	Good
Pollution Control	3	2	1	0	Substantial
Procurement	2	0	1	1	Limited
Public Conveniences Cleaning Contract	4	3	0	1	Limited
Section 106 Agreements	2	1	1	0	Substantial
Totals: 14 Audit Reports	55	39	13	3	
	100%	70.9%	23.6%	5.5%	
Good/Substantial Assurance	10 (19)		71.4% (95%)		
Limited/Minimal Assurance	4 (1)		28.6% (5%)		

*Previous year's performance italicised and in brackets.*