

Audit Recommendations Not Implemented

Chief Executives			
736	Partnership - Governance	Report Issued	01/03/2010
Recommendation 3	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
<p>The Council had not entered into formal Partnership agreements with the Community Safety Partnership or the Valuing People Partnership. The partnership agreement with the Derwent Community Team was held by Legal Services, but certain Derwent officers were unaware of its existence.</p> <p>We recommend that all partnerships, in which the Council becomes involved, are supported by formal Partnership Agreements which set out the responsibilities of each partner organisation. All Partnership Agreements should be signed by suitable representatives from each partner organisation. This agreement should be a working document. Copies of which should be readily available to all key officers and members involved in the partnership.</p>			
Action Details	Responsible Officer	Action Date	30/09/2010
<p>This has been recognised as a weakness and is addressed through the Governance Action Plan (item 8b). The Action Plan will be approved at the Audit and Accounts Committee on 25 March 2010. The Plan requires Strategic Directors to put the agreements in place by the end of September. Given the number of partnerships on the register this will need to be prioritised and the following timescale is suggested: High risk by 30 September 2010 Medium risk by 31 December 2010 Low risk by 31 March 2011</p>			
Update Comments		Revised Action Date	31/03/2011
<p>Update from Nick Searle: This has been recognised as a weakness and is addressed through the Governance Action Plan (item 8b).</p> <p>Partnerships will be required to demonstrate either a Partnership Agreement or something that resembles the criteria within a Partnership Agreement by the end of March 2011.</p>			
Recommendation 4	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
<p>A number of areas were missing from the Accountable Body agreement (Partnership Agreement) for the Derwent Community Team that best practice dictates should be documented and agreed upon.</p> <p>We recommend all Partnership Agreements that the Council enters into are fully inclusive of best practice areas. We also recommend that the agreements be reviewed and updated at set intervals in the partnership to ensure they are still fit for purpose.</p>			
Action Details	Responsible Officer	Action Date	30/09/2010
See response to Recommendation 3.			
Update Comments		Revised Action Date	31/03/2011
<p>Update from Nick Searle: Partnerships will be required to demonstrate either a Partnership Agreement or something that resembles the criteria within a Partnership Agreement by the end of March 2011.</p>			
Recommendation 6	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
<p>Business continuity arrangements had not been fully developed for the sample partnerships examined.</p> <p>We recommend that a standard condition is included in every Partnership Agreement which requires that business continuity plans are developed at the start of the partnership and continually reviewed throughout the life of the partnership.</p>			
Action Details	Responsible Officer	Action Date	30/09/2010
See response to Recommendation 3.			
Update Comments		Revised Action Date	31/03/2011
<p>Update from Nick Searle: Partnerships will be required to demonstrate either a Partnership Agreement or something that resembles the criteria within a Partnership Agreement by the end of March 2011. Business Continuity Plans need to be recognised in a Partnership Agreement.</p>			

Recommendation 7	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
------------------	-------------	---------------	-------------------

Staff working at the partnerships sampled, were not required to declare their pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests to identify any conflicts that may exist.

We recommend that every Partnership Agreement entered into by the Council should contain a condition that staff working at all partnerships declare their interests on at least an annual basis. Where partnership staff are employed by Derby City Council, they should be required to adhere to the Council's Officers' Code of Conduct.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Gordon Stirling	Action Date	30/09/2010
----------------	---------------------	-----------------	-------------	------------

See response to Recommendation 3.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/03/2011
-----------------	---------------------	------------

Update from Nick Searle: Partnerships will be required to demonstrate either a Partnership Agreement or something that resembles the criteria within a Partnership Agreement by the end of March 2011. In the Partnership Agreement, there is a requirement to detail the arrangements for guiding the conduct of officers, Councillors and members of the partnership.

Recommendation 8	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
------------------	-------------	---------------	-------------------

There was not a risk register in place for Derwent New Deal nor were the risk management arrangements documented within the Accountabl Body agreement with the Derwent Community Team.

We recommend that risk registers be developed for every partnership that the Council are involved in and that the risks be subject to regular monitoring. We also recommend that risk management arrangements are set out within the Partnership Agreement. Any significant risks identified by the partnership should also be included in the Council's relevant risk registers.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Gordon Stirling	Action Date	30/09/2010
----------------	---------------------	-----------------	-------------	------------

All Partnership Agreement s will require a risk register to be drawn up and submitted within it. In line with the response to Recommendation 3 the following timescale is suggested: □High risk by 30 September 2010 □Medium risk by 31 December 2010 □Low risk by 31 March 2011

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/03/2011
-----------------	---------------------	------------

Update from Nick Searle: Partnerships will be required to demonstrate either a Partnership Agreement or something that resembles the criteria within a Partnership Agreement by the end of March 2011. The risk management arrangements need to be outlined in the Partnership Agreement.

993	Performance indicator Self Assessment 2009-10	Report Issued	18/06/2010
-----	---	---------------	------------

Recommendation 1	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
------------------	------------------	---------------	-------------------

Data required to calculate National Indicator 116 was not made available to the Council by either the Dept for Work and Pensions (DWP) or Jobcentre Plus.

We recommend that the Performance Management Unit draw up formal data sharing protocols with all partner organisations which are required to provide performance data to the Council. These protocols should stipulate that the required data should be provided within agreed timescales for performance figures to be calculated by the reporting deadlines, as outlined in the indicator's definition.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Heather Greenan	Action Date	31/12/2010
----------------	---------------------	-----------------	-------------	------------

This issue was reported to the DCP Management Group in January 2010. We agreed that data sharing protocols should be in place for all major partners and we will review arrangements / set up protocols as part of an overall refresh of the Data Quality Policy.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	30/06/2011
-----------------	---------------------	------------

Update from HG - Feb 11 - The refresh of the Data Quality Policy has been reviewed in light of the review of Chief Executive's functions. It is expected the Policy and protocols will be updated by June 2011.

Recommendation 2	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
------------------	------------------	---------------	-------------------

The Council did not have a formal agreement with Jobcentre Plus to provide the Council access to the performance management systems at Jobcentre Plus to review National Indicator 152.

We recommend that the Performance Management Unit draw up a formal partnership agreement for all partners responsible for capturing performance data and compiling performance figures. This agreement should ensure that auditors have access to examine the performance management systems, records and other information held by partners or their appointed third parties, in order for the Council to give assurance that there are robust performance management systems in place.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Heather Greenan	Action Date	30/09/2010
----------------	---------------------	-----------------	-------------	------------

This issue is being addressed through the development of a Partnership Policy and Toolkit, which requires a formal partnership agreement for all major partners of the Council. We will ensure the agreement template includes provision for performance data and access to relevant systems.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
-----------------	---------------------	------------

Update Oct 10 - The Partnership Toolkit now includes a provision for data sharing and access to systems within the template partnership agreement. The toolkit was approved by Audit and Accounts in September 2010 and is being rolled out during November, with implementation expected by March 2011

779	Procurement of Capital Schemes	Report Issued	15/01/2010
------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------

Recommendation 3	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The client was not signing off the tender specification to formally evidence their agreement with the content of the document.

We recommend that the client, or client's representative, should be requested to formally sign up to the tender specification prior to its inclusion in the tender package. This approval should be evidenced on the relevant Contract File.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mandeep Thandi	Action Date	31/03/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------	-------------------

Contrary to the audit report, tender documentation is not generally received by AMP for review prior to sign off of the proposed work although the team are now required to sign off the F10 as part of their CDM client function. There are likely to be significant resourcing implications if AMP is to check all documentation.

AMP employ Property Services as their competent project manager/designer therefore the sign off process will be employed purely to ensure the requirements of the brief are met.

The process in relation to the sign off of project work is to be reviewed. Project Log book to be further developed to include brief agreement, design freeze and specification sign off by the AMP.

Phasing
Resource implications
Change control
Progress reporting
Exception reports
Project closure
Lessons learned log

Responsible Officers: Phil Derbyshire/Paul Glowacki/ Steve Allwood

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/03/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

AMP is in the process of agreeing CRB/separation clauses for tender documentation with Child Protection Team. Details required in the tender documentation to be built into the brief issued at start of project. Checklist previously issued to be used and adjusted if necessary. AMP to arrange meeting to discuss handover process. AMP/Property Teams to roll out information and form to teams.

Recommendation 4	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The minutes of the capital project monitoring group did not demonstrate that "at risk" projects were being given priority attention, receiving greater scrutiny or appropriate corrective action was being taken to address the risks identified.

We recommend that capital project monitoring meetings become more flexible to allow for increased scrutiny on projects causing concern. The minutes of the meeting should clearly demonstrate the priority issues under review, any agreed actions and the responsible officers.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Gail Thornton	Action Date	31/03/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	-------------------

There is currently no recording mechanism for the monitoring of projects apart from the spreadsheets which are updated by Corporate Finance/Accountants therefore it has been necessary to review all projects on a regular basis. Project management software to be procured to manage contract data and produce monitoring reports estimated timescale April 2011.

Ultimately project monitoring meetings will be focussed on the exceptions in the meantime projects will be monitored based on a traffic light system, therefore identifying key, high risk schemes and any slippage.

The new database will be expected to provide :
Programme monitoring
Contract Payments
Issuing of contract documentation
Issue various reports including monthly monitoring reports

Responsible Officers: Phil Derbyshire/Paul Glowacki/ Steve Allwood

software won't be available until April 2011

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	30/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

Still to be implemented by Property team. There has been some adjustment to Architect's monitoring meetings but AMP pushing for traffic light system to be introduced.

AMP to discuss with Property and Architects at group meeting on 19 November.

Recommendation 6	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The internal billing process has been identified as a major cause of delay in the capital contract payment process. Delays have lead to key sources of funding being withdrawn which has meant that funds have had to be sourced from elsewhere to the detriment of other important capital projects.

We recommend that a formal structured process of billing is introduced, in consultation with the Oracle Project Board, so that internal recharges can be identified promptly after completion and handover of capital projects and journals can be raised promptly in order that internal funds are transferred without delay.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Gail Thornton	Action Date	31/03/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------	--------------------	------------

It should be noted that the accounting system and procurement process does not allow AMP to be responsible for the payments and billing process as orders are placed directly by Property Services. Property Services to be made clear of any time limited funding at the inception/briefing stage of a project. There is always a major focus by AMP on ensuring that spending forecasts are monitored as closely as possible in order to limit funding slippage.

The internal payments process links to the Transforming Derby Report on Internal billing. Philip Derbyshire to discuss the Internal Billing Report with Steven MacNamara to find out if the report has been completed.
 Property Services to look at a more proactive approach towards payment certificates
 Clear funding deadlines to be built into the clients brief
 Clear fee bids to be agreed at the beginning of project

Discussion to be had between AMP and Property Services regarding timely agreement and payment of final accounts.

Responsible Officers: Phil Derbyshire/Paul Glowacki/ Steve Allwood

Update Comments	Revised Action Date
------------------------	----------------------------

Property Team reported that maintenance charges are now being monitored before being passed to accountants and they are tightening up on regular processing of timesheets. Still a resources issue for processing charges but fees should be charged every three months to avoid block charging at end of financial year. Julie sends reminder to Paul and Phil at end of each quarter, asking for fees to be calculated and charged on larger projects. I'm not aware if there has been any consultation with the Oracle Project Board.

AMP to discuss with Property and Architects at group meeting on 19 November.

Children & Young People			
2047	Intergrated Disabled Childrens Service	Report Issued	22/10/2010

Recommendation 1	Significant	Action Status
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------

The Integrated Disabled Children's Service pooled fund accounts were not being audited and certified as required by the Partnership Agreement between Derby City Council and the Derby City PCT.

We recommend that the Head of the Integrated Disabled Children's Service arrange for the annual accounts to be audited by the Council's External Auditors, in conjunction with the Principal Accountant responsible for the pooled fund, and make arrangements for the certification of the annual return under Section 28(1)(d) of the Audit Commission Act 1998. The certified accounts should be made available to all partners upon receipt.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Libby Johnston	Action Date	20/12/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	----------------	--------------------	------------

It is proposed that at the next Pooled budget meeting, (26/10/10) the Head of Service and Principal Accountant will discuss with the PCT a waiver to this part of the agreement. Instructing an external audit will incur further costs and an increase in resources – both of which are under severe pressure in both the Council and the PCT. The pooled budget is already subject to scrutiny by the External Auditors on both sides.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date
------------------------	----------------------------

Recommendation 3	Merits Attention	Action Status
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------

Insurance cover was being provided for the Integrated Disabled Children's Service through the Council's blanket insurance policy but payer for this cover was not being re-charged to the pooled fund.

We recommend that the Principal Accountant responsible for the pooled fund contact the Council's Insurance Manager on an annual basis to find out the cost to the Council of providing insurance cover to the Integrated Disabled Children's Service. This cost should then be re-charge to the pooled fund in accordance with the Partnership Agreement between Derby City Council and the Derby City PCT.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Libby Johnston	Action Date	29/11/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	----------------	--------------------	------------

To be implemented as per recommendation by Elizabeth Johnson and Amy Goring.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date
------------------------	----------------------------

Recommendation 5 Merits Attention**Action Status**

Formal budgeting exercises were not being undertaken in conjunction with Derby City PCT and the budget was not being formally agreed with the Partnership Management Board.

We recommend that the Head of the Integrated Disabled Children's Service, in conjunction with the Principal Accountant responsible for the pooled fund, arrange for Derby City PCT to be involved in preparing the annual budget for the Integrated Disabled Children's Service and for this budget to be formally agreed by the Partnership Management Board at the start of each financial year.

Action Details **Responsible Officer** Libby Johnston **Action Date** 28/02/2011

To be implemented as per recommendation by Elizabeth Johnson, Denyse Freemantle and Amy Goring – detailed workings to be undertaken at pooled budget meetings and ratified at the Board meetings.

Update Comments**Revised Action Date**

2076	NI 085 - Post 16 participation in physical sciences	Report Issued	24/09/2010
-------------	--	----------------------	-------------------

Recommendation 1 Significant**Action Status**

The reported performance figures for 2009/10 had not been calculated in line with the required definition and had been incorrectly reported.

We recommend that the 14-19 Strategy Co-ordinator waits for the performance results for National Indicator 85 to be published by the Department for Education (DfE) on their website (usually in the January following the academic year) and for the performance figures relating to Derby City to be taken from this source and reported on the Performance Management System. This will ensure that the figures reported have been calculated in line with the required definition and negate the need for the performance figures to be independently reviewed by a separate officer before being reported. Evidence should be retained from the DfE website in the form of a screen print to support the reported performance figures, should the data be removed at a later date. Furthermore, the 14-19 Strategy Co-ordinator should contact the Performance Management Unit and arrange for the 2009/10 performance figures to be updated on the Performance Management System in line with those reported by the DfE.

Action Details **Responsible Officer** Graeme Ferguson **Action Date** 28/02/2011

To be implemented as per the recommendation.

Update Comments**Revised Action Date**

Recommendation 2 Significant**Action Status**

The Compiling Officer did not hold a copy of the definition for this indicator or have a documented methodology in place for deriving the performance figures, which resulted in incorrect performance figures being reported.

We recommend that the 14-19 Strategy Co-ordinator document the revised process for obtaining the performance figures from the Department for Education website and clearly explain the make up of the performance figures, the Council can then demonstrate that the process followed complies with the requirements of the definition. This methodology and an up-to-date copy of the definition for the indicator should be retained with the evidence supporting the reported performance figures.

Action Details **Responsible Officer** Graeme Ferguson **Action Date** 28/02/2011

To be implemented as per the recommendation.

Update Comments**Revised Action Date**

2077	NI 086 - Secondary schools standards of behaviour	Report Issued	18/08/2010
-------------	--	----------------------	-------------------

Recommendation 1 Merits Attention**Action Status**

Supporting documentation maintained by the Compiling Officer was not consistent with the performance figure reported in 2009/10 and the figure reported had been incorrectly rounded.

We recommend that clear unambiguous guidance be made available to the Compiling Officer to ensure that all calculations and working papers are conducted in line with the required definition and any supplementary guidance and that the reported performance figures are consistent with the figures calculated (Guidance can be provided by the Information Manager). We also suggest that the reported performance figure of 78% for 2009/10 be corrected on the Performance Management system to either 78.6% or 79%, in line with the requirements of the definition.

Action Details **Responsible Officer** Paul Davies **Action Date** 31/12/2010

To be implemented as per recommendation.

Update Comments**Revised Action Date**

Recommendation 2 Merits Attention**Action Status**

Performance figures were not being checked and authorised by the Accountable Officer.

We recommend that the Compiling Officer should be responsible for collating the performance data and calculating the performance figure and the Accountable Officer should be responsible for the independent review of these figures and sign and date supporting documentation to evidence that the review has been undertaken prior to the figures being reported on the Performance Management System.

Action Details**Responsible Officer**

Paul Davies

Action Date

31/12/2010

To be implemented as per recommendation.

Update Comments**Revised Action Date****Neighbourhoods****984 Museums 2009-10****Report Issued**

14/05/2010

Recommendation 4 Significant**Action Status Being Implemented**

Electronic environmental monitoring systems were not operating effectively throughout the whole museum network and results were not being acted on.

We recommend that robust systems for monitoring the environmental conditions of objects in storage are implemented throughout the museum network.

Action Details**Responsible Officer**

Stuart Gillis

Action Date

31/07/2010

Roger Shelley to set out short term changes to systems to address this recommendation. Further to the above, broader issues about environmental monitoring will be considered in the New Approach to Collections Management (by March 2011), including: the potential to reduce closed storage, eliminating un-used collections, bringing more objects into the public realm

Update Comments**Revised Action Date**

01/04/2011

Update from the Museum on 15 Sept 10 - Works currently taking place within the Museum & Art Gallery. The monitoring system will then be addressed and implemented by March 2011. Responsible officer Roger Shelley.

Recommendation 5 Merits Attention**Action Status Being Implemented**

Certain areas used for storage were either overcrowded, not fit for purpose or inadequately maintained.

We recommend that the Head of Museums review the storage areas with a view to freeing up space through employing better storage solutions which improve the conditions in which objects are stored. In particular, storage areas should be well organised and clean with suitable racking, boxing and labelling, with spare capacity for incoming objects.

Action Details**Responsible Officer**

Stuart Gillis

Action Date

28/02/2011

This issue is being directly addressed in the emerging Museums Service strategy (to be completed in July 2010). A full review of the storage areas will be completed and reported in the New Approach to Collections Management (by March 2011).

Update Comments**Revised Action Date**

01/04/2011

Update from the Museum on 15 Sept 10 - As part of the proposed new imperative to use collections and eliminate un-used collections, the Museums Service will move towards a planned approach to reduce its requirement for closed storage and will investigate purpose built, out of town locations for residual storage requirements. Implementation March 2011. Responsible officer Roger Shelley.

Recommendation 17 Significant**Action Status**

The MODES database did not provide a comprehensive register of all objects in the museums ownership and up to date valuations were unavailable for the objects known to the museum.

We recommend that the Head of Museums urgently review the way in which the museum account for the objects in its collection and undertake the valuation of objects in order to satisfy the requirements of the Council's Financial Accounts and the Council's Insurers, which are as follows: The Accounting Standards Board require the Council to value heritage assets on a current cost basis, on a five year rolling programme, for them to be included on the balance sheet and are issuing new standards on Heritage Assets. The Council are required by the Insurers to have a comprehensive register of all objects insured, with up to date insurance valuations, and insurance cover would be limited to the items listed and valuations stated.

Action Details**Responsible Officer**

Stuart Gillis

Action Date

28/02/2011

The Museums Service will set out the way in which this issue can be addressed that fulfils the requirements of the Accounting Standards Board and the Council insurers whilst also not necessitating a significant increase in budgets in order to determine and maintain valuations.

The issue will be addressed as part of the production of the plan to implement the New Approach to Collections Management as set out in report: The Future of Derby Museums Service (April 2010).

Update Comments**Revised Action Date**

999	Planning & Building Control Fees	Report Issued	02/03/2010
------------	---	----------------------	-------------------

Recommendation 2	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

There was no plan of action or written procedures in place to deal with an emergency call should a member of staff working behind Roman House Reception activate the panic alarm.

We recommend that an action plan and written procedures are developed so that appropriate action is taken should the panic alarm be activated. We also recommend that a more appropriate person is informed of the situation and they are suitably trained in dealing with such circumstances.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Kate Neale	Action Date	01/04/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	------------	--------------------	------------

A meeting with Carol Gothard and Chriss Smythe to discuss this has been held. Chriss is preparing a report for DMT. Once this has been to DMT, we shall develop an action plan and written procedures. □ Responsible Officer: Carol Gothard, Senior Receptionist

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	30/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

In the light of the forthcoming decant and the alteration of the reception services within Heritage Gate a risk assessment has been completed by the reception staff with their line manager.

A written procedure has been agreed on the actions to be taken should an emergency arise at Roman House reception.

Discussions on the operational requirements of the procedure have taken place between the Interim Head of Business Support and the Facilities Manager and it is anticipated that full implementation was planned for mid-October (following DECANT) but further changes with Business Support have now put this back to end of April 2011.

Recommendation 4	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Finance (R&C) did not maintain a key register to evidence who had responsibility for the safe key.

We recommend that Finance introduces a key register to officially evidence the responsible officer for the possession of the safe key. Ideally the register should cover one key and the second, spare key should be retained by an independent officer, away from the office, which could be retrieved in emergencies.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Kate Neale	Action Date	01/04/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	------------	--------------------	------------

A key register will be introduced for the main key. We would prefer for the second key to be maintained by the Finance Administrator rather than 3rd party. This ensures that the spare key remains held by an authorised cash handling officer. □ As the reception team also have a safe, we propose to implement a similar arrangement for the reception team. □ Responsible Officer: Alison Charman, Finance Administrator

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	30/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

This issue has been discussed and an informal rota system is in operation for the safe keys.

Following the decant the teams responsible for petty cash and therefore keys will be changing and will come under Business Support. This change is likely to be introduced in April 2011.

Recommendation 6	Merits Attention	Action Status
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------

Building Regulation applicants are not reminded to submit proof of their disability to verify they are entitled to claim an exemption either on the application forms or on the exemption information on the charges document. Similarly, Building Control does not pursue, in all cases, any verification to validate the exemption claimed.

We recommend that Building Control staff provide evidence to validate an applicant's claim for a disabled exemption. This should explain why the exemption is valid and should provide details of who completed this check. Building Control section should consider not processing applications until such verification has been completed.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mick Henman	Action Date	01/04/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------	--------------------	------------

To inform agents/applicants that we require justification for disabled exemptions. Any anomalies for this process are to be referred to Mick Watts, Access Officer. □ Responsible Officer, Salinda Kaur, Business Co-ordinator

Update Comments	Revised Action Date
------------------------	----------------------------

No responses received to email reminders.

859	Trading Standards	Report Issued	26/05/2009
------------	--------------------------	----------------------	-------------------

Recommendation 4	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Checks were not being undertaken on the content or the accuracy of the data recorded in the APP system, other than for general completeness.

We recommend that the Team Leader of the Inspections Team arrange for monthly checks to be undertaken of the data recorded in the APP system to ensure that it is fit for purpose and that it correlates with other records held by Trading Standards. These checks can be conducted on a sample basis but should be documented and records should be signed and dated by the officer(s) conducting the review. The Team Leader should formally report any key findings to the Trading Standards Manager.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Julian Demowbray	Action Date	31/08/2009
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------	-------------------

Monthly checks will be incorporated into the team leader's 1:1 meetings with staff and will now also form part of the team's internal audit programme. They will be recorded as recommended in ref. 4. Outcomes will be discussed at team leader's 1:1 meetings with Trading Standards Manager and reported quarterly to Management Team

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/12/2010
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

Not actioned yet. IT problems have prevented installation of APP upgrade software, which needs to be done before recommendation can be implemented. APP upgrades are imminent however and this should be implemented by the end of the financial year.

Jun 10 - Update from Julian DeMowbray, for recommendations 2 and 4, we need to do some more work and I'd suggest revised target dates of 30 Sept 2010 and 31 Dec 2010 respectively.

Resources			
949	Back-up Procedures & Security	Report Issued	19/07/2010

Recommendation 1	Significant	Action Status
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------

The back-up policy had not been formally agreed with the Council and vital information was missing from the policy itself. If the missing information is not included in the report there is a risk that it will not be actioned due to a lack of guidance.

We recommend that IT Management liaise with Serco to update the back-up policy to include guidance on the following: □ Tape Cleaning. □ Back-up Device Management. □ Responsibilities. □ Media Management. □ Back-up Checks. □ Destruction Procedures. □ Retention Policy. □ Systems Information. □ Back-up Schedule. □ The amended policy should then be formally agreed with the Council.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Miles Peters	Action Date	30/09/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------

We will review the current back-up policy with Serco and agree any changes with an appropriate sign off

Update Comments	Revised Action Date
------------------------	----------------------------

Update from MP 09/02/2011 - No Action to Date

Recommendation 2	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Business System Administrators had not been consulted on the formation of the back-up schedule. This could result in data loss if a restore from back-up is required but the restoration period is not available.

We recommend that an assessment of the back-up schedule is carried out by ICT management in conjunction with business systems administrators to ensure that each server is contained within the back-up schedule and that the back-up schedule for each system is suitable to the needs of that system.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Lynda Innocent	Action Date	31/12/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------	-------------------

The Systems Administrators will be asked to validate the appropriateness of the back-up arrangements for the systems on the Critical Systems list.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	30/06/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

2010	Council Tax 2009-10	Report Issued	11/06/2010
-------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------

Recommendation 1 Merits Attention

Action Status

An account review had not been undertaken in accordance with a system prompt, which resulted in a student discount being awarded for a longer period than was necessary.

We recommend that student discounts/exemptions are flagged with both review dates and expected end of course dates. Review dates should be set to pre-date the expiry date by approximately 3 months to establish whether any changes in circumstances would require the end date to be revised. This would ensure that if reviews are not undertaken the discount would be cancelled at the agreed end date and would prompt the student to inform the Council of any changes in circumstances which would require the discount to continue.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	John Massey	Action Date	31/07/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------	--------------------	------------

Accepted. A review date can be entered into the Academy system and then a report can be run containing all the accounts with a review date ☐

There are insufficient resources within the Council Tax team to perform a check of every account with a review but sample checking will commence. If sample checking highlights problems then more detailed checking will take place.

Update Comments

Revised Action Date

Spoke with John Massey 8/3/11 and he promised to provide feedback ASAP

Recommendation 2 Merits Attention

Action Status

System access rights allocated to staff administering council tax on Academy were not subject to regular checks by management for assurance that they were appropriate for the tasks expected to be undertaken within the role.

We recommend that a list of staff access rights is obtained from business systems team and reviewed on a periodic basis by Council Tax Management.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	John Massey	Action Date	30/06/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------	--------------------	------------

Accepted – a list of access rights for the Academy system has been produced and will be completed by 30 June 2010. Future reviews will be undertaken every six months

Update Comments

Revised Action Date

Spoke with JM as above

Recommendation 3 Merits Attention

Action Status

There was no evidence that the council tax suspense account managed by the Revenues Control Officer was subject to an independent overview by management.

We recommend that the Head of Exchequer Services introduces a process for evidencing management oversight of the operation of the Council tax suspense account.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	John Massey	Action Date	01/06/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------	--------------------	------------

Accepted - Random checks will be performed monthly by the Income & Post Manager to check that items cleared out of suspense have been correctly allocated. Relevant records will be kept. This will be implemented with immediate effect.

Update Comments

Revised Action Date

Spoke with JM as above

Recommendation 4 Merits Attention

Action Status

A liability order on an arrears account had been automatically withdrawn when the balance outstanding was written off in error. The balance was subsequently reinstated but the liability not restarted, leaving the amount outstanding with no recovery action.

We recommend that a list of accounts which have recently had the recovery process stopped or liability orders withdrawn is produced on a regular basis using a query from the Academy Recovery toolbox and checked for confirmation that the stop is valid.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	John Massey	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------	--------------------	------------

Recommendation not accepted. It is rare that debts are written back onto accounts so the recommendation is deemed excessive.

☐ Alternative Solution ☐ We will talk to the Business Systems team to determine how we can identify all accounts that have a write-on. If such accounts can be identified then a report will be run listing all accounts with a write-on to check that the original recovery stage has been reinstated.

Update Comments

Revised Action Date

Spoke with JM as above.

2014	Creditors - 2009-10	Report Issued	03/08/2010
-------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------

Recommendation 3	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Consolidated invoicing was being used to allocate costs to different budgets, where a service had been provided by a different Council department on behalf of the budget holders, but this then required the approval of each service specific budget holder before the invoice could be paid.

We recommend that where there has been one order and one invoice for goods or services provided across the Council that this is processed as a conventional invoice and not as a consolidated invoice. The allocation of costs to the budget holders should then be processed through journal entries by Corporate Finance. This will ensure that invoice payments are not delayed and that the officers approving the invoice have the information necessary to verify the payment.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	John Massey	Action Date	31/12/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------------

The TSC Project Team have been looking into this issue and this is due to be discussed at the next Accounts Progress Improvement Group (APIG), due in August 2010, with a view to where the re-allocation of postings will sit. We are looking into a way to enable the invoices to be authorised by the Council department who have provided the service and for the costs to be re-allocated within the Accounts Payable system.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	30/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

Update - A Charman - Mar 11 - The whole AP function will be brought together in April 2011, following the TSC Review, at which point all such invoices will all be processed and the allocation of costs will be processed by Finance as journals.

Recommendation 6	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Procedural guidance notes had not been prepared to instruct officers involved in the processing and approval of consolidated invoices, in the appropriate control processes.

We recommend that the External Payments Manager arrange for procedural guidance notes to be produced for users of the Accounts Payable system on the processing of consolidated invoices, in conjunction with TSC Project group, and be disseminated to all relevant officers without delay. Guidance should instruct all officers responsible for preparing invoices for payment to identify the names of potential authorisers and direct authorising officers to enter the reason for rejecting payments in the payment rejection comments box on the Accounts Payable system.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	John Massey	Action Date	30/09/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------------

It should be noted that both Business Systems (July and August 2009) and the External Payments Manager (September 2009) have previously issued instructions via e-mail, see below. The content of these e-mails will be written into the existing procedural guidance and posted on Derbynet.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	30/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

Update - A Charman - Mar 11 - This will be written into the procedural guidance by the end of April 11.

Recommendation 9	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

There were no exception reports to identify suppliers recently set up or amended on the Accounts Payable system in order to facilitate a suitable sample for checking.

We recommend that a bespoke system report be generated to list all suppliers who have either been set up or amended since the previous report and for the report to be run on a weekly basis. This report should then be used by the Accounts Payable Team Leader to select a suitable sample of suppliers to be checked through their existing process.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	John Massey	Action Date	30/09/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------------

Accepted. These points will be raised with the Business Systems Manager and a further update will be provided.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/05/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

Update - A Charman - Mar 11 - This will be actioned by the end of May 2011

Recommendation 12	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
--------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Electronic payment files were not being authorised prior to their submission to the Business Systems team to be processed on the Accounts Payable system.

We recommend that the Business Systems team only accept electronic payment files forwarded from the designated budget holder or an officer with delegated responsibility. To ensure that the officer requesting the non-invoice payments has the required authority, a list of officer who can request non-invoice payments should be maintained by Business Systems for reference purposes.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	John Massey	Action Date	30/09/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------------

Accepted. These points will be raised with the Business Systems Manager and a further update will be provided.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/05/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

Update from Ali Charman - Nov 10 - Only the Business Systems Team accept the submission of electronic payment files.

Update from Ali Charman - Nov 10 - The AP Manager will look to address this issue in conjunction with Wendy Hooley by the end of May 2011

Recommendation 14	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
--------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Effective systems were not in place to ensure that invoices had been scanned onto the Accounts Payable system to be scrutinised prior to electronic invoice approval.

We recommend that the External Payment Manager liaises with the TSC Project group who are presently reviewing external payments and impress upon them the importance of having adequate resources and robust systems in place for scanning documents onto the Accounts Payable system to ensure that the authorisation of electronic payments are not unduly delayed and that officers have had sight of the invoice before approving them for payment.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	John Massey	Action Date	31/12/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------	--------------------	------------

Agreed. Scanning and workflow will be a major part of the TSC centralisation of the Creditors function. This will be addressed as part of the centralisation of the team at Heritage Gate in December 2010.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	30/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

Update - A Charman - Mar 11 - All invoices will be scanned into the system in their entirety by the end of April 2011

889	Debtors 2008-9	Report Issued	27/10/2009
------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------

Recommendation 2	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The AR module cannot be configured to enforce a separation of duties which ensures that the person who raises the original invoice is unable to raise a credit note against that invoice.

We recommend that the Head of Business Systems evaluates 3rd party software (such as CaoSys) which can enhance Oracle's functionality. We understand this product may be used to enforce an appropriate separation of duties via system controls. If the enforcement of an appropriate separation of duties by 3rd party software is either not practical or not cost effective, the Revenues Manager should devise a manual process for approving credit notes for those users who can raise a credit note against an invoice that they had previously raised. The Revenues Manager should undertake random checks to ensure that credit notes processed have been appropriately approved.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	John Massey	Action Date	31/10/2009
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------	--------------------	------------

Software Supplier (as mentioned in Audit recommendation) will be working with Business Systems on the proposed solution. Proposed implementation date of 31/10/09. In terms of the External Payments Manager/ Revenues Manager devising a manual process of approving credit notes, this presents practical difficulties. Between April to August 2009 670 credit notes were raised. Any documentary evidence of these will be held at the Department where the transaction was completed. As such any such checks will need to be undertaken by Officers in Departments. Email sent to Carolyn Wright (14/09/09) requesting that this is added to the agenda of the Heads of Finance Meeting

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	30/09/2010
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

We have undertaken an initial review of the CoaSys product and hope to make a decision before the end of November as to whether we will be pursuing this option.

Jan update We have taken the decision not to pursue the CaoSys product because implementing this will mean that we have to licence the database on a different basis that would be very prohibitive.

Update 16/03/2010 This item is still outstanding. It was hoped for an IT solution to this recommendation but this is not deliverable. We are now looking to amend working practice via the TSC review, recommending that Credit Note processing should be undertaken centrally. Implementation date 30 Sept 2010. Response 15/10/10 In the Audit report this was put in the hands of Business Systems with regards to the software, I am afraid that this is as much as I have been told so I cannot supply anymore information than you already have. However people can still raise invoices and credit notes so nothing has changed as yet.

However at this year's audit it was decided that I would inform staff that they can only raise a credit note against the invoice it was made for and not a credit memo against any invoice. I am going to ask systems if they can take away the ability for staff to raise credit memos. So this will help a little at least they will only be raising it against the correct invoice and not any invoice. But with regards to taking the facility away totally that still sits with Business Systems.

update 04/02/11 When Oracle came in the other day I asked them if they could prevent people raising credit notes who raised invoices. They said that they would look into it but did not hold out much hope as it would probably prevent people from raising invoices.

Recommendation 4	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Periodic statements were not being sent to appropriate debtors to allow them to confirm the transactions and balances on their accounts.

We recommend that the Revenues Manager, in conjunction with the relevant Service Heads, determine which of the recurring debtors would benefit from receiving a periodic statement of account, determine an appropriate schedule for each and provide an appropriate independent contact point for any queries. This process should be commenced at the earliest possible juncture.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	John Massey	Action Date	31/03/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------	--------------------	------------

Statements are not routinely sent out as they can only be produced by customer number. This means production on an ad-hoc account basis or a range of account numbers. The proposal was taken to the Oracle Board in September 2008, however the Board dismissed the idea. It is assumed that this recommendation is only applicable to those clients receiving periodic invoices, i.e. Estate Rents, Market Traders etc. It is proposed to include this issue in future consultation exercises with clients to identify if there is a demand for such functionality.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	30/09/2010
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

16/03/2010 As reported previously Oracle functionality does not allow the production of statements by client type. Investigations are ongoing regarding moving certain client types to annual billing ie Market Traders/Estate Rents. Implementation date 30 Sept 2010. Response 15/10/10 This again is an Oracle function and has not been actioned. Currently Oracle does not have the functionality to produce statements as requested so this would mean an update to the system.

Nothing has happened with this and I am not aware of changes for the immediate future.

965	Disciplinary & Dismissals Policy	Report Issued	20/01/2010
------------	---	----------------------	-------------------

Recommendation 2	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Although the provision whereby the Council can access pension contributions was used rarely, we would expect to find mention of this in the Policy or management guidance, so a potential wrong-doer could not claim that they did not know they were jeopardising their future pension. We recommend that a note about this provision be included in the revised policy, together with guidance as to when, or if, it is appropriate to exercise this power. The authority will also have to ensure that it records what the decision was in respect of the pension and the authority for that decision, as this will be required by the pension authority should an appeal against the access be submitted.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------

Recourse to this is too rare an event to be written into policy. Should be considered in the light of the offence and the outcome of the process. To include a reference in the management guidance - this will be made available for reference by all staff on the Intranet.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

date extended. The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in drawing up the new guidance. The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

Recommendation 3	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The Council has a self-imposed restriction on which officers can be involved in the disciplinary and dismissals process, including the appeal stage which required Members to be involved.

We recommend that a review of responsibility levels be undertaken to bring the Council into line with other authorities, and to expand the potential pool of officers and, if appropriate, reduce the level of Member involvement in the process.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------

We are already looking to do this in schemes of delegation but may be influenced by 2nd and 3rd tier restructure.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

date extended. The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in the procedure re-write which will follow the revision of the policy. The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

Recommendation 4	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The Council may be challenged over its approach to "spent" warnings.

We recommend that the reasoning behind being able to refer to expired warnings for possible internal promotions in the future needs to be clearly explained, both in the policy and in the contents of any formal warnings so that the employee is aware that their behaviour may impact on their future beyond the expiry of the warning period. Consideration also needs to be given to the time limits applied to warnings, and to whether some roles within the authority should be classed as outside the scope of ignoring past disciplinary action (e.g. roles dealing with vulnerable adults or children when the subject has been disciplined for inappropriate behaviour in the past).

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------

For inclusion in management guidance re wording of letters.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

date extended. The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in the procedure re-write which will follow the revision of the policy. The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

Recommendation 5	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The references to cumulative misconduct in the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy were sparse and unclear.

We recommend that a deeper explanation of this concept be given in the proposed Investigation Handbook with expanded guidance on how to deal with repeated disciplinarys.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------	--------------------	------------

To be included in management guidance.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

date extended . The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in the procedure re-write which will follow the revision of the policy.

The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

Recommendation 6	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The policy states that the grounds for suspension have to be given to the employee.

We recommend that an initial suspension pending investigation pro forma letter be created in line with the existing policy. This could be used under clearly specified circumstances, with rules being drawn up as to how long such a suspension may last prior to the grounds being provided to the employee. This will simplify the process of an immediate suspension and still meet the ACAS Code. This should also outline the actions which will be taken should the terms of the suspension be breached.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------	--------------------	------------

To be included in management guidance

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

date extended . The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in the procedure re-write which will follow the revision of the policy.

The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

Recommendation 7	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The Disciplinary and Dismissals Procedure gives guidance on a limited level of delay to be permitted within the process when the subject calls in sick.

We recommend that investigators are reminded of this 14 day provision prior to requesting advice from the Occupational Health Service. Only where the Occupational Health Service confirms that the subject is not fit to attend should the hearing be delayed.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------	--------------------	------------

To be included in management guidance

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

date extended . The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in the procedure re-write which will follow the revision of the policy.

The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

Recommendation 8	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The Disciplinary and Dismissals policy does not include any guidance on what action should be taken if an investigation subject offers their resignation part-way through the process.

We recommend that full guidance be provided together with the requirement for the decision reached, as to whether to accept the resignation to be fully documented.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------	--------------------	------------

To be included in management guidance

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

date extended . The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in the procedure re-write which will follow the revision of the policy.

The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

Recommendation 9	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Appointed investigating officers have no formal support mechanism in place, to help them undertake a fair, consistent and thorough investigation.

We recommend that a corporate support mechanism be put in place where an investigating officer can go for help, advice, technical information and support. This support mechanism would include the monitoring and overview of all cases by HR to ensure that all administrative requirements are met and to ensure that the process is kept on track by highlighting deadlines for actions. Centrally provided support can also improve consistency of approach across the authority and give all staff a sense of managerial ownership which will build confidence in the process. Consideration needs to be given to assessing whether the investigation relates to a financial irregularity, in which case an initial reference to Internal Audit needs to be included in the procedure. As part of this refresher training, we also recommend that support be given to individual investigators though being able to consult with more experienced colleagues who would act as mentors. By meeting regularly, good practice can be shared, lessons learned from past investigations and any policy or procedural issues highlighted so that these can be addressed and rectified by HR. Post investigation review should be undertaken by corporate HR, the investigating officer, the Chair of the Hearing and any other involved parties to develop a "lessons learned log" to assist in future investigations.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------

The actual form of the support available will depend on the outcome of the HR review and the subsequent capacity and priorities for HR. At present we do not have clear knowledge of what resources will be available so this will need to be revisited. Also, as Investigations are identified, there is currently uncertainty as to whether they will be allocated to investigators on a departmental or a rota basis.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

date extended. The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in the procedure re-write which will follow the revision of the policy. The support mechanism required will depend on the revised procedures.

The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

Recommendation 10	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
--------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Although the training given to investigators described standard investigative documents such as witness statements and investigation reports no samples were provided.

We recommend that an Investigation Handbook which can be used for reference or as a workbook should be developed. This should also include: Comprehensive guidance for the subject of the investigation covering all aspects of the process, as well as for the investigating officer, to ensure openness and transparency of process. A set of templates and pro formas be drawn up to ensure consistency between investigations, following known best practice as in PACE and give confirmation to the investigator that all aspects of the process have been covered. This would also include a log of all decisions made, giving the reasons, during the lifetime of the investigation.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------

In principle yes but finding resources to do this may be problematic.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

date extended. The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in the procedure re-write which will follow the revision of the policy.

The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

Recommendation 11	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
--------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Although a pool of 18 trained investigators was established in 2006, there have been no new additions to that pool since then.

We recommend that: An assessment is carried out to establish an optimum number of trained investigators and that more trained investigators are recruited to meet this requirement. Regular refresher training sessions should be set up, along the lines of the refreshers under the Recruitment and Selection Procedure to maintain the skills of the investigators. This can be an opportunity for investigators to raise issues where there may be problems in operating the procedure or where they are finding difficulty with any aspect of the process.

We also recommend that criteria are set to recruit new investigators to the pool.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------

Accepted in principle but may have significant budget resource implications. If it is identified as a budget priority funds may be made available to buy this in otherwise would have to be requested from Employee development team.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

date extended. The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in the procedure re-write which will follow the revision of the policy.

The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

Recommendation 12	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
--------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The Council has not developed a standard method of case analysis to assist investigators in establishing what aspects of the investigation they should focus on.

We recommend that a standard method of case analysis is developed and included in the training of investigators.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------	--------------------	------------

Accepted in principle but may have significant budget resource implications. If it is identified as a budget priority funds may be made available to buy this in otherwise would have to be requested from Employee development team.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

date extended . The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in the procedure re-write which will follow the revision of the policy.

The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

Recommendation 13	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
--------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Investigators may know that there is specialist help available to them in their task, but may be unaware of where to find that help.

We recommend that as part of the investigation handbook a reference section gives guidance on where to find the specialist advice and help particularly as this can be found in-house and is therefore less expensive to the authority.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------	--------------------	------------

To be included in management guidance

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

date extended . The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in the procedure re-write which will follow the revision of the policy.

The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

Recommendation 14	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
--------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The unstructured nature of personal files makes them difficult to interrogate and leads to irrelevant data being made available when a file is required by an investigator.

We recommend that the personal files be structured in such a way that investigators, managers and auditors are able to access only the relevant parts of the files for their purposes.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------	--------------------	------------

Personal file structure is under review as part of the HR review, Access is covered by a separate policy Access to Personal Files currently being revised by the ESC

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

date extended . The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in the procedure re-write which will follow the revision of the policy.

The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

Recommendation 15	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
--------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The Council does not provide investigating officers with guidance as to where information can be gathered, including the personal file of the investigation subject.

We recommend that a specific instruction to check the subject's personal file should be included, and that a protocol be established such that once an investigation is initiated, any information requested by the investigating officer be provided without delay. An "access to information" protocol needs to be established giving the investigating officer rights of access to information.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------	--------------------	------------

To be included in management guidance

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

date extended . The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in the procedure re-write which will follow the revision of the policy.

The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

Recommendation 16	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
--------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The Council has not provided investigating officers with any guidance on briefing colleagues about their responsibilities in relation to a fellow employee under investigation.

We recommend that the Investigation handbook includes set guidance on briefing the colleagues of the suspended employee at all stages of the process from the initial suspension to the post-hearing actions, so that they are reassured and a clear and honest message is given.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Mark Edwards	Action Date	31/08/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------

To be included in management guidance

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

date extended . The updating of the Disciplinary and Dismissals Policy is to be included in a revision and rewriting of an extended group of policies (including grievance, Improving Employee Performance and Probation) and this is a much bigger task than initially estimated. The policy and procedure elements are to be separated and the policy elements are undergoing work with consultation in Autumn 2010 and implementation due 1/4/2011. This recommendation will be taken into account in the procedure re-write which will follow the revision of the policy.

The revised policy has been put into effect with effect from 1 February 2011. The guidance which will follow shortly will address this issue.

882	Environmental Services HR-Payroll	Report Issued	30/10/2009
------------	--	----------------------	-------------------

Recommendation 7	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

A separate report on variations to pay was not being produced or distributed in Environmental Services for verification by Service managers.

We recommend that, as it is intended that individual service managers will be responsible for monitoring establishment data, processes should be put in place in the ESC to ensure that changes to standing data, such as new starters, are reported to those service managers. As the service manager would be the creator of changes, they would therefore be best placed to check that the amendment has been processed correctly. Reports should be distributed regularly and discrepancies investigated.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Nigel Dowey	Action Date	31/12/2009
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------------

This recommendation will be carried out in full. Officer responsible for action – Mark Snape.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/03/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

As for rec 6 above

16/09/10 ND - this recommendation will be implemented as part of a bigger project. ND is currently implementing a project that allows Managers to self serve. Variations will be included in the management information alert that will be highlighted to individual managers to allow them to monitor their staff's variation to pay. (see email 16/09/10)

860	Fixed Asset Register	Report Issued	30/09/2009
------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------

Recommendation 4	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

There were no documented procedures relating to the compilation of the fixed asset records and evidence of write-offs had not been retained by the Capital Team.

We recommend that the Principal Capital Accountant arrange for procedural guidance notes to be prepared for the maintenance of the Capital Team's fixed asset records which incorporate the required processes for the disposal, write-off or transfer of assets. These guidance notes should be distributed to all relevant officers to ensure that standard processes are followed. The Capital Team should ensure that all supporting evidence is retained in respect of any changes to their fixed asset records.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Nicola Goodacre	Action Date	30/10/2009
-----------------------	----------------------------	------------------------	--------------------	-------------------

As per Nicola Goodacre, Group Accountant (Capital). In line with external audit recommendations documented procedures on the maintenance of the asset register including responsibilities will be produced and issued to estates and all departments maintaining a departmental register.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

We have had various updates on this issue from Carolyn Wright, Chloe Kenny and Nicola Goodacre since the original action date passed on 30 October 2009. These updates have described actions being taken at the time, not always relevant to this recommendation, but have failed to address the control weakness.

Update - Carolyn Wright - Jun 10 - As we have had to develop a new asset register system the focus and priority has had to be to get this tested and working for the 2009/10 annual accounts. Having gone through this process and now fully understanding all the requirements of the asset register formal procedure notes for the on-going maintenance of the system will now be finalised. This could not have been completed until we had gone through the development phase.

Last Update - Oct 10 - This was not completed by the specified date as closedown and external audit took precedence. The procedure notes are now currently underway.

Recommendation 5	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Art gallery and museums exhibits (heritage assets) had not been valued recently to enable them to be recorded in the Council's fixed asset records.

We recommend that the Capital Team request that the Head of Museums considers arranging for all significant heritage assets, not purchased within the last five years, to be valued. Further to this, a five year rolling programme of re-valuations should be considered for all significant heritage assets, which could be fed into the Council fixed asset and insurance records.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Nicola Goodacre	Action Date	25/09/2009
-----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------	------------

As per Nicola Goodacre, Group Accountant (Capital). Formal notification to be sent to the head of museums to instruct them to have the significant items of heritage assets properly valued and to continue this on a 5 year rolling programme to be added to the central asset register as soon as is practically possible.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

We have had various updates on this issue from Carolyn Wright and Nicola Goodacre since the original action date passed on 25 September 2009. These updates have described actions being taken at the time, not always relevant to this recommendation, but have failed to address the control weakness.

Last Update from Martyn Marples - Sept 10 - The Museum Service is in the process of assessing and valuing their assets for future inclusion in the asset register and for insurance valuation purposes. This is expected to be completed in February 2011. Following this review, the assets which have been valued will be included in the FAR, and subsequent valuations will be included in the year they are re-valued. An early indication of the assets which will need to be considered in the FAR, as part of the 2010/11 statement of accounts, will be reviewed with the Museum Service in March 2011

2013	Fixed Assets 2009-10	Report Issued	29/07/2010
-------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	------------

Recommendation 3	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

There were no robust processes or documented guidance in place which covered the treatment of assets that have been acquired at nil cost

We recommend that the Capital Team consider the process for identifying and recording assets that have been bequeathed or donated. We also suggest that the process be documented.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Nicola Goodacre	Action Date	30/09/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------	------------

Nil cost fixed asset transactions occur only on a very exceptional basis. In most cases, these are identified via the regular liaison between the Capital Accountancy and Legal departments. This issue is therefore not considered to be a significant control weakness. ☐ Actions Agreed ☐ Details of the requirements for identifying and recording nil cost fixed assets will be included within the fixed asset procedure notes currently under development. Proformas will also be developed for completion by the legal department / departmental accountancy teams to formalise the collection of this information.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/03/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

Response from Nicola Goodacre: Proformas have been developed and are awaiting comments from AMG to then post as web ADI forms. Procedure notes are in progress.

31/3/11 deadline

2044	IT Hardware Inventory Control	Report Issued	30/11/2010
-------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------	------------

Recommendation 1	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The Council had not assigned overall responsibility for inventory management to an individual officer. Currently, departmental ITLO's were expected to verify that the inventory was accurate in their departments, but the ITLO's did not have to sign acceptance that a quarterly verification had taken place.

We recommend management seeks to: ☐ Formally assign overall responsibility for inventory management to an individual officer. ☐ Introduce a procedure whereby the responsible officer ensures departmental ITLO's sign acceptance on a quarterly basis that they have audited the inventory for there departments, and retain the signed acceptance for accountability purposes. ☐ Ensure the responsible officer sends out on a quarterly basis a list of all devices that have not connected to the corporate Network in 60 says and requests that the ITLO responsible in that area documents reasons why the device has not connected in 60 days.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Nick O'Reilly	Action Date	31/12/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------	--------------------	------------

Assign to the ICT Contracts Officer for laptops and desktops; to the Voice Network Manager for mobile telephony ☐ A quarterly review proces to be implemented that checks notifications received and undertakes a random 10% sample check. ☐ The ICT Contracts officer to introduce a notification procedure supported by on line forms and paper templates that allows line managers to record and notify ICT when computer devices are retrieved from staff such that: ☐ Any local transfer of the device is noted with the asset tag and the member of staff the device has been reassigned to ☐ Any requirement to dispose of the device is noted, allowing for such disposal to be arranged ☐ If the device is surplus to requirements in one section it can be assessed and if still fit for use can be reassigned to another section, thus avoiding redundant costs. ☐ All line managers will be formally reminded it is their responsibility to manage computer devices assigned to their section/staff; and specifically to ensure such devices including computers and mobile telephony devices are retrieved when staff leave. Line Mangers have a duty to notify the ICT service such that the inventory can be maintained and any devices no longer required can have data securely removed and any costs associated with their use (e.g. line rental or costs per device under the SERCO contract) be cancelled. Failure of line managers to undertake such could result in the line manager being responsible for any costs incurred, including any penalties for non compliance with the Data Protection Act. ☐ ICT Contracts officer to draft the procedure and the appropriate forms and to issue an email to all staff advising them of such. ☐ All line managers will be to understand and comply with their responsibility and to be aware that failure to do so will leave them liable to both explain any discrepancies in the inventory and for any redundant costs incurred.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/03/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

Recommendation 2	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Departmental ITLO's were being asked to undertake physical inventory checks, but these checks were not being evidenced and a recent investigation of discrepancies demonstrated that if any such checks were being undertaken, they were ineffective.

We recommend that management assigns formal responsibility to a single officer for ensuring that the Council's IT hardware inventory is complete, accurate and up-to-date. This officer should work with the departmental ITLO's to reconcile the whole inventory at least annually. Formal records of the checks that have been undertaken should be maintained to evidence the verification and reconciliation process.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Nick O'Reilly	Action Date	31/12/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------	--------------------	------------

Agreed that the co-ordination of such should rest with a single officer and assigned to the ICT contract officer; however that is in context of the actions detailed against Recommendation 1 and the understanding that ownership and responsibility equally rests with line managers and they need to comply with the notification procedures.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/03/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

Recommendation 4	Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The IT hardware inventory was not always being appropriately updated to reflect movements/amendments and disposals. Audit's investigation demonstrated that the current inventory was not an accurate reflection of the Council's current IT equipment.

We recommend that management produces procedural guidance notes which adequately describe the process for maintaining an accurate IT hardware inventory. It should clearly explain the relevant responsibilities of each officer involved in the process (i.e. the employee who the equipment has been assigned to, the departmental ITLO, the Council officer responsible for maintaining the IT hardware inventory). The guidance should include pro-forma documents to be used to record and inform the Council officer responsible for maintaining the IT hardware inventory about any additions, changes or disposals that should be reflected on the inventory.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Nick O'Reilly	Action Date	31/12/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------	--------------------	------------

Agreed we need to draft the required policies, procedures and forms and to implement these. ☐ In relation to devices being moved from one department to another, this equally applies if equipment is being re-assigned within a department or section; essentially the only officers who can ensure such are the local line managers; however to enable this we need a clear procedure and some easy to use notification forms.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/03/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

2030	NNDR 2009-10	Report Issued	01/09/2010
-------------	---------------------	----------------------	------------

Recommendation 2	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

NNDR were not always receiving sufficient detail about changes in occupancy or ownership to fully facilitate the recovery process.

We recommend that management reviews the existing processes for obtaining information on changes of occupier or ownership details for NNDR properties. Consideration should be given to providing better on-line guidance for ratepayers, which could include an on-line form. Also consideration should be given to providing Derby Direct staff with clearer guidance or training on the questions to ask the outgoing ratepayer about the future liability for the property.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	John Massey	Action Date	31/10/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------	--------------------	------------

Self service options are being reviewed as part of the one Derby, one council Customer Management theme. This will include a review of the self service offering for both telephony contact and on-line. ☐ We are also embarking on a training programme for Derby Direct staff which will include providing guidance on the necessary questions to ask to determine liability.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/12/2010
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

12/11/10 No progress as yet

774	Payroll 2007-8	Report Issued	09/05/2008
------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------

Recommendation 5	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The supplier of the Council's payroll system did not inform the Council that their accreditation to the Payroll Standard had ceased.

We recommend that the Council ask Selima to confirm in writing the current situation with the HMRC Payroll Standard.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Nigel Dowe	Action Date	30/06/2008
-----------------------	----------------------------	------------	--------------------	------------

This will be requested as part of the contract negotiations currently taking place.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	30/09/2010
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

Selima are undergoing testing at the moment to determine whether they can claim accreditation for their payroll system (Feb 2011).

2033	Risk Management	Report Issued	16/07/2010
-------------	------------------------	----------------------	-------------------

Recommendation 3	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The supplementary guides to risk management for partnerships, projects and fraud were not readily available and were not subject to regular review and update. The Project Risk Management Guide and the Guide to Risk Management had not been presented to the Strategic Risk Group for approval. The Risk Management Strategy and Policy Statement and the Guide to Risk Management had not been reviewed for a number of years.

We recommend that the risk management guidance documents are reviewed on a regular basis and following each review they should be presented to the Strategic Risk Group for consideration and to the Audit & Accounts Committee for approval. The approved guides should be made widely available throughout the Council.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Richard Boneham	Action Date	30/09/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	------------------------	--------------------	-------------------

The Guidance documents were considered by the Strategic Risk Group in March 2009. However, they have been held back to reflect developments in the partnership toolkit and work being done on Anti-fraud and corruption risks with ZM. The final documents will be taken to Audit and Accounts in September 2010. Once approved they will be made available on Derbynet.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/03/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

Final project risk guidance and partnership risk guidance documents were approved by the Audit & Accounts Committee on 23rd September 2010.

Fraud guidance document will go to Audit & Accounts Committee in December 2010.

Response as at 24 December 2010:

RM guide/strategy, RM & partnerships and the environmental risk guide have all been approved and are awaiting formal publication on Derbynet in January 2011.

The fraud risk guide has been withdrawn to be rewritten so as to tie in with the revised framework.

Recommendation 4	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Although departments have risk registers in place, they were of a poor quality and were not subject to regular review. Officers identifying and scoring risks used differing methods to that specified in the Council's risk management guidance and had not documented the potential value of the impact of departmental risks.

We recommend that a plan of action is put in place to ensure that the JCAD RISK system is promptly developed and rolled out to departments. This will ensure that the same methodology is used for scoring risks and will help to identify where officers are either not undertaking risk management, or where they require further support in identifying and managing risks. Suitable training and documented guidance should be given to those officers who have access to the JCAD RISK system to ensure they are able to use the system effectively.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Richard Boneham	Action Date	01/03/2011
-----------------------	----------------------------	------------------------	--------------------	-------------------

The Risk Management Action Plan 2010/11 contains an action to fully develop JCAD Risk by March 2011. A timetable will be produced to ensure that the timeframe for this action is met. Training is planned as part of the implementation process.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/05/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

The Business Planning cycle is being used to develop risk registers within directorates for each department. Once business plans are finalised, the risks will be put on JCAD Risk.

Training on JCAD risk has been provided to relevant officers to enable the roll out of JCAD risk.

Recommendation 6	Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

The strategic risk log was unfinished at the time of audit testing.

We recommend that the strategic risk log should be completed and made available throughout the Council. The strategic risk log should be subject to regular review and update thereafter.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Richard Boneham	Action Date	30/09/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	------------------------	--------------------	-------------------

The Strategic Risks are currently being reviewed following the recently changes to national and Local government. The revised list is scheduled to go to Audit and Accounts Committee in September 2010.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/03/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

Response as at 24 December 2010:

The revised list did go to Audit and Accounts in September and was noted by Members. However, at the last SRG meeting (05/10/10) it was decided that the creation of the strategic risk list should be passed to COG. The turmoil caused by the Comprehensive Spending Review announcement means that the strategic risks are very fluid. It is intended to present the current draft list to COG in late January 2011.

Response from Richard Boneham at 16th February 2011: The Strategic Risk log for 2011/12 has been drafted. It will be presented to COG in early March with the aim of taking the agreed list to Audit and Accounts on 24 March.

Recommendation 12 Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
--	----------------------	--------------------------

There was limited monitoring by the Risk Management section to ensure that responsible officers have undertaken agreed actions in relation to the risks they manage, and there was no assurance from departments that internal monitoring of risks and agreed actions was undertaken. We recommend that the Risk Management section seek assurances on a periodic basis that departmental risks are being managed and monitored, and that agreed actions are being undertaken. Where the Risk Management Section identify that departments do not undertake agreed actions, this should be reported to the Audit & Accounts Committee.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Richard Boneham	Action Date	01/03/2011
-----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------	------------

The RM action plan contains an action to "Review the risk management process within individual departments" by March 2011. The RM team are currently making departmental visits to discuss the management and monitoring of risks. Where departments are not complying with risk management practices, these will be highlighted to Audit and Accounts in the quarterly update.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	31/05/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

Given the upheaval in the Council - this exercise has been delayed. Visits to DMT in each directorate are planned for May 2011 to promote risk management practices. Monitoring of directorates and their adherence to risk management processes will then be undertaken on a quarterly basis.

Recommendation 13 Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
---	----------------------	--------------------------

There was insufficient communication between responsible officers across the Council in relation to risk management developments and changes to key risks and action plans.

We recommend that the Risk Management Section develops and implements a formal protocol for Directorates to feedback information on risk. This information will ensure that the Strategic Risk Group and the Audit & Accounts Committee will receive accurate and timely information on the operation of risk management processes within the Council.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Richard Boneham	Action Date	29/10/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------	------------

A protocol will be developed.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	30/06/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

Status: Being Implemented - the new Operational Risk Group has been introduced to address this issue.

Response from Richard Boneham at 16th February 2011: The newly created operational risk groups (based in directorates) will be the medium for this. These are due to meet following the production of the business plans.

Recommendation 14 Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
--	----------------------	--------------------------

There were limited or insufficient early warning indicators in place for the Council's risks.

We recommend that all of the Council's identified risks are reviewed to ascertain where early warning indicators can be put in place. These matters should then be reported to an appropriate group or Committee.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Richard Boneham	Action Date	01/03/2011
-----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------	------------

This is an issue that will be discussed with individual risk owners.

Update Comments	Revised Action Date	30/06/2011
------------------------	----------------------------	------------

This has been delayed due to Council re-structures etc. Once the risks are identified through the business planning process, individual risk owners will be contacted to discuss early warning indicators

958	Virtual Private Networks	Report Issued	02/11/2010
------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	------------

Recommendation 1 Merits Attention	Action Status
---	----------------------

A document titled 'VPN Connections into the Council' had been produced, but it did not adequately cover all aspects of a comprehensive VPN policy. If a comprehensive VPN policy is not in place, there is a risk that connections may not be appropriately approved, which could allow unauthorised and inappropriate remote access to the Council's network.

We recommend that a comprehensive VPN policy is produced which incorporates the existing information on third party and employee VPN approvals and also information on: • VPN User Responsibilities and Restrictions. • Enforcement Details. The VPN Policy should then be reviewed at least annually by IT Management to ensure that it remains up-to-date. Any changes to staff, contained in the systems authorisation matrix, should also be reflected in the policy as soon as the change occurs.

Action Details	Responsible Officer	Alison Moss	Action Date	01/12/2010
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------	--------------------	------------

A revised VPN policy is being prepared by the security and access manager for review

Update Comments	Revised Action Date
------------------------	----------------------------

No Action Taken place as of 15/02/2011

Recommendation 7		Significant	Action Status	
Two-factor authentication was not being utilised for client connections and domain credentials was the only authentication being used. Domain credentials are not a secure way to authenticate VPN clients.				
We recommend that ICT Management look into the possibility of rolling out two-factor authentication to all VPN clients, to better protect the network from hijacked domain accounts.				
Action Details	Responsible Officer	Miles Peters	Action Date	01/03/2011
A project is underway to deploy the existing Safenet (formerly Aladdin) smartcard and one-time PIN to VPN users				
Update Comments			Revised Action Date	
Recommendation 9		Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
VPN logs relating to the activities of users and connection attempts were not being monitored. Logs were only being analysed on a reactive basis and no monitoring software was in place to assist in the process.				
We recommend that VPN audit logs are monitored and reviewed on an ongoing basis to identify potential attacks and misuse of the resource. The monitoring process should prompt action and possible escalation where appropriate. This could be achieved through the use of an automated tool that monitors audit data and immediately reports suspicious activity to the administrators of the VPN Systems.				
Action Details	Responsible Officer	Miles Peters	Action Date	01/02/2011
Manual auditing on demand is undertaken at present. An automated log aggregation and correlation utility is planned for deployment by the end of January 2011				
Update Comments			Revised Action Date	
Update from MP 09/02/2011 - we are seeking funding for the log correlation utility.				
Recommendation 10		Merits Attention	Action Status	
There was no Idle timeout setting activated to ensure that any idle VPN sessions were terminated to prevent unauthorised access to the Council's network.				
We recommend that idle timeout setting be applied with an appropriate parameter to ensure that any idle VPN connections cannot be abused but also does not disrupt the work being carried out.				
Action Details	Responsible Officer	Miles Peters	Action Date	01/03/2011
This has been configured on the new ASA solution				
Update Comments			Revised Action Date	
Recommendation 11		Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
The procedures in place governing how an employee obtains VPN access did not require managers to submit a business case which justified the access request. Neither did it require managers to indicate when this VPN access should be terminated. We also found that the current procedures had not always been adhered to.				
We recommend that the procedure for granting VPN access should change to ensure that the request must first come from the employee's Line Manager with a business case justifying the need for access. The request should also provide details of the Council equipment being used (e.g. laptop and router). If permanent VPN access is not required, a termination date should also be stated on the service request so that the VPN access can be withdrawn when it is no longer required. The Mobile Computing Policy should then be updated to reflect any procedural changes.				
Action Details	Responsible Officer	Alison Moss	Action Date	01/12/2010
Accepted – procedure will be revised				
Update Comments			Revised Action Date	01/04/2011
Update 15/02/2011 - Complete review of the current policy is scheduled				

Recommendation 13		Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
Third party computers were not being checked for minimum security requirements prior to connecting to the Council's network via VPN. It is important to ensure that all devices connecting to the network have a minimum level of security to help protect the Council's network from virus infection.				
We recommend that third parties should be required to sign a standard agreement which specifies the minimum level of security required on any devices connecting via VPN.				
Action Details	Responsible Officer	Miles Peters	Action Date	01/12/2010
Accepted – a policy and agreement will be drafted for enactment				
Update Comments			Revised Action Date	
Update 15/02/2011 - The responsibility for this control has been passed to Miles Peters				

Recommendation 14		Merits Attention	Action Status	Being Implemented
VPN accounts for third parties had non expiring passwords and passwords for these accounts were often set to the third party's business name. This increases the likelihood of the passwords being cracked or guessed.				
We recommend that passwords for third party accounts are set to expire every 60 days and that a complex password is enforced. A complex password should be at least 10 characters with a composition of at least 1 uppercase character, 1 lowercase character, 1 special character. Also a non-guessable password should be used which means the business name can not be used as the password.				
Action Details	Responsible Officer	Alison Moss	Action Date	01/12/2010
Accepted – procedure will be revised				
Update Comments			Revised Action Date	
Update 15/02/2011 - Terry Tinsley is currently progressing a project to implement complex passwords across the domains which will include third party VPN connections.				

928	Web Applications - SQL Injection / XSS Attacks		Report Issued	14/10/2010
-----	--	--	---------------	------------

Recommendation 3		Significant	Action Status	Being Implemented
The FormRec Share on DCCDC10 was accessible the Everyone group, thus every user in the domain. This share housed the backend Microsoft Access Databases for 2 of the Web Applications, and also disclosed usernames and passwords in configuration documentation that could be used for further compromise on the server. In addition, the D\$ and Premier\$ Shares on DERBYCC43 were also being shared to the Everyone group.				
We recommend that the Everyone group is removed from the FormRec Directory ACL and a more stringent set of permissions is assigned granting access to only an approved list of users.				
Action Details	Responsible Officer	Miles Peters	Action Date	01/02/2011
A work package has been prepared and submitted to Serco for quotation as a Small Works Brief and which will be undertaken by utilisation of the development days.				
Update Comments			Revised Action Date	
Passed to web team as it affects the functioning of the applications				