



<b>Audit Title:</b>	<b>IT Backup and Recovery: Civic Campus Server cont.</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each of the physical security risks raised in Appendix C should be assessed, to determine if further mitigating action is required. A formal risk assessment of the server room and its environment should be carried out by a qualified professional. A regular report of those with access to the Server Room should be produced and reviewed to ensure that access is appropriate.</li> <li>As long as tapes are used for backups, they should be stored offsite, including daily tapes. Preferably, a system whereby backups are transmitted to a secure, logical location offsite via a secure network connection (e.g. to backup servers in West Malling) should be introduced as per AP2.1.</li> <li>A record should be kept of new tapes introduced to the backup cycle and those disposed of (and how this has been done).</li> <li>The Council should republish the data breach incident management policy and procedure, covering all significant areas of risk, e.g. security breaches, loss of data and disaster recovery.</li> </ul>	

<b>Audit Title:</b>	<b>Council Tax 2012-13</b>				<b>Date of Report:</b>	June 2013	
<b>Number of High Priority Recommendations:</b>	0	<b>Current Audit Opinion:</b>	2	<b>Previous Audit Opinion:</b>	2	<b>Overall Evaluation (Risk):</b>	<b>Moderate</b>
<p><b><u>Key Findings and Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>This audit review was conducted as part of the joint working between Swindon Internal Audit Services and our External Auditors, Grant Thornton, to ensure that reliance can be placed on the internal control procedures within the Council Tax system. The Council Tax review also included a follow-up on the previous audit on IT controls on the Northgate system, used for both Council Tax and NNDR.</p> <p>Since the last review, the four previous recommendations have either been implemented or superseded as a result of other departmental changes. The Auditor was pleased therefore to make no high priority recommendations as a result of this year's review and the Council Tax system was assessed as operating to a Satisfactory standard.</p>							

<b>Audit Title:</b>	<b>Highways Project Management</b>				<b>Date of Report:</b>		May 2013	
<b>Number of 'High Priority' Recommendations:</b>	0	<b>Current Audit Opinion:</b>	2	<b>Previous Audit Opinion:</b>	n/a	<b>Overall Evaluation (Risk):</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	
<b><u>Key Recommendations</u></b> There are no key recommendations made as a result of this review.								

<b>Audit Title:</b>	<b>Common Assessment Framework (CAF) 2012/13</b>					<b>Date of Report:</b>	July 2013	
<b>Number of 'High Priority' Recommendations:</b>	2	<b>Current Audit Opinion:</b>	3	<b>Previous Audit Opinion:</b>	n/a	<b>Overall Evaluation (Risk):</b>	Of Concern	

## Key Recommendations

The Children and Families Team had produced an action plan prior to the audit to achieve a number of required improvements to the CAF process. It was the auditor's opinion that once these actions and recommendations are implemented, the audit opinion on the system controls would be "satisfactory." However, the audit opinion above reflects that these actions were outstanding at the time of the audit.

The key message in the report was therefore to endorse the recommendations in the Children and Families action plan. Only two further high priority recommendations were made:

- The timescales for actions in the Children and Families action plan should be reviewed to ensure these are realistic. The action plan should be amended to reflect any slippage and consideration should be given to reporting on the status of each recommendation at regular intervals.
- A framework to measure the cost effectiveness of the CAF process should be introduced to measure the success of early interventions provided by the CAF process i.e. compared to the later cost of interventions when a child is in care.

<b>Audit Title:</b>	<b>UK Broadband 2012-13</b>					<b>Date of Report:</b>	June 2013	
<b>Number of High Priority Recommendations:</b>	1	<b>Current Audit Opinion:</b>	2	<b>Previous Audit Opinion:</b>	n/a	<b>Overall Evaluation (Risk):</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	

## Key Findings and Recommendations

There were only one key recommendation made in the Audit Report:

This was around business continuity for the project plan as there were potential risks at that time due to the imminent departure of many of the staff that had been responsible for the implementation of the project from its outset. These departures have now taken place and the impact of the business continuity arrangement put in place will be assessed in a follow-up review due to be conducted in September 2013.

<b>Audit Title:</b>	<b>Governance Over Local Decision Making</b>				<b>Date of Report:</b>		July 2013	
<b>Number of ‘High Priority’ Recommendations:</b>	0	<b>Current Audit Opinion:</b>	n/a	<b>Previous Audit Opinion:</b>	n/a	<b>Overall Evaluation (Risk):</b>	<b>No opinion provided</b>	
<p><b><u>Key Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>There are no key recommendations made as a result of the review.</p>								

Audit Title:	Contract Carers					Date of Report:		July 2013	
Number of 'High Priority' Recommendations:	n/a	Current Audit Opinion:	n/a	Previous Audit Opinion:	n/a	Overall Evaluation (Risk):	No opinion provided		
Internal Audit carried out a piece of consultancy work - research into potential 'Contract Carer' arrangements to assist with a planned project to devise and implement a similar system at Swindon									

Audit Title:	Oasis Transfer				Date of Report:		May 2013	
Number of 'High Priority' Recommendations:	1	Current Audit Opinion:	2	Previous Audit Opinion:	n/a	Overall Evaluation (Risk):	Moderate	
<u>Key Recommendation(s)</u> The key recommendation made as a result of the review is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>That a detailed terms of reference should be drawn up for the Oasis and North Star Programme Board, the current terms of reference does not include such things as roles and responsibilities, decision making authority, quorum arrangements, reporting, the role of non-Council members on the committee etc.</li></ul>								



Audit Title:	WB 13/14 - 2					Date of Report:		July 2013	
Number of 'High Priority' Recommendations:	n/a	Current Audit Opinion:	n/a	Previous Audit Opinion:	n/a	Overall Evaluation (Risk):	No opinion provided		
An investigation was undertaken in to whether a member of staff had followed proper Council procedures. The allegation was not substantiated.									

Audit Title:	Inv. 12/13 - 8				Date of Report:		July 2013	
Number of 'High Priority' Recommendations:	n/a	Current Audit Opinion:	n/a	Previous Audit Opinion:	n/a	Overall Evaluation (Risk):	No opinion provided	
An investigation was undertaken in to allegations that a provider had overcharged the Council for services provided. The allegation was substantiated and recovery of the overpayment is underway.								

<b>Audit Title:</b>	<b>Carbon Reduction Commitment</b>				<b>Date of Report:</b>	July 2013	
<b>Number of ‘High Priority’ Recommendations:</b>	n/a	<b>Current Audit Opinion:</b>	n/a	<b>Previous Audit Opinion:</b>	n/a	<b>Overall Evaluation (Risk):</b>	No opinion provided
<p>As required by the Environment Agency, Internal Audit completed a review of the evidence pack used as a basis for determining the Council’s Carbon Annual Report Summary for 2012/13.</p>							



<b>Audit Title:</b>	<b>Partnerships around economic development</b>				<b>Date of Report:</b>	July 2013	
<b>Number of High Priority Recommendations:</b>	n/a	<b>Current Audit Opinion:</b>	n/a	<b>Previous Audit Opinion:</b>	n/a	<b>Overall Evaluation (Risk):</b>	n/a
<b><u>Key Findings and Recommendations</u></b> <p>This piece of work was commissioned as a consultancy review to identify and share best practice in economic partnership delivery. As a result, no audit opinion was given. The following key recommendations were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A review of the structure, purpose and function of FSL should be undertaken. An appraisal of benefits and risks of transferring the Property and Development functions of the Council to FSL should be undertaken. If a decision to transfer the functions to FSL is taken, then controls should be introduced to ensure that decisions cannot be taken in relation to land and assets that would disadvantage the Council in the long-term, for short term economic gain.</li> <li>• When projects are undertaken in conjunction with FSL, the roles of the officers from both SBC and FSL should be clearly specified. This should include specification of responsibilities for negotiation with third parties and also remits for decision making. These should clearly be set out in relevant project PIDs.</li> <li>• The Council should encourage the LEP to review and finalise its draft business plan and use this to help re-invigorate current arrangements for LEP governance.</li> <li>• A Memorandum of Understanding should be produced between InSwindon and SBC, defining the nature of funding, its intended purpose, the role of the funding body and what is expected of the recipient of the monies. It is suggested that an annual partnership plan for activities to be delivered by InSwindon is produced, to clarify schemes to be undertaken and what each partners role will be.</li> <li>• The Council should develop a standard client management process for partnerships that can be scaled up or down to meet the complexity and size of the partnership in question. This should be implemented in the Economic Development programme, where there is delivery in partnership (e.g. with FSL). There should be regular, formal officer level partnership management meetings, with a standard agenda to monitor and review progress and partnership status. Both Officer and Member meetings should be clearly minuted including areas discussed, the issues raised and the agreed resolutions.</li> </ul>							

<b>Audit Title:</b>	<b>Shaw Ridge Primary School</b>			<b>Date of Audit:</b>	August 2013		
<b>Number of High Priority Recommendations:</b>	6	<b>Current Audit Opinion:</b>	3	<b>Previous Audit Opinion:</b>	2	<b>Overall Evaluation (Risk):</b>	<b>Moderate</b>

### **Key Findings and Recommendations**

The key recommendations made as a result of the review are:

- Governors should be presented with monitoring information that summarises the progress being made in delivering the objectives of the School's Strategic Action Plan (SAP). This should identify any objectives completed but more importantly, those that still require further action to be implemented fully. Consideration should be given to allocating budgets to the 5 areas of action identified in the SAP so their progress can be monitored e.g. Cost Code 98A Literacy, 98B Assessment, 98C ICT etc. This monitoring should lead up to the production of a summary at the end of the year for the SAP to summarise what was delivered and achieved and what was not completed. This can then form the basis for the next SAP where, for example, projects need to be rolled over.
- The school should cancel their debit card with immediate effect. Online purchases can be made with a charge card, which gives the school added protection, and the school should explore the possibility of obtaining one.
- In accordance with the Financial Regulations for schools three quotes should be obtained for purchases above £5,000 and a Form C completed. Where large projects are to take place, Governors should be presented with sufficient options as to allow them to make an informed decision on value for money to the School. The level at which Governor scrutiny is required should be set out in the School's Scheme of Delegation.
- The Resource Committee should be provided with the current actual income expenditure position against budget at each meeting. This should be accompanied with the projected position to the end of the financial year. By projecting the year-end balances during the year, it will provide Governors with an opportunity to plan in advance how best these monies could be used on School improvement before the end of year.
- The school should consider highlighting at the Resources Committee, the current surplus at that point in time against the predicted roll-over / contingency budget. This may act as a stimulus to debate how surpluses could be used during the year on school improvement. At the end of each financial year, the Governors should be provided with a summary confirming the final rollover figure. This should include details of which cost centres have contributed to this sum and the reasons why.

<b>Audit Title:</b>	<b>Key Partnership Governance Arrangements</b>				<b>Date of Report:</b>		August 2013	
<b>Number of 'High Priority' Recommendations:</b>	n/a	<b>Current Audit Opinion:</b>	n/a	<b>Previous Audit Opinion:</b>	n/a	<b>Overall Evaluation (Risk):</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
<p><b><u>Key Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>This consultancy review has been carried out to provide assurance to the Chief Executive and the Board Director: Commissioning that clear and robust arrangements are being put in place to govern the Council's key partnerships. The issues identified, through interviews and review of documentation with Members and officers, fall broadly into the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity of vision and purpose of partnership</li> <li>• Clarity of roles and responsibilities between client, commissioner, shareholder and provider</li> <li>• Partnership behaviours and values</li> <li>• Appropriateness of governance structures, planning frameworks and risk management arrangements</li> <li>• Maturity of commissioning arrangements</li> <li>• Adequacy of performance management arrangements</li> </ul>								