

This Report will be made public on 20 July 2018



Report Number **AuG/18/04**

To: Audit and Governance Committee
Date: 30 July 2018
Status: Non-Executive Decision
Corporate Director: Tim Madden – Customer Support & Specialist Services (S151)

SUBJECT: INTERNAL AUDIT ANNUAL REPORT 2017-18

SUMMARY:

This report provides the summary of the impact of the work of the East Kent Audit Partnership for the year to 31st March 2018.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The Committee is asked to agree the recommendations set out below because: In order to comply with best practice, the Audit & Governance Committee should independently contribute to the overall process for ensuring that an effective internal control environment is maintained.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. To receive and note Report AuG/18/04.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The primary objective of Internal Audit is to provide independent assurance to Members, the Head of Paid Service, Directors and the Section 151 Officer on the adequacy and effectiveness of those systems on which the Authority relies for its internal control. The purpose of bringing forward an annual report to members is to:

- Provide an opinion on the overall adequacy and effectiveness of the Council's internal control environment.
- Present a summary of the internal audit work undertaken to formulate the opinion, including reliance placed on work by other assurance bodies,
- Draw attention to any issues the Head of the Audit Partnership judges particularly relevant to the preparation of the Annual Governance Statement.
- Compare actual audit activity with that planned, and summarise the performance of Internal Audit against its performance criteria.
- Comment on compliance with the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards (PSIAS), and report the results of the Internal Audit quality assurance programme.
- Confirm annually that EKAP is organisationally independent, whether there have been any resource limitations or instances of restricted access.

1.2 The report attached as Annex A therefore summarises the performance of the East Kent Audit Partnership (EKAP) and the work it has performed over the financial year 2017-18 for Folkestone & Hythe District Council, and provides an overall assurance on the system for internal control based on the audit work undertaken throughout the year, in accordance with best practice. In providing this opinion, this report supports the Annual Governance Statement.

1.3 The internal audit team is proactive in providing guidance on procedures where particular issues are identified during audit reviews. The aim is to minimise the risk of loss to the Authority by securing adequate internal controls. Partnership working for the service has added the opportunity for the EKAP to share best practice across the four sites within the East Kent Cluster to help drive forward continuous service improvement.

1.4 During 2017-18 the EKAP delivered 80.49% of the agreed audit plan days, with 64.79 days under delivered to be adjusted for in 2018-19. The performance figures for the East Kent Audit Partnership as a whole for the year show good performance against targets, particularly as the EKAP has experienced staffing changes and delivered financial savings against its agreed budget to all its partners in the delivery of the service.

2.0 RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

2.1 A summary of the perceived risks follows:

Perceived risk	Seriousness	Likelihood	Preventative action
Non completion of the audit plan	Medium	Low	Review of the audit plan on a regular basis
Non implementation of agreed audit recommendations	Medium	Low	Review of recommendations by Audit & Governance Committee and Audit escalation policy.
Non completion of the key financial system reviews	Medium	Medium	Review of the audit plan on a regular basis. A change in the External Audit requirements reduces the impact of non-completion on the Authority.

3.0 LEGAL, FINANCIAL AND OTHER CONTROLS/POLICY MATTERS

3.1 Legal Officer's comments –

There are no legal issues arising out of this report.

3.2 Finance Officer's Comments –

Responsibility for the arrangements of the proper administration of the Council's financial affairs lies with the Chief Finance Officer. The internal audit service helps provide assurance as to the adequacy of the arrangements in place. It is very reassuring that EKAP have given positive feedback on their overall assessment of the Council's system of internal controls for 2017-18, stating that there were "no major areas of concern". It is also reassuring to note that most audits now result in reasonable or substantial assurance.

3.3 Head of the East Kent Audit Partnership comments –

This report has been produced by the Head of the East Kent Audit Partnership and the findings / comments detailed in the report are the Partnership's own, except where shown as being management responses.

3.4 Diversities and Equalities Implications

This report does not directly have any specific diversity and equality implications however it does include reviews of services which may have implications.

4.0 CONTACT OFFICERS AND BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

4.1 Councillors with any questions arising out of this report should contact either of the following officers prior to the meeting.

Christine Parker, Head of the Audit Partnership
 Telephone: 01304 872160 Email: christine.parker@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk

Tim Madden, Corporate Director Customer Support & Specialist Services
Telephone: 01303 853263 Email: tim.madden@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk

- 4.2 The following background documents have been relied upon in the preparation of this report:

Internal Audit Annual Plan 2017-18 - Previously presented to and approved at the March 2017 Audit & Governance Committee meeting.

Internal Audit working papers - Held by the East Kent Audit Partnership.

Previous Audit Charter – previously presented and approved at former Audit & Governance meetings

Attachments

Annex A – East Kent Audit Partnership Annual Report 2017-18

Annual Internal Audit Report for Folkestone & Hythe District Council 2017-18

1. Introduction

The Public Sector Internal Audit Standard (PSIAS) defines internal audit as:

“Internal Audit is an independent, objective assurance and consulting activity designed to add value and improve an organisation’s operations. It helps an organisation accomplish its objectives by bringing a systematic, disciplined approach to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of risk management, control and governance processes.”

A more detailed explanation, of the role and responsibilities of internal audit, is set out in the approved Audit Charter. The East Kent Audit Partnership (EKAP) aims to comply with the PSIAS, and to this end has produced evidence to the s.151 and Monitoring Officers to assist the Council’s review of the system of internal control in operation throughout the year.

This report is a summary of the year, a snapshot of the areas at the time they were reviewed and the results of follow up reviews to reflect the actions taken by management to address the control issues identified. The process that the EKAP adopts regarding following up the agreed recommendations will bring any outstanding high-risk areas to the attention of members via the regular reports, and through this annual report if there are any issues outstanding at the year-end.

2. Objectives

The majority of reviews undertaken by Internal Audit are designed to provide assurance on the operation of the Council’s internal control environment. At the end of an audit we provide recommendations and agree actions with management that will, if implemented, further enhance the environment of the controls in practice. Other work undertaken, includes the provision of specific advice and support to management to enhance the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of the services for which they are responsible. The annual audit plan is informed by special investigations and anti-fraud work carried out as well as the risk management framework of the Council.

A key aim of the EKAP is to deliver a professional, cost effective, efficient, internal audit function to the partner organisations. The EKAP aims to have an enabling role in raising the standards of services across the partners through its unique position in assessing the relative standards of services across the partners. The EKAP is also a key element of each councils’ anti fraud and corruption system by acting as a deterrent to would be internal perpetrators.

The four partners are all committed to the principles and benefits of a shared internal audit service, and have agreed a formal legal document setting out detailed arrangements. The statutory officers from each partner site (the s.151 Officer) together form the Client Officer Group and govern the partnership through annual meetings. The shared arrangement for EKAP also secures organisational independence, which in turn assists EKAP in making conclusions about any resource limitations or ensuring there are no instances of restricted access.

3. Internal Audit Performance Against Targets

3.1 EKAP Resources

The EKAP has provided the service to the partners based on a FTE of 6.88. Additional audit days have been provided via audit contractors in order to meet the planned workloads. There was higher than usual sickness within the team during the year and early warnings of achieving approximately 85% of the plan were given during the quarterly meetings.

3.2 Performance against Targets

The EKAP is committed to continuous improvement and has various measures to ensure the service can strive to improve. The performance measures and indicators for the year are shown in the balanced scorecard of performance measures at Appendix 4. The measures themselves were reviewed by the Client Officer Group at their annual meeting and no changes were made.

3.3 Internal Quality Assurance and Performance Management.

All internal audit reports are subject to review, either by the relevant EKAP Deputy Head of Audit or Head of the Audit Partnership; all of who are Chartered Internal Auditors. In each case this includes a detailed examination of the working papers, action and review points, at each stage of report. The review process is recorded and evidenced within the working paper index and in a table at the end of each audit report. Detailed work instructions are documented within the Audit Manual. The Head of Audit Partnership collates performance data monthly and, together with the monitoring of the delivery of the agreed audit plan carried out by the relevant Deputy Head of Audit, regular meetings are held with the s.151 Officer. The minutes to these meetings provide additional evidence to the strategic management of the EKAP performance.

3.4 External Quality Assurance

The external auditors, Grant Thornton, conducted a review in February 2018 of the Internal Audit arrangements. They concluded that, where possible, they can place reliance on the work of the EKAP.

3.5 Liaison between Internal Audit and External Audit

Liaison with the audit managers from Grant Thornton for the partner authorities and the EKAP is undertaken largely via email to ensure adequate audit coverage, to agree any complementary work and to avoid any duplication of effort. The EKAP has not met with any other review body during the year in its role as the Internal Auditor to Folkestone & Hythe District Council. Consequently, the assurance, which follows is based on EKAP reviews of the Council's services.

3.6 Compliance with Professional Standards

The EKAP self-assessment of the level of compliance against the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards shows that some actions are required to achieve full compliance which the EKAP will continue to work towards. There is however, no appetite to pay for an External Quality Assessment of the EKAP's level of compliance, relying on a review by the s.151 officers of the self-assessment. Consequently the EKAP can only say that it partially conforms with PSIAS and this risk is noted in the AGS.

3.7 Financial Performance

Expenditure and recharges for year 2017-18 are all in line with the Internal Audit cost centre hosted by Dover District Council. Financial management has delivered a cashable saving of 10% against budget.

Year	Cost / Audit Day
2006-07	£288
2007-08	£277
2008-09	£262 (Reserve Refunded to Partners)
2009-10	£281
2010-11	£268
2011-12	£257
2012-13	£279
2013-14	£290
2014-15	£287
2015-16	£293
2016-17	£294
2017-18	£300

The EKAP was formed to provide a resilient, professional service and therefore achieving financial savings was not the main driver, despite this considerable efficiencies have been gained through forming the partnership. The net result is a reduced EKAP cost per audit day below the original budget estimate.

4. Overview of Work Done

The original audit plan for 2017-18 included a total of 26 projects. We have communicated closely with the s.151 Officer, CMT and this Committee to ensure the projects actually undertaken continue to represent the best use of resources. As a result of this liaison, and due to the reduced available resources through sickness, some changes to the plan were agreed during the year. A few projects (10) have therefore been pushed back in the overall strategic plan, to permit some higher risk projects (3) to come forward in the plan. The total number of projects undertaken in 2017-18 was 13, with 3 being WIP at the year end to be finalised in April. In addition 5 projects were finalised from the 2016-17 plan, with one being work in progress. The team suffered long term sickness absence during the year and consequently the undelivered projects and 64.79 days have been rolled forward into 2018-19.

Review of the Internal Control Environment

4.1 Risks

During 2017-18, 86 recommendations were made in the agreed final audit reports to Folkestone & Hythe District Council. These are analysed as being Critical, High, Medium or Low risk in the following table:

Risk Criticality	No. of Recommendations	Percentage
Critical	0	0%
High	16	19%
Medium	44	51%
Low	26	30%
TOTAL	86	100%

Naturally, more emphasis is placed on recommendations for improvement regarding high risks. Any high priority recommendations where management has not made progress in implementing the agreed system improvement are brought to management and members' attention through Internal Audit's regular update reports. During 2017-18 the EKAP has raised 86 recommendations, and whilst 70% were in the High or Medium Risk categories, none are so significant that they need to be escalated at this time.

4.2 Assurances

Internal Audit applies one of four 'assurance opinions' to each review, please see Appendix 1 for the definitions. This provides a level of reliance that management can place on the system of internal control to deliver the goals and objectives covered in that particular review. The conclusions drawn are described as being "a snapshot in time" and the purpose of allocating an assurance level is so that risk is managed effectively and control improvements can be planned. Consequently, where the assurance level is either 'no' or 'limited', or where high priority recommendations have been identified, a follow up progress review is undertaken and, where appropriate, the assurance level is revised.

The summary of Assurance Levels issued on the 20 pieces of work completed for Folkestone & Hythe District Council together with the finalisation of the five 2016-17 audits over the course of the year is as follows:

NB: the percentages shown are calculated on finalised reports with an assurance level

Assurance	No.	Percentage of Completed Reviews
Substantial	4	27%
Reasonable	11	73%
Limited	0	0%
No	0	0%
Work in Progress at Year-End	5	-
Not Applicable	5	-

NB: 'Not Applicable' is shown against special investigations or work commissioned by management that did not result in an assurance level.

Taken together 100% of the reviews account for substantial or reasonable assurance to management on the system of internal control in operation at the time of the review. There were no reviews assessed as having limited or no assurance.

There were seven reviews completed on behalf of East Kent Housing Ltd. and the assurances for these audits were - 0 Substantial, 5 Reasonable, 2 Limited, 0 Not Applicable and 3 work in progress at the year-end. Information is provided in Appendix 3.

For each recommendation, an implementation date is agreed with the Manager responsible for implementing it. Understandably, the follow up review is then timed to allow the service manager sufficient time to make progress in implementing the agreed actions against the agreed timescales. The results of any follow up reviews yet to be undertaken will therefore be reported to the committee at the appropriate time.

4.3 Progress Reports

In agreeing the final Internal Audit Report, management accepts responsibility to take action to resolve all the risks highlighted in that final report. The EKAP carries out a follow up/progress review at an appropriate time after finalising an agreed report to test whether agreed action has in fact taken place and whether it has been effective in reducing risk.

As part of the follow up action, the recommendations under review are either:

- “closed” as they are successfully implemented, or
- “closed” as the recommendation is yet to be implemented but is on target, or
- (for medium or low risks only) “closed” as management has decided to tolerate the risk, or the circumstances have since changed, or
- (for critical or high risks only) escalated to the audit committee.

At the conclusion of the follow up review the overall assurance level is re-assessed.

The results for the follow up activity for 2017-18 are set out below. The shift to the right in the third & fourth columns in the table from the original opinion to the revised opinion also measures the positive impact that the EKAP has made on the system of internal control in operation throughout 2017-18.

Total Follow Ups undertaken 15	No Assurance	Limited Assurance	Reasonable Assurance	Substantial Assurance
Original Opinion	0	2	7	6
Revised Opinion	0	0	7	8

The reviews with an original (partial) limited assurance, together with the result of the follow up report, are shown in the following table:

Area Under Review	Original Assurance (Date to A&G Cttee)	Follow Up Result
Dog Warden & Litter Enforcement	Reasonable/Limited (November 2016)	Reasonable
Waste Recycling	Reasonable /Limited (March 2017)	Reasonable

East Kent Housing received two follow up reviews for which the revised assurance levels were one Substantial, one Reasonable.

Consequently, there are no fundamental issues of note arising from the audits and follow up undertaken in 2017-18. There are no Folkestone & Hythe reviews showing a limited assurance after follow up.

4.4 Special Investigations and Fraud Related Work

The prevention and detection of fraud and corruption is ultimately the responsibility of management however, the EKAP is aware of its own responsibility in this area and is alert to the risk of fraud and corruption. Consequently the EKAP structures its work in such a way as to maximise the probability of detecting any instances of fraud. The EKAP will immediately report to the relevant officer any detected fraud or corruption identified during the course of its work; or any areas where such risks exist.

The EKAP is, from time to time, required to carry out special investigations, including suspected fraud and irregularity investigations and other special projects. Whilst some responsive work was carried out during the year at the request of management, there were no fraud investigations conducted by the EKAP on behalf of Folkestone & Hythe District Council in 2017-18, however one matter of a cash theft was investigated and reported to the Audit & Governance Committee on 13th September 2017.

4.5 Completion of Strategic Audit Plan

Appendix 2 shows the planned time for reviews undertaken, against actual time taken, follow up reviews and unplanned reviews resulting from any special investigations or management requests. 267.32 audit days were completed for Folkestone & Hythe District Council during 2017-2018. Including the 17.11 days carried forward this adjusts to the budgeted 315 days to 332.11, therefore 80.49% plan completion. The 47.68 days behind at the year end, will be carried over to 2018-19. The EKAP was formed in October 2007; it completes a rolling programme of work to cover a defined number of days each year. As at the 31st March each year there is undoubtedly some “work in progress” at each of the partner sites; some naturally being slightly ahead and some being slightly behind in any given year. However, the progress in ensuring adequate coverage against the agreed audit plan of work since 2007-08 concludes that EKAP is 64.79 days behind schedule as we commence 2018-19, as shown in the table below.

Year	Plan Days	Plus B/Fwd	Adjusted Requirement from EKAP	Days Delivered	Percentage Completed	Days Carried Forward (Days Planned – Days Delivered)
2008-09	350	0	350.00	353.76	101.07%	+3.76
2009-10	350	-3.76	346.24	345.82	99.88%	-4.18
2010-11	350	-0.42	349.58	358.68	102.36%	+8.68
2011-12	335	-8.26	326.74	333.68	102.12%	-1.32
2012-13	330	-6.94	323.06	277.25	85.82%	-52.75
2013-14	330	45.81	375.81	371.92	98.96%	+41.92
2014-15	330	3.89	333.89	334.93	100.31%	+4.93
2015-16	330	1.04	328.96	324.74	98.72%	-5.26
2016-17	330	-4.22	334.22	317.11	94.82%	-12.89
2017-18	315	-17.11	332.11	267.32	80.49%	-47.68
Total	3350			3285.21	98.07%	-64.79

Appendix 3 shows the planned time for reviews undertaken, against actual time taken, follow up reviews and unplanned reviews resulting from any special investigations for East Kent Housing Ltd. This council contributed 25 days from its original plan in 2011-12 and 20 days since 2012-13 as its share in this four way arrangement. From 2017-18 an additional 15 days has been contributed to the EKH Plan from each partner taking their total plan to 140 days. The EKH Annual Report in its full format will be presented to the EKH - Finance and Audit Sub Committee on 2nd July 2018.

5. Overall assessment of the System of Internal Controls 2017-18

Based on the work of the EKAP on behalf of Folkestone & Hythe District Council during 2017-18, the overall opinion is:

There are no major areas of concern, which would give rise to a qualified audit statement regarding the systems of internal control concerning either the main financial systems or overall systems of corporate governance. The Council can have very good level of assurance in respect of all of its main financial systems and a good level of assurance in respect of the majority of its Governance arrangements. This

position is the result of improvements to the systems and procedures over recent years and the willingness of management to address areas of concern that have been raised.

Whilst a number of reviews have been postponed either at management request or due to the unusual lack of EKAP resources, there were no reviews attracting a Limited or No assurance rating given in the year.

6. Significant issues arising in 2017-18

From the work undertaken during 2017-18, there were no instances of unsatisfactory responses to key control issues raised in internal audit reports by the end of the year. There are occasions when audit recommendations are not accepted for operational reasons such as a manager's opinion that costs outweigh the risk, but none of these are significant and require reporting or escalation at this time.

The EKAP has been commissioned to perform only one follow up, there were no reviews that remained a Limited Assurance after follow up, however, two recommendations that were originally assessed as high risk, which remained a high priority and outstanding after follow up were escalated to the Audit & Governance Committee during the year (regarding the Licensing and Dog Warden audits).

There are no current Folkestone & Hythe reviews previously assessed as providing a Limited or No Assurance awaiting follow up.

And for East Kent Housing there were no reviews remaining at Limited assurance after follow up, and two recommendations that were originally assessed as high risk, which remained a high priority and outstanding after follow up were escalated to the Governance and Audit Committee during the year there. There is one current partially limited assurance awaiting a follow up (Safeguarding & Vulnerable Groups).

7. Overall Conclusion

The Internal Audit function provided by the EKAP has performed well against its targets for the year. Clearly there have been some adjustments to the original audit plan for the year 2017-18, however, this is was partly due to the unusual sickness levels and partly in response to management request to postpone some planned reviews; as this work has been carried forward, there are no further matters of concern to be raised at this time.

The EKAP assesses the overall system of internal control in operation throughout 2017-18 as providing reasonable assurance. No system of control can provide absolute assurance, nor can Internal Audit give that assurance. This statement is intended to provide reasonable assurance that there is an ongoing process for identifying, evaluating and managing the key risks.

Definition of Audit Assurance Statements & Recommendation Priorities

Assurance Statements:

Substantial Assurance - From the testing completed during this review a sound system of control is currently being managed and achieved. All of the necessary, key controls of the system are in place. Any errors found were minor and not indicative of system faults. These may however result in a negligible level of risk to the achievement of the system objectives.

Reasonable Assurance - From the testing completed during this review most of the necessary controls of the system in place are managed and achieved. There is evidence of non-compliance with some of the key controls resulting in a marginal level of risk to the achievement of the system objectives. Scope for improvement has been identified, strengthening existing controls or recommending new controls.

Limited Assurance - From the testing completed during this review some of the necessary controls of the system are in place, managed and achieved. There is evidence of significant errors or non-compliance with many key controls not operating as intended resulting in a risk to the achievement of the system objectives. Scope for improvement has been identified, improving existing controls or recommending new controls.

No Assurance - From the testing completed during this review a substantial number of the necessary key controls of the system have been identified as absent or weak. There is evidence of substantial errors or non-compliance with many key controls leaving the system open to fundamental error or abuse. The requirement for urgent improvement has been identified, to improve existing controls or new controls should be introduced to reduce the critical risk.

Priority of Recommendations Definitions:

Critical – A finding which significantly impacts upon a corporate risk or seriously impairs the organisation's ability to achieve a corporate priority. Critical recommendations also relate to non-compliance with significant pieces of legislation which the organisation is required to adhere to and which could result in a financial penalty or prosecution. Such recommendations are likely to require immediate remedial action and are actions the Council must take without delay.

High – A finding which significantly impacts upon the operational service objective of the area under review. This would also normally be the priority assigned to recommendations relating to the (actual or potential) breach of a less prominent legal responsibility or significant internal policies; unless the consequences of non-compliance are severe. High priority recommendations are likely to require remedial action at the next available opportunity or as soon as is practical and are recommendations that the Council must take.

Medium – A finding where the Council is in (actual or potential) breach of - or where there is a weakness within - its own policies, procedures or internal control measures, but which does not directly impact upon a strategic risk, key priority, or the operational service objective of the area under review. Medium priority recommendations are likely to require remedial action within three to six months and are actions which the Council should take.

Low – A finding where there is little if any risk to the Council or the recommendation is of a business efficiency nature and is therefore advisory in nature. Low priority recommendations are suggested for implementation within six to nine months and generally describe actions the Council could take.

**Performance against the Agreed 2017-18
Folkestone & Hythe District Council Audit Plan**

Review	Original Planned Days	Revised Planned Days	Actual days to 31-0318	Status and Assurance level
FINANCIAL SYSTEMS				
Business Rates	10	10	0.12	Postponed
Council Tax	10	10	0.12	Postponed
Housing Benefits DHPs	10	10	0.19	Postponed
Housing Bens Overpayments	10	10	10.44	Finalised – Substantial
Main Account–Feeder Systems	10	10	9.89	Finalised - N/A
HOUSING SYSTEMS				
Homelessness	10	10	0.26	Postponed
ICT SYSTEMS				
ICT Policies Review	9	6	4.10	Finalised - Reasonable
HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEMS				
Employee Benefits in Kind	10	10	11.72	Work-in-Progress
Payroll Transactions	5	5	0	Postponed
GOVERNANCE RELATED				
Contracts Monitoring	15	18	18.44	Finalised – N/A
Public Scrutiny of Accounts	10	10	7.22	Work-in-Progress
SERVICE LEVEL				
Asset Management	10	0	0	Postponed
Business Continuity	10	0	0	Postponed
Cemeteries & Crematoria	10	10	11.33	Finalised - Reasonable
Child & Adults - Safeguarding	10	10	10.48	Finalised - Reasonable
Councillor Grants	10	11	11.04	Finalised - Reasonable
Customer Services	10	0	0	Postponed
Digital Transformation	10	10	0.10	Postponed
Electoral Finance	10	10	3.04	Work-in-Progress
Employee Health & Safety	5	7	7.83	Finalised - Reasonable
Environmental Protection	10	10	10.42	Finalised - Reasonable
Equality & Diversity	10	10	7.09	Finalised - Reasonable
Hythe Swimming Pool	10	12	12.28	Finalised - Reasonable
Improvement Grants / DFGs	10	10	10.80	Finalised - Substantial

Planning S106s / CILs	10	10	0.11	Postponed
Risk Management	10	10	5.19	Finalised – N/A
OTHER				
Committee reports & meetings	10	10	8.74	Finalised for 2017-18
S151 meetings & support	11	11	11.36	Finalised for 2017-18
Corporate advice / CMT	3	3	4.98	Finalised for 2017-18
Audit plan prep & meetings	11	11	8.86	Finalised for 2017-18
Liaison with External Audit	1	1	0.24	Finalised for 2017-18
Polling Duty Elections	0	5	5.61	Completed
Follow Up Reviews	15	15	15.66	Finalised for 2017-18
FINALISATION OF 2016-17- AUDITS				
Performance Management	10		3.86	Finalised - Reasonable
Emergency Planning			0.41	Finalised – Substantial
Payroll			0.07	Finalised - Substantial
Planning Income			13.62	Finalised - Reasonable
Right To Buy			2.52	Finalised - Reasonable
Local Code of Corporate Gov.			7.68	Work-in-Progress
Events Management			0.51	Postponed
Days under delivered in 16-17	0	17.11		Completed
RESPONSIVE ASSURANCE				
Car Parks	0	20	21.54	Finalised – N/A
BOSCO	0	0	5.54	Finalised – N/A
Members Allowances	0	10	3.93	Work-in-Progress
Total	315.00	332.11	267.32	80.49%

**Performance against the Agreed 2017-18
East Kent Housing Audit Plan**

Review	Original Planned Days	Revised Planned Days	Actual days to 31-03-2018	Status and Assurance Level
PLANNED REVIEWS				
CMT/Audit Sub Cttee/EA Liaison	4	4	6.08	Finalised for 2017-18
Follow-up Reviews	4	4	4.82	Finalised for 2017-18
Finance Systems & ICT Controls	15	15	2.00	Postponed
Data Protection & Information Management	12	12	12.64	Finalised - Reasonable
Leasehold Services	15	15	26.24	Finalised - Reasonable
Fire Safety Records Management	15	18	17.23	Finalised - Limited
Safeguarding Children & Vulnerable Groups	10	15	15.09	Finalised – Reasonable/Limited
Tenancy & Right to Buy Fraud Prevention	10	10	0.22	Work-in-Progress
Risk Management	10	10	11.54	Finalised - Reasonable
Performance Management	5	0	0	Postponed
Complaints Monitoring	10	10	13.98	Finalised - Reasonable
Single System – Implementation Review	10	13	12.18	Finalised
Property Services Improvement Plan	20	0	5.94	Work-in-Progress
FINALISATION OF 2016/17 AUDITS				
Days under delivered in 2016-17	0	7.84	0	Completed
Performance Indicator Data Quality	0	0	8.62	Finalised - Reasonable
RESPONSIVE ASSURANCE				
Contract Management	0	14	0.31	Work-in-Progress
Total	140	147.84	136.90	92.60%

EKAP Balanced Scorecard

<u>INTERNAL PROCESSES PERSPECTIVE:</u>	<u>2017-18 Actual</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>FINANCIAL PERSPECTIVE:</u>	<u>2017-18 Actual</u>	<u>Original Budget</u>
	Quarter 4		Reported Annually		
Chargeable as % of available days	84%	80%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost per Audit Day 	£300.38	£309.77
Chargeable days as % of planned days			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct Costs 	£387,843	£385,970
CCC	89.19%	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • + Indirect Costs (Recharges from Host) 	£10,530	£10,530
DDC	104.64%	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - 'Unplanned Income' 	£1,873	Zero
SDC	80.49%	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • = Net EKAP cost (all Partners) 	£396,500	£396,500
TDC	85.54%	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Savings Achieved (10% of 2016-17 Budget) 	£34,620	10%
EKS	73.11%	100%			
EKH	92.60%	100%			
Overall	87.57%	100%			
Follow up/ Progress Reviews;					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issued 	53	-			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not yet due 	19	-			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Now due for Follow Up 	31	-			
Compliance with the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards (PSIAS) (see Annual Report for more details)	Partial	Full			

<u>CUSTOMER PERSPECTIVE:</u>	<u>2017-18 Actual</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>INNOVATION & LEARNING PERSPECTIVE:</u>	<u>2017-18 Actual</u>	<u>Target</u>
	Quarter 4		Quarter 4		
Number of Satisfaction Questionnaires Issued;	70		Percentage of staff qualified to relevant technician level	75%	75%
Number of completed questionnaires received back;	35		Percentage of staff holding a relevant higher level qualification	38%	38%
	= 50%		Percentage of staff studying for a relevant professional qualification	14%	N/A
Percentage of Customers who felt that;			Number of days technical training per FTE	4.79	3.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews were conducted in a professional manner • The audit report was 'Good' or better • That the audit was worthwhile. 	95%	100%	Percentage of staff meeting formal CPD requirements (post qualification)	38%	38%
	91%	90%			
	100%	100%			