Internal Audit Progress Report (16 July 2010 to 05 September 2010) Performance Select Committee, 21 September 2010, item 10

Committee: **Performance Select Committee** Agenda Item

21 September 2010 Date:

Title: **Internal Audit Progress Report**

(16 July 2010 to 05 September 2010)

Author: Sheila Bronson, Audit Manager, 01799

Item for Information 510610

Summary

1 To report to the Performance Select Committee details of work undertaken by Internal Audit since the last report to this Committee on 27 July 2010 and to provide an update on implemented and outstanding internal audit recommendations.

Recommendations

That the Internal Audit Progress Report (16 July 2010 to 05 September 2010) be noted

Background Papers

Internal Audit Work Plan 2010/11

Impact

Communication/Consultation	The Internal Audit Work Plan 2010/11 referred to in this report has been circulated to Members
Community Safety	none
Equalities	none
Finance	none
Health & Safety	none
Legal implications/ Human Rights	none
Sustainability	none
Ward-specific impacts	none

Author: Sheila Bronson Item 10/1 Page 1

Version Date: 05 September 2010

Internal Audit Progress Report (16 July 2010 to 05 September 2010)

Performance Select Committee, 21 September 2010, item 10

Workforce/Workplace	none

Situation

- 2 The purpose of this report is to provide to management and members:-
 - Details of the work completed by Internal Audit since the last report to the Committee;
 - ii) A summary of the risk level 3 and 4 highest priority recommendations made and agreed;
 - iii) Performance against the 2010/11 audit plan;
 - iv) Details of risk level 3 and 4 highest priority recommendations not implemented within the agreed timescale;
 - v) Details of risk level 1 and 2 lower priority recommendations not implemented within the agreed timescale.

Work Undertaken by Internal Audit 16 July 2010 to 05 September 2010

- 3 Since the last report to the Committee:
 - (i) 3 audits from the 2010/11 audit plan have been completed and Final Reports issued with a total of 5 recommendations made.
 - All final audit reports issued have been copied to Performance Select Committee members. An overall summary of final reports issued together with an analysis of agreed recommendations is presented at Appendix A.
 - (ii) There are 2 risk level 4 or 3 highest priority recommendations arising from the final reports, details of these are presented at Appendix A.
 - (iii) Between 16 July 2010 to 05 September 2010, 5 further audits from the 2010/11 plan have been completed to draft report stage.

Audit Plan 2010/11 Review

- Appendix A also provides details of overall performance against the audit plan to date. As of 05 September 2010, Internal Audit year to date work against the audit plan is:
 - o 17 out of 31 Audits commenced (55%)
 - 8 out of 31 Audits completed to draft report stage (26%)
 - o 3 out of 31 Audits completed and Final Reports Issued (10%)

Author: Sheila Bronson • Page 2 Item 10/2

Version Date: 05 September 2010

Internal Audit Progress Report (16 July 2010 to 05 September 2010)
Performance Select Committee, 21 September 2010, item 10

Recommendations Implemented 16 July 2010 to 05 September 2010

There are 4 risk level 3 and 4 highest priority recommendations which have been implemented; a summary is presented at Appendix B.

Recommendations Not Implemented by due date at 05 September 2010

- There are 2 previously agreed risk level 3 and 4 highest priority recommendations not implemented in accordance with their agreed due date, a summary is presented at Appendix B.
- 7 There is 1 previously agreed risk level 1 and 2 lower priority recommendations not implemented in accordance with their agreed due date, a summary is presented at Appendix B.

Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
The issues highlighted in the internal audit reports are	1 Action is already being taken towards the implementation of	2 There would be varying levels of impact from non-	Internal audit reports are followed up to ensure compliance.
not acted upon	the recommendations contained in the reports.	implementation of recommendations given the significance of the control risks identified.	There are escalation procedures in the event of non compliance.

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.

Author: Sheila Bronson • Page 3 Item 10/3

Version Date: 05 September 2010