

**Warwickshire and West Mercia Police and Crime Commissioners
Warwickshire and West Mercia Chief Constables**

**Joint Audit Committee
11 January 2018**

Progress against 2017/18 Internal Audit Plan

Report by the Head of Internal Audit

Summary

This report summarises progress against the agreed Internal Audit plan.

Recommendation

The Committee is requested to note the report.

1. This brief report summarises in Appendix A the audit work undertaken since 1 April compared to the 2017/18 Internal Audit plan agreed by the Committee at its meeting on 20 March 2017.
2. The Internal Audit plan that is presented to the Committee at the start of the year is only an indicative one as it has to be responsive to changes in risks and hence the individual jobs may vary from the original plan and new jobs may need to be added or jobs deleted or amended.
3. The Committee will recall that the key outcome of each audit is an overall opinion on the level of assurance provided by the controls within the area audited. Audits will be given one of four levels depending on the strength of controls and the operation of those controls. The four categories ranging from the lowest to highest are Limited, Moderate, Substantial and Full. The opinion reflects both the design of the control environment and the operation of controls. Both Warwickshire and West Mercia PCC Grant audits, Place Partnership and IT Service Delivery Standards audits have been completed since the last report to Committee and issued as final reports, three have been given a substantial opinion and one a moderate opinion, a summary of the findings are provided at Appendix B.

GARRY ROLLASON
Head of Internal Audit

6th December 2017

Appendix A: Police Internal Audit Workplan 2017/2018 Progress report as at 30 November 2017

| Topic | Priority | Opinion | Latest Status |
|---|----------|---|--|
| PCCs | | | |
| Victim Support | H | | Planning Commenced |
| Grants (audit) | H | West Mercia - Substantial Warwickshire - Substantial | Complete |
| Grants (advisory) | H | | In Progress |
| Alliance | | | |
| Information Management (audit) | H | | In Progress |
| Information Management (advisory) | H | | In Progress |
| Disclosure Service / Vetting (advisory) | H | | |
| Seized Property | H | | |
| Change Programme (Governance, advisory, benefits realisation) | H | | In Progress |
| Place Partnership | H | Substantial | Complete |
| Financial Systems (payroll, debtors, creditors, GL) | H | | Planning Commenced |
| Financial Systems (self service – overtime, travel etc) | H | | Planning Commenced |
| Fleet Management | H | | In Progress |
| Business Planning (advisory) | H | | In Progress |
| Performance Management | H | Substantial | Complete – outcome reported to September meeting |
| MASH | H | | Draft report issued, management response being agreed. |
| Firearms & Tasers | H | | Planning Commenced |
| IT audit: | H | | |
| Asset Management and Configuration | | | |

| Topic | Priority | Opinion | Latest Status |
|--|----------|-------------|--|
| Database Administration and Management | | | |
| Risk Management | M | | In Progress |
| Firearms Licensing | M | | In Progress |
| Procurement | M | | Terms of reference agreed 6th December |
| Completion of 2016/17 Audits | | | |
| Treasury Management | | Substantial | Complete # |
| Covert Funds | | Substantial | Complete # |
| Crime Property | | Moderate | Complete # |
| Partnerships | | Limited | Draft report issued following completion of requested additional work. Response awaited |
| IT Audit: | | | |
| IT – Service Delivery Standards | | Moderate | Complete |
| IT – Programme/Projects Benefits Realisation | | | In Progress, Additional work identified following initial draft report. Subsequently there have been difficulties in obtaining information to complete the required additional work. |
| Active Directory | | | Fieldwork completed. Difficulties have been experienced in getting meetings to discuss the audit findings. |

Reported in 2016/17 Annual Report

Appendix B: Summary of audits completed since the previous update.

| Audit | Key findings | Opinion on level of assurance provided by controls | Number of recommendations | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| | | | Fundamental | Significant | Merits Attention |
| PCC Grants Warwickshire | <p>The objective of the audit was to provide assurance on the adequacy of the grant award process operated by the Police and Crime Commissioner.</p> <p>Our key concern was due to a potential conflict of interests the decision on whether to approve grant applications from Warwickshire County Council is delegated to the Chief Executive. Although there is evidence that the applications were presented to the Chief Executive the grant allocations are formally signed off by the PCC. In order to evidence the decision making process any grants awarded to Warwickshire County Council should be formally signed off by the Chief Executive.</p> <p>It has now been decided that decisions relating to Warwickshire County Council will now be signed off by the newly appointed Deputy PCC.</p> | Substantial | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PCC Grants West Mercia | <p>The objective of the audit was to provide assurance on the adequacy of the grant award process operated by the Police and Crime Commissioner.</p> <p>Issues identified were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the PCC, Deputy PCC and the Chief Executive | Substantial | 0 | 1 | 2 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|
| | <p>have completed a declaration of interest there is no evidence that members of the Commissioning Team responsible for evaluating grant applications have done the same. The declaration made by the Chief Executive is dated April 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all grant recipients had provided the progress reports required in accordance with the grant agreement. • Progress reports received for some of the lower value grants do not provide information about the outcomes achieved by the project but focus more on the numbers attending. | | | | |
| Place Partnership Limited | <p>The objective of the review was to provide an opinion on the PPL client side monitoring arrangements and to determine from the Warwickshire Police and West Mercia Police standpoint that the benefits set out in the Business Case are being delivered. It must be stressed that the review is of the Police arrangements only and not those of PPL.</p> <p>Our key concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Operations and Assurance Group was revised and updated in January 2017. However, a review of the minutes from the Operations and Assurance Group found no evidence of the updated ToR being approved. • A suite of KPIs has now been developed and monitored using a tracker spreadsheet. The KPIs reported differ to those identified in the Service Agreement, but have yet to be formally adopted as a variation. • The benefits realisation delivery, by PPL, is behind schedule but recording and monitoring improvements have | Substantial | 0 | 2 | 2 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|----------|---|---|---|
| | <p>been made by the Alliance. A spreadsheet has been developed to show the original aims and expected benefits of the Full Business Case and progress is now being tracked. However, there is no formally documented process to assist staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the Alliance collates feedback on an ongoing basis through the Operations and Assurance group, there has never been a root and branch review to identify lessons to be learnt from establishing PPL. | | | | |
| IT – Service Delivery Standards | <p>The objective of the audit was to assess the effectiveness of the Force’s IT service delivery arrangements and provide assurance as to whether these are established in line with recognised standards such as Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL).</p> <p>The review identified the following areas for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no formally defined and agreed targets or Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) around the handling and resolution of incidents dealt with by the service desk as recommended by ITIL; Service reporting should be improved and based on agreed Service Level Agreements as recommended by ITIL; There is not currently an ICT service catalogue in place providing a comprehensive list of services/ details of service level requirements relating to those services. A complete and up-to-date IT service catalogue is an ITIL best practice recommendation; The incident management process documentation requires review and formalisation; There is currently no process in place to collect and monitor customer satisfaction with service desk performance, assisting in identifying potential areas for | Moderate | 0 | 4 | 1 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| | improvement. | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|--|--|--|

Garry Rollason
Head of Audit

Jackie Sparkes
Engagement Manager

6th December 2017