

Nottinghamshire and City of Nottingham Fire and Rescue Authority Finance and Resources Committee

# INTERNAL AUDIT STRATEGY 2010-2013

Report of the Treasurer to the Fire Authority

Agenda Item No:

**Date:** 09 April 2010

## **Purpose of Report:**

To inform Members of the Finance and Resources Committee (acting in their capacity as Audit Committee) of the Internal Audit Strategy for the three year period 2010 to 2013 and to present the planned work to be undertaken by the Internal Auditors.

## CONTACT OFFICER

- Name : Neil Timms Head of Finance & Resources
- **Tel :** (0115) 967 0880
- Email : neil.timms@notts-fire.gov.uk

Media EnquiriesElisabeth ReesonContact :(0115) 967 5889 elisabeth.reeson@notts-fire.gov.uk

## 1. BACKGROUND

In previous years the audit plan for the forthcoming year has been presented to the Fire Authority in conjunction with the annual report for the previous financial year. In recognition of changes to the corporate governance arrangements within the Fire Service, it is considered more appropriate to present the forward plan to the Finance and Resources Committee at an early stage in the financial year so that Members are informed of the proposed schedule of work and can obtain a better view of the regulatory framework in their role as audit committee.

## 2. REPORT

- 2.1 The full Internal Audit Strategy is given as Appendix A to this report and sets out the responsibilities of the Authority to maintain an adequate internal audit function.
- 2.2 The Strategy also gives assurances to the Authority as to the standards to which the internal auditors will adhere and the ways in which they will report their findings and recommendations.
- 2.3 The internal auditors develop their plans and strategies by carrying out a risk assessment process which considers all the key systems and processes in operation as well as liaising with the Head of Finance and Resources and the External Auditors. This risk assessment which is attached as Appendix B uses a scoring matrix to determine relative levels of risk which informs the strategic plan.
- 2.4 The final part of the strategy document given as Appendix C, sets out the particular work plans which are derived from the risk assessment process. The internal auditors will be present at the meeting to discuss any areas of particular interest to Members.
- 2.5 Also attached as Appendices D and E is the detailed explanation of the risk assessment process and a worked example.

## 3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The agreed charges for the Internal Audit Service for 2010/2011 is £305 per day an increase of £2 per day on the 2009/2010 fee. The agreed input of 95 days will cost the service £28,975 which is already included in the 2010/2011 budget.

## 4. HUMAN RESOURCES AND LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

There are no implications for human resources or learning and development arising from this report.

## 5. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

An equality impact assessment has not been undertaken for this report as it does not relate to a change of policy or procedure and will have no impact on equalities.

## 6. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

There are no crime and disorder implications arising from this report.

#### 7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no legal implications arising from this report.

#### 8. **RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

As referred to above, the Strategy and annual plan are based on risk assessments undertaken by Internal Audit, while the Authority's integrated risk management approach will be reviewed within the Governance programme.

#### 9. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

That Members approve the Audit Strategy and work proposals for 2010 to 2013.

## 10. BACKGROUND PAPERS FOR INSPECTION (OTHER THAN PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS)

None.

Peter Hurford TREASURER TO THE FIRE AUTHORITY

#### **INTERNAL AUDIT STRATEGY 2010 - 2013**

#### Nottinghamshire and City of Nottingham Combined Fire Authority

#### 1 Introduction

1.1 The requirement for the Fire Authority to maintain an Internal Audit function is derived from the local government legislation including Section 151 of the Local government Act 1972 and the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2003, amended in 2006, in that a relevant body must:

"maintain an adequate and effective internal audit of its accounting records and of its system of internal control in accordance with the proper internal audit practices".

- 1.2 The responsibility for ensuring an effective internal audit function rests with the Authority Treasurer as part of his Section 151 obligations.
- 1.3 Internal Audit is an assurance function that primarily provides an independent and objective opinion to the Authority on the control environment comprising risk management, control and governance by evaluating its effectiveness in achieving the organisation's objectives.
- 1.4 It objectively examines, evaluates and reports on the adequacy of the control environment as a contribution to the proper, economic, efficient and effective use of resources.

In particular it:

- (a) carries out a risk based review and evaluation of the Authority's financial and other systems and procedures;
- (b) provides management and Members with advice and assurance to assist them in the effective discharge of their responsibilities;
- (c) plans audit work having regard to the Services Corporate plans.
- 1.5 Internal Audit's work will also cover the local Code of Corporate Governance, which establishes the framework of the Authority's internal control environment. Overall, the results of Audit work will allow the Treasurer to deliver an audit opinion on the Authority's internal control environment and contribute to the annual Statement on Internal Control, as required by the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2003.
- 1.6 Responsibility for the design and correct operation of internal controls rests with departmental managers. Internal Audit is not a substitute for effective internal control. Its task is to carry out an independent review of the soundness of internal control systems to highlight weaknesses and recommend improvements where necessary. Accountability for the response to the advice and recommendations of Internal Audit lies with management, who either accept and implement the advice or formally reject it, thereby accepting the risk outlined.

#### 2 Internal Audit Standards

- 2.1 Internal Audit operates in accordance with the Code of Practice for Internal Audit in Local Government issued by CIPFA. Compliance with the Code is reviewed annually both by the Head of Service for Internal Audit and the External Auditor.
- 2.2 A thorough recruitment process is applied to the appointment of Audit staff to ensure the Section has the appropriate professional skills and experience to fulfil its objectives. Internal Audit staff work in accordance with an Internal Audit Manual, incorporating an Internal Audit Protocol, which provides guidance to Internal Auditors to help them carry out their work in accordance with professional standards and the CIPFA Code of Practice.

#### 3 Internal Audit Strategy

- 3.1 Internal Audit produce an Internal Audit Strategy consisting of a three year risk-based programme, and a work plan. The programme and plans have been developed in consultation with the Treasurer and Head of Finance and Resources.
- 3.2 The Internal Audit plans include an element of contingency to allow Internal Audit to be responsive to changes in conditions and to requests for assistance from the Head of Finance and Resources.
- 3.3 Objectives are prepared for each planned Internal Audit assignment and are normally discussed with relevant line managers before the work is started. Internal Audit will usually give reasonable notice to the relevant manager of the start of an audit and will minimise any disruption to the smooth running of the area under review. However, Internal Audit reserves the right to make unannounced visits where the Treasurer or Head of Finance and Resources considers it necessary.

#### 4 <u>Strategic and Annual Plans</u>

4.1 Appendices B and C provide details of the Internal Audit risk assessment and the plan for 2010/11 to 2012/13. The plans are based on a risk analysis matrix, with high risk systems and services being audited every two years (on average), medium risk areas every three years and low risk areas every five years. The Internal Audit risk assessed work makes up approximately two thirds of the planned work, with the other third comprising 'managed audit' work, carried out on behalf of External Audit to provide a level of assurance on the operation of high level controls associated with financially significant systems. This work is carried out in the final quarter of each financial year and is not directly linked to the Internal Audit risk assessment.

#### 5 Internal Audit Reporting

- 5.1 Internal Audit reports its findings in draft to appropriate managers, who have the opportunity to discuss and influence the findings and recommendations. The formal draft report is then issued to the Head of Finance and Resources, who is responsible for responding to reports on behalf of the Chief Fire Officer. Recommendations are risk ranked and reports contain an audit opinion on the area reviewed. There are four separate audit opinions, namely sound, satisfactory, unsatisfactory and unsound. If an opinion is unsatisfactory or unsound, a follow-up audit is normally carried out six months later to ensure that the recommendations have been implemented.
- 5.2 Final Audit reports are circulated in accordance with a list agreed with the Head of Finance and Resources and the Treasurer. In order to provide an additional level of scrutiny, and to strengthen the independence of Internal Audit, from 2006/7 the circulation list includes the Chairman of the CFA and Chair of Finance and Resources Committee, in addition to the Chief Fire Officer and Head of Performance. Reports are also passed to the Information Services Department, which carries out follow up enquiries to ensure that Audit recommendations are implemented.

#### Nottinghamshire and City of Nottingham Combined Fire Service

#### Assessment of risk for the financial year 2010/11

<u>/////////////////////////////////////</u>			loiui	your ior	HIGH	MED	MED	MED	MED	MED	LOW	MED	LOW	MED	MED	HIGH	MED	HIGH	MED
					1	2	3		5		7	8	9						15
					1	2	3	4	5	6	/	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
					Fin Mngt				Purch &	Income									
ELEMENT		SCALE OF MEASUREMENT		Weight Factor	& Budgets	Payroll	Pensions	Treasury Mngt	Cr Payments	& Debtors	Assets	Premises	Transport	Capital	Trading Activities	Comput er Audit	Risk Mngmt	Corp Governance	Partner schemes
	< £100k	Up to £1k	1	Risk Score					<b>,</b>										
	- 21001	00 10 211			5	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	4
Transaction	£100k-£500k	£1k to £10k	2																
Value £ pa	£500k - £1m	£10k to £100k	3		> £10m	> £10m	>£1m to	> £10m	> £10m	£1m to	> £10m	> £10m	£1m to	> £10m	£1m to	> £10m	> £10m	> £10m	£1m to
· · ·							£10m			£10m			£10m		£10m				£10m
	£1m - £10m	£100k to £1M	4	2															
	> £10m	Over £1M	5	Risk Total	10	10	<u> </u>	10	10		10	10		10		10	10	10	
					10	10	8	10	10	8	10	10	8	10	8	10	10	10	8
	< 1,000	Up to 1,000	1	Risk Score															
	,	<u> </u>			4	2	3	2	3	2	1	2	2	1	2	5	1	1	1
Transaction	1,000 - 5,000	1,000 to 10,000	2																
Volume pa	5,000- 10,000	10,000 to 100,000	3		100k to 1m	1k to 10k	10k to 100k	1k to 10k	10k to 100k	1k to 10k	< 1k	1k to 10k	1k to 10k	< 1k	1k to 10k	> 1m	< 1k	< 1k	< 1k
	10,000-										l	l	l	l				l	
	50,000	100,000 to 1M	4	3															
	>50,000	Over 1M	5	Risk Total	12	6	9	6	9	6	3	6	6	3	6	15	3	3	3
					12	9	5	9	5	9	5	0	Ŭ	5	0	15	5	J	<u> </u>
Std of		Good	1	Risk Score					1.										
					2	1	1	1	2	3	2	2	1	2	3	2	1	2	2
Internal		Average	2	5	Average	Good	Good	Good	Average	Poor	Average	Average	Good	Average	Poor	Average	Good	Average	Average
Controls		Poor	3	Risk Total	10	-	-	-	10	45	10	10	-	10	45	10	-	10	10
					10	5	5	5	10	15	10	10	5	10	15	10	5	10	10
		Low	1	Risk Score															
		2014			1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Cash & Bank		Medium	2	5	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Risk		High	3	Risk Total															
					5	5	5	10	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

System	Simple	1	Risk Score	3	3	3	2	2	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3
Complexity	Average	2	5	Comple x	Comple x	Complex	Medium	Medium	Simple	Simple	Medium	Medium	Comple x	Medium	Comple x	Complex	Complex	Complex
	Complex	3	Risk Total	15	15	15	10	10	5	5	10	10	15	10	15	15	15	15
System	V Stable	1	Risk Score	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	2	2
Stability	Average	2	5	Medium	Stable	Stable	Stable	Medium	Stable	Stable	Stable	Stable	Stable	Unstable	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
	Unstable	3	Risk Total	10	5	5	5	10	5	5	5	5	5	15	10	10	10	10
System	Low	1	Risk Score	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	3	3	3
Sensitivity	Medium	2	5	High	High	High	High	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Low	High	High	High	High
	High	3	Risk Total	15	15	15	15	10	10	5	5	5	10	5	15	15	15	15
Number	Single site	1	Risk Score	1	1	1	1	3	2	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
of	Two to five sites	2	2	Single	Single	Single	Single	> 5	2 to 5	> 5	> 5	Single	Single	Single	Single	Single	Single	Single
Sites	Over five sites	3	Risk Total	2	2	2	2	6	4	6	6	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
No of Years	One year	1	Risk Score	1	1	1	3	1	2	2	3	3	4	2	1	2	4	1
Since last	Two years	2		Year(s)	Year(s)	Year(s)	Year(s)	Year(s)	Year(s)	Year(s)	Year(s)	Year(s)	Year(s)	Year(s)	Year(s)	Year(s)	Year(s)	Year(s)
Audit	Three years	3	3								-							
	Over three years	4	Risk Total	3	3	3	9	3	6	6	9	9	12	6	3	6	12	3
		1																
High Risk	81 to 118	2	Yrs	82	66	67	72	73	64	55	71	55	72	72	85	71	82	71
Medium Risk	65 to 80	3	Yrs	HIGH	MED	MED	MED	MED	MED	LOW	MED	LOW	MED	MED	HIGH	MED	HIGH	MED
Low Risk	0 to 64	5	Yrs															

#### APPENDIX C

### COMBINED FIRE AUTHORITY - INTERNAL AUDIT STRATEGIC PLAN FOR 2010 to 2013

SERVICE AREA	Assessed Risk	Audit Freq Yrs	Audit Days Planned 2010-2011	Audit Days Planned 2011-2012	Audit Days Planned 2012-2013	Comments	Total Days
Corp Governance	Н	2	10		10	Review compliance with Audit Commission guidance.	20
Financial Management	н	2	5	10		1) Transfer of balances to Aggresso. 2) Review of controls.	15
ICT	Н	2	10		10	To be agreed with Head of Finance & Resources.	20
Capital	М	3	10			Management of contracts.	10
Notts FRS Trading Ltd	М	3	10			First look at the new Trading Company.	10
Partnerships	М	3			10	Review of partnership arrangements.	10
Payroll	M 3			9		Focus on the role of HR in payroll processing.	9
Pensions	М	3			10	Review of pensions records and contributions.	10
Premises	М	3			10	Premises maintenance - planned & reactive.	10
Purchasing & Cr Payments	М	3			8	Stores purchasing	8
Risk Management	М	3		10		Review of risk management arrangements.	10
Treasury Management	М	3		9		Compliance with TM policy.	9
Assets	L	5	8			Review implementation of the RedKite system.	8
Income and Debtors	L	5		10		Issuing invoices and management of Debtors	10
Transport	L	5		10		Review of travel claims.	10
Cardiff Checks		Annual	10	10	10	Examination of invoices selected by members.	30
Managed Audit		Annual	20	20	20	To be agreed with external audit.	60
Fin Regs Advice		One-off	5			As requested.	5
Client Management			7	7	7	Time spent on planning, reporting, meetings etc	21
Total planned days for the yea	r		95	95	95		285

#### Fire Audit strategy 2010/11 – 2012/13

In January 2010, the main business areas and activities to be audited were agreed with the Head of Finance & Resources.

These areas have each been risk assessed to determine the level of audit needed and the results of this process have been used to produce the audit strategy for 2010/11 to 2012/13

#### **Risk Assessment:**

The risk assessment model used considers nine different risk factors to provide a consistent and objective methodology for ranking each business area assessed. The risk factors used are:-

1. Annual Value: This takes account of the materiality of the area being assessed.

**2. Transaction volumes**: This takes into account the number of transactions processed per year and recognises that the greater the number of transactions involved, the greater the risk of error through inaccuracy, omission, duplication or late processing.

**3. Effectiveness of Internal Controls:** This takes into account the known quality of the current controls operating within the area of activity. Normally this is obtained from the most recent audit report for this area.

**4. Cash & Bank Risk:** This takes into account the value and quantity of cash and cheques being processed. The presence of cash and cheques increases the opportunity and the temptation for theft and fraud.

**5. System Complexity:** This recognises that, as the complexity of the processes increases, the greater the risk of errors being made and, perhaps, remaining undetected.

**6.** System Stability: This recognises that instability within systems, e.g. the number and frequency of changes, increases the risk of confusion and error.

**7. System Sensitivity:** This takes account of the political and reputational factors involved with an activity and the potential impact of error or failure.

**8. Number of Sites involved:** This recognises that where processes take place at more than one location, the risk of inconsistency, communication failure and variations in procedure increases.

**9. Number of year since the last audit:** This recognises that, the longer the period since the last audit, the greater the risk that controls have reduced in effectiveness.

Each risk factor is scored – see appendix A and once scores have been assigned to each risk factor, an overall risk total is obtained for the area or activity. This score is then categorised into one of three risk levels – High, Medium and Low.

High risk areas are subject to audit every two years, medium risk areas every three years and low risk areas every five years.

The number of days assigned to each audit is based on knowledge of the size and complexity of the area to be reviewed and is largely a matter of judgement based on experience of audit carried out in similar areas.

#### Risk scores for each risk factor.

Annual Value	:	
	Up to £10k £10k - £100k £100k - £1m £1m - £10m Over £10m	1 2 3 4 5
Volume of Tra	ansactions: Up to 1,000 1,000 to 10,000 10,000 to 100,000 100,000 to 1 million Over 1 million	1 2 3 4 5
Internal Cont	<b>rols:</b> Good Average/ Unknown Poor	1 2 3
Cash & Bank	<b>Risk:</b> Low Medium High	1 2 3
Complexity:	Simple Average Complex	1 2 3
Stability:	Stable Average Unstable	1 2 3
Sensitivity:	Low Medium High	1 2 3
No. of Sites:	1 site 2 – 5 sites over 5 sites	1 2 3
No. of Yrs sir	<b>ice Last Audit:</b> 1 year 2 years 3 years Over 3 years	1 2 3 4

## Worked example of an audit risk assessment of the NFRS Payroll system

Risk Factor	Basis of score	Score	
Annual Value: Number of Transaction: Internal Controls: Cash & Bank Risk System Complexity System Stability Sensitivity Number of Sites: Number of Yrs since last audit	Over £10 million 1,000 to 10,000 Good Low Complex Stable High One One	5 2 1 1 3 1 3 1 1	
Weighted risk score		66	
Overall risk category	Medium		
Audit frequency	Every 3 years		
No of days assigned for each audit	10 days		