



NOTTINGHAMSHIRE
Fire & Rescue Service
Creating Safer Communities

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

INTERNAL AUDIT ANNUAL REPORT 2015/16

Report of the Treasurer to the Fire Authority

Date: 24 June 2016

Purpose of Report:

To bring to the attention of Members the annual report prepared by the Authority's Internal Auditors.

CONTACT OFFICER

Name : Sue Maycock
Head of Finance

Tel : (0115) 967 0880

Email : sue.maycock@notts-fire.gov.uk

**Media Enquiries
Contact :** Therese Easom
(0115) 967 0880 therese.easom@notts-fire.gov.uk

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Nottinghamshire County Council has provided an Internal Audit service to the Fire and Rescue Authority since its formation in 1998. The Finance and Resources Committee receives the Internal Auditor's annual report in accordance with its role as an audit committee.
- 1.2 The annual report for 2015/16 is attached in full as Appendix A to this report.
- 1.3 Under the provisions of the Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting, the Authority is required to annually review its arrangements for the provision of Internal Audit and comment on that review. This report sets out the basis of that review and a draft statement on Internal Audit is attached.

2. REPORT

AUDITOR'S REPORT

- 2.1 The Auditor's report is divided up into five sections:
 - A A narrative summary to 31 March 2016.
 - B A summary of reports issued to date
 - C An analysis of progress against plan for 2015/2016
 - D Internal Audit Plan for 2016/17
- 2.2 The Auditors again comment in their narrative summary that overall the audit reports issued during the year confirmed that satisfactory control procedures are in operation.
- 2.3 The narrative section also shows the level of Internal Audit Staff that have been employed on the Fire Authority contract as over 60% provided by senior and/or qualified staff.
- 2.4 The Auditors have also provided a view on the internal control environment and conclude that:

“From the work carried out during the 2015/16 financial year, we have been able to satisfy ourselves that the overall level of internal control is satisfactory and provides a good basis for effective financial and resource management.”

This statement will form part of the Annual Governance Statement to be reported to the Fire Authority in September as part of the Statement of Accounts.
- 2.5 Section B of the audit report gives a summary of the reports issued up to 31st March 2016 and gives a brief description of the levels of assurance that the auditors have given to each area of work.

- 2.6 In respect of the reports issued during 2015/16 the Auditors assessed all of the relevant areas as showing either reasonable or substantial levels of assurance, however at the end of the year three reports were at the draft stage and one of these, the Prince's Trust Partnership audit, will be categorised as having a limited level of assurance. The draft report shows that this assessment relates to the risk associated with the uncertain levels of funding for the Prince's Trust and Members are already well aware of this issue.
- 2.7 Section C shows the Auditors actual performance against planned activity for the year 2015/16. This shows that they completed 83 audit days from the planned delivery of 106 days and will be carrying forward 25 days to complete work in progress.
- 2.8 Section D shows the internal audit plan for 2016/17 and the draft plan for 2017/18. The plan has been agreed by the Head of Finance, but there is sufficient flexibility to amend the plan if circumstances require alternative work to be carried out by the Auditors in the year.
- 2.9 Reports not previously brought to this committee are given in full in Appendix B to this report.

REVIEW OF INTERNAL AUDIT

- 2.10 The requirement for an Authority to maintain an Internal Audit function is derived from local government legislation, including Section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 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”

- 2.11 The responsibility for ensuring an effective internal audit function rests with the Authority Treasurer as part of his Section 151 obligations.
- 2.12 The Authority views Internal Audit as an integral part of the corporate governance framework, particularly in so far as it relates to the system of Internal Control. Whilst it is acknowledged that Internal Control is a managerial responsibility, it is considered that Internal Audit can provide managers with independent assurance that the system is working effectively and draw any deficiencies in the system to the attention of managers and elected members.
- 2.13 These assurances, however, can only be relied upon providing the internal audit service is adequate to meet the needs of the organisation and is provided professionally.
- 2.14 The Internal Audit Service of the Authority is provided under a Service Level Agreement with Nottinghamshire County Council and requires the Auditors to operate within the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards set down by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA). Operating to these standards will ensure that the Authority meets its obligations under statute.

- 2.15 There are regular reviews of audit plans and progress by senior managers and the audit team to monitor the work being carried out.
- 2.16 The External Auditors, in their general review of controls and as part of their specific annual audit, are required to comment on the adequacy or otherwise of Internal Audit. To date they have always been satisfied that the work of Internal Audit is sufficient for them to rely on their audit work and that the service is effective.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

4. HUMAN RESOURCES AND LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

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

5. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

There are no implications for equalities arising from this report.

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

Internal Audit forms part of the wider system of internal control which deals entirely with the Authority's exposure to financial, and to some extent non-financial risk. Presenting the annual report to the Authority enables Members to see the work of internal audit and the contribution that they make to the overall system of internal control.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

That Members note the contents of this report.

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

None.

Neil Timms
TREASURER TO THE FIRE AUTHORITY

INTERNAL AUDIT ANNUAL REPORT 2015/16
TO THE CHIEF FIRE OFFICER

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
A	Narrative Summary to 31st March 2016
B	Summary of Reports Issued to Date
C	Detailed Analysis of Progress against Plan for 2015/16
D	Internal Audit Plan for 2016/17

A

INTERNAL AUDIT ANNUAL REPORT 2015/16

SUMMARY

1 Audit coverage for the twelve months to the end of March 2016

- 1.1 Eleven audits were planned for 2015/16 This included one audit deferred from 2014/15 and the contingency which was used for the audit of anti-fraud procedures.
- 1.2 Six final reports have been issued in 2015/16, comprising three reports relating to 2014/15 audits and three relating to 2015/16 (including the audit and sign-off of the Capital Grant for 2014/15).
- 1.3 Draft reports have been issued in respect of three audits (Contracts and Procurement, Transport, and the Princes Trust Partnership). The Cardiff Checks audit is substantially complete and will be issued in April 2016. The audits of Payroll, Anti-Fraud and ICT (environmental and physical controls) have been started and will be completed in 2016/17, along with the review of Pensions which has been deferred to 2016/17.
- 1.4 All but one of the areas reviewed to date in 2015/16 have been categorised as providing either substantial or reasonable assurance. A limited assurance opinion was issued for the Princes Trust Partnership audit. The Sharepoint audit was a follow-up and this confirmed that sufficient actions had been taken for the opinion to be lifted to reasonable assurance.
- 1.5 Overall, the audit reports issued during the year confirmed that satisfactory control procedures are in operation.
- 1.6 A summary of reports issued in the 2015/16 financial year, together with the main findings, is attached (Section B).
- 1.7 Over 60% of the audit work carried out in the year was undertaken by senior and/or qualified staff.

2 Audit Strategy

- 2.1 This is the third year of the risk based Internal Audit strategy for 2013/14 to 2015/16 approved at the Finance and Resources Committee meeting on 4 April 2013. **A risk analysis and strategy for 2016/17 is attached. (Section D)**

3 Annual Governance Statement

- 3.1 The Accounts and Audit Regulations 2011 require the Authority to review the effectiveness of its system of internal control and publish an Annual Governance Statement to cover the effectiveness of the Authority's systems for governance and internal control. The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) and

Society of Local Authority Chief Executives (SOLACE) issue guidance to Local Authorities from time to time to assist with compliance.

- 3.2 In order to satisfy the principles of effective risk management and internal control, the Authority needs to have in place effective risk management systems, including sound systems of internal control and an internal audit function. These arrangements need to ensure compliance with all applicable statutes and regulations and other relevant statements of best practice, and need to ensure that public funds are properly safeguarded and are used economically, efficiently and effectively.
- 3.3 Internal Audit is appointed by the Chief Fire Officer and Treasurer (who is the Section 151 officer for the Fire Authority), and provides management with an independent appraisal of these matters.
- 3.4 The scope and cyclical frequency of work carried out by Internal Audit during each financial year is mainly based on an assessment of (predominately) financial risk on all activities that form the responsibility of the Combined Fire Authority. Annual reviews of key control areas for the main financial systems are also conducted following discussions with external audit.
- 3.5 The objective of the audits is to form an opinion on the adequacy of the systems of internal control put in place by management; to review efficiency, effectiveness and best value issues and to ensure that the assets of the authority are properly safeguarded. Formal audit reporting procedures are in place to provide assurance to management where effective controls are being operated, and to make recommendations for change and improvement where control weaknesses are identified.
- 3.6 From the work carried out during the 2015/16 financial year, we have been able to satisfy ourselves that the overall level of internal control is satisfactory and provides a good basis for effective financial and resource management.
- 3.7 The Chief Fire Officer and his managers have responded positively to all recommendations made in the reports that have been finalised.

4 Conclusion

- 4.1 Based on the Internal Audit work completed during the year, we have concluded that the overall level of internal control is satisfactory.

Angela Wendels
Senior Auditor
31 March 2016

B

SUMMARY OF REPORTS ISSUED TO THE FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2015/16 AS AT 31st MARCH 2016

Audit Opinion

In the areas examined, we have assessed the controls in place to determine their effectiveness in ensuring business objectives are met and risks are mitigated. The level of assurance provided following each audit is selected from the following range:



LIMITED ASSURANCE

Risk levels are high



REASONABLE ASSURANCE

Risk levels are acceptable



SUBSTANTIAL ASSURANCE

Risk levels are low

1. **FRS 1510 – Treasury Management**

In Audit's opinion, a **reasonable** level of assurance could be given. One high and two medium risk recommendations were made. The high risk related to the need for timely reconciliations between the cash flow forecast and bank balance. All three recommendations were implemented.

2. **FRS 1511 – Financial Management System - Agresso**

A **substantial** level of assurance was given. One medium and 3 low priority risk recommendations were made and implementation was agreed.

3. **FRS 1512 – Cardiff Checks**

A sample of payments made during the year was selected for detailed checking, to confirm compliance with ordering, goods receipt, payment and other Fire and Rescue Service procedures. The payments were in

respect of home safety checks, cleaning and repair of fire kit and unplanned vehicle maintenance. Nine recommendations were made in regard to the first two payments and all recommendations were implemented.

4. FRS 1601 – Income and Debtors

A **substantial** level of assurance was given. Five low priority risks were identified and implemented.

5. FRS 1603 – Capital Grant Claim

The capital grant claim form for 2014/15 was signed off satisfactorily.

6. FRS 1604 – Sharepoint System (Follow-up)

Measures to address weaknesses included in the previous report had been implemented and we were therefore able to give a **reasonable** level of assurance.

2015/16 AUDIT REPORTS AT DRAFT STAGE

- 7. Transport Management – Draft issued 11/3/16**
- 8. Prince’s Trust Partnerships – Discussion draft issued 4/2/16**
- 9. Contract Management – Discussion draft issued 11/3/16**

2015/16 AUDITS IN PROGRESS AT 31/3/16

- 10. Cardiff Checks – Substantially complete - to be issued in April 2016**
- 11. Anti-Fraud Procedures – In progress, to be completed in 2016/17**
- 12. ICT – Environmental Controls – In progress, to be completed in 2016/17**
- 13. Payroll – In progress, to be completed in 2016/17**
- 14. LG Pensions – Carried forward - to be undertaken in 2016/17**

C

INTERNAL AUDIT ANNUAL PLAN AND ACTUAL DAYS 2015/16

Area of Service Activity	Planned Audit Days	Actual Days	Report Ref:	Comments
Audits in progress at year end 2014-15				
Financial Management	1	1	FRS/1510	Final report issued May 2015
Treasury Management	1	1	FRS/1511	Final report issued May 2015
Cardiff Checks 14/15	6	6	FRS/1512	Final report issued July 2015
Income and Debtors	5	7	FRS/1601	Final report issued
Transport Management	10	11	FRS/1602	Draft report issued
Capital Grant Claim	1	2	FRS/1603	Complete
Sharepoint System (Follow-up)	5	3	FRS/1604	Final report issued
Partnerships - Prince's Trust	10	11	FRS/1605	Draft report issued
Cardiff Checks 15/16	10	10	FRS/1606	Draft report issued April 2016
Contract Management	10	11	FRS/1607	Final Report issued April 2016
Anti-Fraud Procedures	10	5	FRS/1608	In progress. Will be issued in 2016-17
ICT - Environmental and Physical controls	10	0	FRS/1609	In progress. Will be issued in 2016-17
Payroll system	12	8		In progress. Will be issued in 2016-17
LG Pension Fund	6	0		To be completed in 2016-17
Contingency	2	0		Carried forward to 2016-17
Client Management	7	7	N/A	
Days carried forward to complete outstanding audits		25		
Total Audit Days for the Year	106	108		

Carried forward

Pension	6
Contingency	2
ICT	10
Anti fraud	4
Payroll	3
	25

D

COMBINED FIRE AUTHORITY - INTERNAL AUDIT PLAN FOR 2016/17

	Assessed	Audit	Year Last	2016/17	2017/18
SERVICE AREA	Risk	Frequency (Years)	Audited	Agreed Plan	Draft Plan
Contingency			2014/15	5	3
Anti- Fraud Procedures	Medium	Requested	2015/16		
Assets	Medium	4	2014/15		10
Capital	High	3	2013/14	10	
Cardiff Checks	Medium	Annual	2015/16	10	10
Contracts (Cross Cutting)	Medium	3	2015/16		
Corp Governance	Medium	2	2013/14	10	
Financial Management	High	2	2014/15	10	
ICT	Medium	Annual	2015/16	10	10
Income & Debtors	Medium	3	2015/16		10
Members/Officers Allowances	Medium	3	-		
Notts FRS Trading Ltd	Medium	3	2012/13	10	
Partnerships	Medium	3	2015/16		
Payroll	Medium	3	2015/16		
Payroll Migration	High	Requested		See below	7
Pensions	High	3	2012/13	See below	
Property/Premises	Medium	3	-		10
Purchase Cards	Medium	3	-	5	

	Assessed	Audit	Year	2016/17	2017/18
SERVICE AREA	Risk	Frequency	Last Audited		
		(Years)		Agreed Plan	Draft Plan
Purchasing & Creditor Payments	Medium	3	2014/15		10
Risk Management	Medium	3	2013/14	10	
Transport	Medium	4	2015/16		
Treasury Management	Medium	3	2014/15		10
Follow-up Audits (Prince's Trust Partnership)		Annual		5	5
Client Management				7	7
Total planned days for the year				92	92

Carried forward audit days from 2015/16

LG Pension

ICT - Environmental Controls

Contingency b/fwd to be used for Payroll

Migration

Payroll

Anti-Fraud

6
10
2
3
4
25

To: Chief Fire Officer
Subject: Treasury Management
Date: May 2015

1 Introduction

- 1.1 We have audited records to ensure that policy and procedures are in accordance with CIPFA guidance and have been applied during the period under review. We assessed the adequacy and effectiveness of control measures.
- 1.2 The objectives of the system are to manage the investments and cash flows, banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with those risks.

2 Audit opinion

- 2.1 In the areas examined, we assessed the controls to determine to what extent the risks are being mitigated.
- 2.2 In our opinion the level of assurance we can provide is: -



3 Risk areas examined

- 3.1 During this audit we looked for controls to address the following key risks: -

<i>Risk description</i>	<i>Significance</i>
There is insufficient cash available to meet financial obligations.	The current account would become overdrawn, incur bank charges and be unable to meet commitments.
Fraud and/or errors are committed	Reliance cannot be placed on Treasury Management activities.
Borrowing is entered into with unfavourable terms and conditions.	The costs of borrowing may be more than necessary.
Interest due is not paid on time and is not for the correct amount.	Penalties may be incurred.
Inappropriate or unsafe investments may be made and the best interest rate may not be obtained.	Money may be lost or income from interest not maximised.

The scale of the area reviewed is: -

<i>Treasury management indicators</i>	<i>2013-14 actual</i>
<i>External debt (£m)</i>	<i>22.5</i>
<i>Investments (£m)</i>	<i>10.0</i>
<i>Net debt position (£m)</i>	<i>12.5</i>

4 Audit findings

4.1 Following our work, and with reference to the other sources of independent assurance that were available, we consider the controls to be effective in the following risk areas: -

- Cash flow forecasts are updated and reconciled to the bank account three times a week. Surplus funds are moved to a savings account nightly.
- A suitable overdraft level is arranged (£200,000)
- An approved treasury management policy statement and strategy are in place, and procedure and guidance notes are available to staff.
- Access to online payment facilities is restricted to necessary employees and reviewed regularly.
- Treasury management activities are covered by suitable insurance.
- Borrowing is authorised by the Chief Fire Officer, records are maintained and outstanding amounts reviewed annually. Interest and repayments are checked for accuracy.
- The transfer of funds is authorised by two people.
- Investments are made with approved brokers. Records are maintained. Interest due and maturity figures are matched to the original statements.

4.2 There were some control weaknesses. The attached Action Plan sets out these weaknesses, and our recommendations to address them.

4.3 A summary of the recommendations made, together with a brief summary of the high and medium priority areas, is set out below: -

<i>Priority level</i>	<i>Number of Recommendations</i>	<i>Recommended action timescales</i>
High priority	1	Immediate
Medium priority	2	Within two months
Low priority	0	Within six months
Value for money	0	As soon as practicable

High priority areas:

- At the time of audit (January 2015) there had been no formal reconciliation of the bank account since August 2014. **(See Action Plan 1)**

Medium priority areas:

- It is not the practice to carry out disclosure and barring checks for new members of Treasury Management staff below Senior Accountant level or existing staff members. **(See Action Plan 2)**
- Reporting errors were found in the Prudential Code report. **(See Action Plan 3)**

Audit conducted by: Christine Marshall – MAAT
Audit supervised by: Angela Wendels - FCCA

J M Bailey CPFA, Head of Internal Audit

Audit Finding	Recommendation	Management Response
High priority areas (essential for effective internal control, must implement recommendations to improve existing control arrangements)		
<p>1. Formal bank reconciliation</p> <p>Although the bank account is reconciled to the cash flow forecast spread sheet three times a week by the Senior Accounts Assistant, at the time of audit (January 2015) there had been no formal reconciliation of the bank account signed off since August 2014.</p> <p>There is also no independent review of the cash flow forecast to the bank account unless investments are made. There were no investments from 5 November 2014 – 22 January 2015.</p> <p>Risk: <i>Errors and omissions may not be detected.</i></p>	<p>The bank account should be reconciled monthly in line with 5.2 of the Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Authority Financial Procedures (December 2011). These state that bank accounts should be reconciled with banking records at not less than monthly intervals. This could also be reconciled to the cash flow forecast.</p>	<p><u>Response of Chief Fire Officer</u></p> <p><i>The bank reconciliation was not completed in a timely way between September 2014 and March 2015. This situation arose because of two personnel changes within the team following voluntary redundancies. The issue was known, and efforts were directed into the coding of bank transactions and the improvement of processes – this needed to be done before the monthly reconciliations could be resumed. All reconciliations for the year were completed by 2nd April 2015 (post audit), and monthly processes are now firmly in place.</i></p> <p><i>The Senior Accountancy Assistant reconciles the cash flow forecast to the bank balance at least twice a week, so any errors would be discovered within a week. An independent check is already in place when investments are made, so this is considered a very low risk.</i></p> <p><u>Date for implementation</u> <i>Already implemented</i></p> <p><u>Officer responsible for implementation</u> <i>Principal Accountant</i></p>

Audit Finding	Recommendation	Management Response
Medium priority areas (highly desirable for effective internal control, should implement recommendations to improve existing control arrangements)		
<p>2. Disclosure and barring service (DBS) checks</p> <p>Staff carrying out Treasury Management duties are suitably qualified but it is not the practice to carry out DBS checks for new members of staff below Senior Accountant level.</p> <p>Risk: Staff with criminal convictions could become involved in treasury management functions.</p>	<p>A risk assessment of the Treasury Management processes should be undertaken and the requirement for DBS checks for Treasury Management staff should be reviewed as part of this exercise.</p>	<p><u>Response of Chief Fire Officer</u> <i>A review of Treasury Management Practices will be undertaken to ensure that all internal controls are sufficiently robust to prevent fraud. Once this has been completed a decision will be made about whether a DBS check would be appropriate.</i></p> <p><u>Date for implementation</u> <i>By 30 June 2015</i></p> <p><u>Officer responsible for implementation</u> <i>Principal Accountant</i></p>

Audit Finding	Recommendation	Management Response												
<p>3. Prudential Code Report</p> <p>As part of our audit testing, we identified a lack of clarity and anomalies between the details reported to the 'Nottinghamshire and City of Nottingham Fire and Rescue Authority' (NFRA) meeting on 27th February 2015 and the figures shown on the financial records dated 31 March 2014.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="73 544 904 1094"> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="73 544 904 587">Anomalies:</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="73 587 490 691">Details reported to the NFRA, 27 February 2015 at section 2.12</th> <th data-bbox="490 587 904 691">Treasury Management information according to the accounts</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="73 691 490 770">£22,476k External long term borrowing</td> <td data-bbox="490 691 904 770">This figure was total borrowing (excluding £53k finance lease)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="73 770 490 850">£53k Other long term liabilities</td> <td data-bbox="490 770 904 850">Short-term finance lease</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="73 850 490 1018">Total investments: £10,065k</td> <td data-bbox="490 850 904 1018">£10,040k (accrued interest of £25k had been included. We were informed this is as required by the accounting code of practice)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="73 1018 490 1094">Net debt position at 31/03/2014 £12,411k</td> <td data-bbox="490 1018 904 1094">£12,489k</td> </tr> </table> <p>Risk: Indicators for Treasury Management may be mis-stated in the reports.</p>	Anomalies:		Details reported to the NFRA, 27 February 2015 at section 2.12	Treasury Management information according to the accounts	£22,476k External long term borrowing	This figure was total borrowing (excluding £53k finance lease)	£53k Other long term liabilities	Short-term finance lease	Total investments: £10,065k	£10,040k (accrued interest of £25k had been included. We were informed this is as required by the accounting code of practice)	Net debt position at 31/03/2014 £12,411k	£12,489k	<p>Checking procedures should be undertaken to ensure that clear and accurate Treasury Management figures are reported to the NFRA.</p>	<p><u>Response of Chief Fire Officer</u></p> <p><i>This recommendation is accepted. Ordinarily figures for Treasury Management CFA reports are produced by one staff member and checked by a second person, but this did not happen in the case of this report. In future, checking will be reinstated as part of the process.</i></p> <p><u>Date for implementation</u></p> <p><i>Immediate</i></p> <p><u>Officer responsible for implementation</u></p> <p><i>Principal Accountant</i></p>
Anomalies:														
Details reported to the NFRA, 27 February 2015 at section 2.12	Treasury Management information according to the accounts													
£22,476k External long term borrowing	This figure was total borrowing (excluding £53k finance lease)													
£53k Other long term liabilities	Short-term finance lease													
Total investments: £10,065k	£10,040k (accrued interest of £25k had been included. We were informed this is as required by the accounting code of practice)													
Net debt position at 31/03/2014 £12,411k	£12,489k													

To: Chief Fire Officer
Subject: Financial Management System
Date: May 2015

1 Introduction

- 1.1 We have audited the controls in place for the management of the financial management system (Agresso).
- 1.2 The objectives of the system are to maintain complete and accurate financial records and to provide useful financial information as required.
- 1.3 The Agresso system is being managed on a joint basis between Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Services.

2 Audit opinion

- 2.1 In the areas examined, we assessed the controls to determine to what extent the risks are being mitigated.
- 2.2 In our opinion the level of assurance we can provide is: -



Limited assurance



Reasonable Assurance



SUBSTANTIAL ASSURANCE

Risk levels are low

3 Risk areas examined

- 3.1 During this audit we looked for controls to address the following key risks: -

<i>Risk description</i>	<i>Significance</i>
Unauthorised access to the system is possible	Fraud and/or error may take place or be concealed
Financial data is lost or corrupted	Reports and financial statements are incomplete and do not show a true position
Accounting codes are not appropriate for the organisation's needs	Information cannot be produced from the financial system in a useful format
Data is omitted, duplicated or incorrect	Incorrectly entered data impacts on the accuracy of reports output from the system
Output from the system is incorrect	Decisions are made on the basis of incorrect information and statutory accounts do not correctly reflect the authority's transactions
Budgets are not monitored effectively	Expenditure may exceed the approved level; action is not taken to correct potential issues

4 Audit findings

4.1 Following our work, and with reference to the other sources of independent assurance that were available, we consider the controls to be effective in the following risk areas: -

- Prevention of unauthorised access to the financial management system
- Protection of the data held on the system and the prevention of its loss
- Data input into the system is verified as correct prior to entry
- Accuracy of the information output from the system (other assurance available from the external audit of the financial statements)
- The coding structure of the financial system and the requirements for the creation of new codes
- The monitoring of income and expenditure against the budget.

4.2 There were some control weaknesses and failures to comply with the standard controls, resulting in remaining risks. The attached Action Plan sets out these weaknesses, and our recommendations to address them.

4.3 The current workflow arrangements for the approval of journals and virements allow finance officers to approve their own input, compromising the segregation of duties. No cases of self-approval were identified in testing, and the system is currently under review to prevent this from happening in the future.

4.4 A summary of the recommendations made, together with a brief summary of the medium priority areas, is set out below: -

<i>Priority level</i>	<i>Number of Recommendations</i>	<i>Recommended action timescales</i>
High priority		Immediate
Medium priority	1	Within two months
Low priority	3	Within six months
Value for money		As soon as practicable

Medium priority areas:

- The log of actions performed by system administrators should be regularly reviewed by the principal accountant.

**Audit conducted by: Brendan Hodson
CIPFA Trainee**

**Audit supervised by: Angela Wendels FCCA
Senior Auditor**

J M Bailey CPFA, Head of Internal Audit

Audit Finding	Recommendation	Management Response
Medium priority areas (highly desirable for effective internal control, should implement recommendations to improve existing control arrangements)		
<p>1. Log of system administrator actions</p> <p>The system administrator (systems accountant) has operational financial responsibilities in order to cover for the absence of other members of the finance team, as well as administration responsibilities, which could allow for separation of duties to be compromised.</p> <p>In addition to this, the Agresso system is managed jointly between Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Leicestershire, with the system administrators of each authority having access to the systems of the other authorities to ensure that there is system administrator cover. However, there is currently no review of actions taken by neighbouring system administrators.</p> <p>In the previous audit of the Agresso system, it was agreed that the principal accountant would regularly review a log of actions for all systems administrator accounts with access to the Nottinghamshire system. At the time of audit, this check was not being performed or documented.</p> <p>Risk: <i>Inappropriate or fraudulent system administrator actions may not be identified.</i></p>	<p>The principal accountant should periodically review the log of system administrator actions in high risk areas, and document this review.</p>	<p><u>Response of the Chief Fire Officer</u></p> <p><i>This review has only been carried out on an occasional basis, but will in future be conducted bi-monthly.</i></p> <p><u>Date for implementation</u></p> <p><i>Immediate</i></p> <p><u>Officer responsible for implementation</u></p> <p><i>Principal Accountant</i></p>

Audit Finding	Recommendation	Management Response
Low priority areas (desirable for effective internal control, may implement recommendations to improve existing control arrangements)		
<p>2. Scanning of journal documents</p> <p>Journals can be entered into the financial system in two ways. Journals can be input on-screen in the system, where they are initially registered by one individual and authorised by another. Alternatively, they can be uploaded to the system from an Excel file. When journals are uploaded, they do not need to be independently authorised in the financial system. Instead, members of the finance team who upload journals have them authorised on paper by another member of the team, to ensure that there is a check on accuracy and that duties are appropriately separated. This written authorisation is retained in a file to ensure that an audit trail is available and that the authorisation can be evidenced.</p> <p>When conducting audit testing of journal authorisation, several paper journal sheets could not be located, so the audit trail and authorisation could not be evidenced. There is provision in Agresso to scan documents and attach them to transactions, and finance team members stated that there were no significant difficulties or barriers to scanning and uploading signed journal sheets.</p> <p>Risk: <i>Loss of audit trail for uploaded transactions.</i></p>	<p>Documentation relating to uploaded journals (including signature of authorising officer) should be scanned and attached to the journal in the Agresso system, to be stored electronically.</p>	<p><u>Response of the Chief Fire Officer</u> <i>An instruction to scan and save printed and authorised journals has been sent to Finance Department staff, implemented 1st April 2015.</i></p> <p><u>Date for implementation</u> <i>Already implemented</i></p> <p><u>Officer responsible for implementation</u> <i>Principal Accountant</i></p>

Audit Finding	Recommendation	Management Response
<p>3. Guidance notes</p> <p>Guidance notes for using key functions of the financial system (e.g. requisitions) are provided as a paper copy to users at training events, but are not currently available on the intranet. Most users are experienced and are confident with the system and can contact finance if they have any issues, however having a centrally accessible set of procedures (which can be updated for any changes in the system) would help to ensure that users, especially infrequent users of the system, have access to current procedure notes.</p> <p>Risk: <i>Incorrect entry of information to the financial system.</i></p>	<p>Guidance notes for the Agresso system for commonly used functions, such as purchasing, should be made available on the intranet to ensure that departments are able to access them if required.</p>	<p><u>Response of the Chief Fire Officer</u></p> <p><i>All Agresso users have been issued with paper versions of guidance notes, and they can refer any queries back to the Systems Administrator. The recommendation is accepted, and will be implemented over a period of time, to fit in with other work priorities.</i></p> <p><u>Date for implementation</u> <i>By 30th September 2015</i></p> <p><u>Officer responsible for implementation</u> <i>Principal Accountant</i></p>
<p>4. Leavers</p> <p>The systems accountant is notified of leavers by the I-Trent HR system by automated emails – these are flagged for follow-up, including the removal of system access on the first working day after the leaving date where the leaver is a user of the system.</p> <p>Testing has identified several cases of leavers' access to the Agresso system being retained for up to six months after the leaving date, as identifying whether a leaver is a user of the system is done by personal knowledge rather than a check on the financial system itself.</p> <p>The risk associated with this is low, as access to the system is likely to be prevented by the disabling of user accounts by IT – however, unauthorised access is possible where there is a failure to promptly remove leavers' access by IT, or where a leaver's account is accessible by a substitute.</p> <p>Risk: <i>Unauthorised access to the financial system.</i></p>	<p>When notified of a leaver by the HR system, the Agresso system should be checked to confirm whether they are a user of the system. Leavers' access should be disabled promptly following notification.</p>	<p><u>Response of the Chief Fire Officer</u></p> <p><i>The recommendation is accepted. It is thought that where access has not been removed promptly, it is mainly due to high workloads meaning that tasks have been delayed.</i></p> <p><u>Date for implementation</u> <i>Immediate</i></p> <p><u>Officer responsible for implementation</u> <i>Principal Accountant</i></p>

FIRE & RESCUE SERVICE - CARDIFF CHECKS 2014/15

Appendix A

Invoice 1 Preventative fire safety checks.

1. Invoice Information

- 1.1 This payment was in respect of Home Safety Checks and related to fire risk reduction actions commissioned by NFRS and provided by Age UK.
- 1.2 The invoice covered the period 1/10/13 to 31/12/13 and was for £2,000.
- 1.3 Payment of the invoice was approved by the Budget Holder.
- 1.4 The invoice was paid on 22nd October 2013 and posted to the correct account code.

2. Summary of Findings

- 2.1 NFRS are required to provide risk reduction services to vulnerable people and selected Age UK to provide these services to elderly residents within the Nottingham City area in 2009. It was considered Age UK could provide the service in a more cost effective manner than NFRS for this group of vulnerable people.
- 2.2 There is a Service Level Agreement (SLA) which defines the services to be provided, various quality measures, charges, payment and review arrangements.
- 2.3 The SLA specifies payments will be made quarterly in arrears. This invoice was paid quarterly in advance.
- 2.4 As the invoice refers to a recurring service it is a non-order invoice and is directed to the Budget Holder for authorisation rather than using the Goods Received Process within the Agresso finance system. Monitoring of the service provided is undertaken by the Risk Reduction Officer. However, no quality assurance visits have been undertaken recently and the results of monitoring are not checked by the Budget Holder who approves the payments.
- 2.5 The SLA relating to the selected invoice specified annual charges of £8,000. The invoice for the service was correctly priced. The current (2014) SLA specifies charges of £20,000 per annum.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 Payments should be made in arrears in accordance with the SLA.

3.2 Monitoring should include quality assurance visits and the Budget Holder should confirm satisfactory services have been received prior to authorising payment of the invoices.

3.3 Given that charges have increased significantly NFRS should revisit the comparative costing for provision of these services and confirm value for money is still being obtained.

4. Response of the Chief Fire Officer

4.1 Recommendation 3.1: The most recent four quarterly invoices have all been paid in arrears as specified by the SLA and the budget holder will continue to check that the timings of payments are appropriate.
Responsibility: Group Manager, Community Safety
Timing: Already in place.

4.2 Recommendation 3.2: Following the restructure and review of Community Safety, all commissioning arrangements are now managed by a Partnerships and Engagement Officer. An annual review of this SLA, and a quarterly review of Home Safety Check work undertaken by Age UK will be carried out and reported to the budget holder. This will give the budget holder assurance that the services provided are in line with expectations, before authorising invoices for payment.
Responsibility: Group Manager, Community Safety
Timing: Already in place.

4.3 Recommendation 3.3: A review of the commissioning arrangement with Age UK has already started and will be completed later this year. Any recommendations arising will be reported to the Area Manager, Service Delivery.
Responsibility: Group Manager, Community Safety
Timing: by 31st October 2015.

FIRE & RESCUE SERVICE - CARDIFF CHECKS 2014/15

Appendix B

Invoice 2 Cleaning and repair of Fire Kit.

1. Invoice Information

- 1.1 This payment was in respect of the cleaning and repair of personal protective equipment (PPE) during September 2013 and was for £4,430.88 including VAT.
- 1.2 Because the invoice matched the order which was authorised by the Budget Holder, approval of the invoice was automatic. Confirmation of goods received was recorded on 4 October 2013 by stores personnel.
- 1.3 The invoice was paid on 22 October 2013 and was coded to the correct account codes.

2. Summary of Findings

- 2.1 The level of expenditure under this contract requires a tendering process to be undertaken. We were advised that the contract was let in 2007. Organisational and staff changes since this date have meant that current staff were not involved in the tendering process and documentation could not be located. The original contract could not be located although a Service Level Agreement effective since 1 January 2012 was available.
- 2.2 Items of PPE are issued to individual members of staff who maintain a log of dates when items are cleaned/inspected/repared. These logs are checked every six months by managers to ensure items have been processed correctly. There is no check from the logs to the items invoiced. It is intended the logs will be moved to an automated system in the future.
- 2.3 Stores collect and deliver items from retained stations and also handle surplus items which are being returned to stock. The contractor collects PPE from individual full time fire stations and Stores each week and returns processed items the following week.
- 2.4 The contractor records details of the items processed and issues an invoice each month. The invoice examined was dated 30 Sept 2013 and an order for the invoiced amount was authorised on 1 October 2013. An accurate order cannot be issued in advance as the charges for repairs cannot be costed until after inspection and some items will be condemned rather than repaired so there will be no charge for these.
- 2.5 Confirmation of goods/services received was entered onto the finance system by the Stores Group. Stores are not in a position to confirm this information for individual stations and do not undertake a check between items returned to Stores and items invoiced.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 Tender documentation should be recorded and retained.
- 3.2 Original contracts should be retained for the duration of the contract.
- 3.3 Estimated orders should be issued to ensure the commitment of expenditure is logged on the finance system.
- 3.4 When automated logs are introduced a sample of details of items processed should be extracted and matched to those charged on the invoice.
- 3.5 Confirmation that the work invoiced has been completed should be advised to Stores who should then complete the goods received process.
- 3.6 Sample checks on prices charged should be introduced to ensure the invoices reflect the prices detailed in the contract/SLA.

4. Response of the Chief Fire Officer

- 4.1 Recommendations 3.1 and 3.2: Procurement processes have changed significantly since this contract was tendered, and tender documentation and contract documentation is now retained as a matter of course.
Responsibility: Head of Estates and Procurement
Timing: Already in place.
 - 4.2 Recommendation 3.3: As the value of work carried out can be so variable, a value order will be raised for an estimated amount for the whole year, against which invoices can be processed.
Responsibility: Equipment Manager
Timing: By 30th September 2015.
 - 4.3 Recommendation 3.4: Sample checks will be carried out when activity logs are automated. The timing of this is not currently known.
Responsibility: Equipment Manager.
 - 4.4 Recommendations 3.5 and 3.6: Confirmation of work completed for the goods received process can only be carried out for a small sample of items, as the volumes are so high that this could adversely affect the ability to pay the invoice on time if all items were checked. Sample checks on work completed and on prices charged will be undertaken by the Equipment Section.
Responsibility: Equipment Manager
Timing: by 31st July 2015.
-

Invoice 3 Fleet maintenance

1. Invoice Information

- 1.1 This payment was for unplanned vehicle maintenance during September 2013 and was for £5,177.67 including VAT.
- 1.2 The invoice matched the amount of the goods received note on the finance system and was automatically approved for payment.
- 1.3 The invoice was paid on 15 October 2013 and each element of cost was coded to a relevant account code.

2. Summary of Findings

- 2.1 Planned and unplanned maintenance of the brigade's vehicles and associated equipment is provided by Nottingham City Council. The contract was let in 2010 using the Office of Government Governance's Competitive Dialogue Procedure.
- 2.2 The invoice is dated 22 September 2013 and relates to maintenance services provided in August/September 2013.
- 2.3 An annual order for the services during the year was issued in April 2013 and approved by the Head of Finance.
- 2.4 Maintenance worksheets are checked and signed off by the Fleet Maintenance Manager and summarised on the Nottingham City Council system. Summaries are uploaded into the NFRS system and entered onto Agresso via the goods received process. When the invoice is received this is compared to the summary and entered onto Agresso. Because the invoice matched the goods received it was automatically paid.
- 2.5 We confirmed prices charged for a sample of maintenance services agreed with the prices specified in the contract.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 None.

4. Response of the Chief Fire Officer

- 4.1 No response required.
-

To: Chief Fire Officer
Subject: Debtors and Income
Date: July 2015

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The audit review seeks to provide assurance that satisfactory controls are in place for the effective management of the debtors system and includes a review of income codes, debtor transactions and related records for the financial year 2014/15.
- 1.2 The objectives of the system are to ensure:
1. Debt related income is received only at a specified location, or through approved financial channels, that offer secure and efficient administration facilities
 2. Debt income received is promptly, securely and accurately processed
 3. Recovery of debt is managed efficiently and effectively
 4. Debt cancellation and write-off is evidenced and authorised.

2 Audit opinion

- 2.1 In the areas examined, we assessed the controls to determine to what extent the risks are being mitigated.
- 2.2 In our opinion the level of assurance we can provide is: -



Limited assurance



Reasonable Assurance



SUBSTANTIAL ASSURANCE

Risk levels are low

3 Risk areas examined

- 3.1 During this audit we looked for controls to address the following key risks: -

<i>Risk description</i>	<i>Significance</i>
1. Income may not be positively identified and delays may occur in processing.	Delays in the processing of income may affect the cash flow of the Authority.
2. Processing delays or inaccuracies in recording income may lead to inaccurate debtor accounts and complications with debt reminder and recovery procedures.	Inaccuracies could lead to inaccurate debtor records which may misrepresent the financial position of the Authority.
3. Without effective management of debt the Authority is at risk of not collecting all income.	Income due to the Authority may be delayed or not collected.

<i>Risk description</i>	<i>Significance</i>
4. Debt may be extinguished inappropriately or fraudulently.	There may be a financial loss to the Authority.

3.2 The scale of the area reviewed is: -

<i>Metric</i>	<i>2014-15 estimated</i>
<i>Sales invoice raised</i>	<i>£697K</i>
<i>Percentage of Revenue Budget</i>	<i>2%</i>

4 Audit findings

4.1 Following our work, we consider the controls to be effective in the following risk areas: -

- Risk 1: Income is identified, invoiced and income is adequately controlled.
- Risk 2: An appropriate income and debt collection process is in place and income received is promptly posted.
- Risk 3: Debts are managed effectively to ensure all income due to the Authority is collected.

4.2 There were some control weaknesses, resulting in remaining risks. The attached Action Plan sets out these weaknesses, and our recommendations to address them.

4.3 A summary of the recommendations made is set out below: -

<i>Priority level</i>	<i>Number of Recommendations</i>	<i>Recommended action timescales</i>
High priority	0	Immediate
Medium priority	0	Within two months
Low priority	5	Within six months
Value for money	0	As soon as practicable

Audit conducted by: Helen Lomas MAAT, Auditor

Audit supervised by: Angela Wendels FCCA, Senior Auditor

J M Bailey CPFA, Head of Internal Audit

Audit Finding	Recommendation	Management Response
Low priority areas (desirable for effective internal control, may implement recommendations to improve existing control arrangements)		
<p>1. Invoice Format and payment instructions As part of the review of the format of the invoices raised by NFRS and of the trading company it was noted that the trading company invoices did not include the use of a credit card as a means of making payment. This facility is not available for making payments for invoices raised by NFRS due to the limited number of invoices processed and the costs involved.</p> <p>Risk: Income due to the Authority or the Trading Company may not be received as promptly from suppliers.</p>	<p>The NFRS trading company invoice template should be amended to include the procedures for the payment of invoices using the credit card facility.</p>	<p><u>Response of The Chief Fire Officer</u> <i>Trading Company invoices have now been amended to state that credit card payments are accepted.</i></p> <p><u>Date for implementation</u> <i>Already implemented</i></p> <p><u>Officer responsible for implementation</u> <i>Manager, NFRS(T) Ltd</i></p>
<p>2. Accuracy of record keeping A review of the source income documentation identified errors in the recording of income prior to posting in the accounting records as well as the filing of the paper records. The accuracy of the filing of the records was improved during the audit.</p> <p>Risk: Inaccuracies in recording income may lead to inaccurate debtor accounts and complications with debt reminder and recovery procedures.</p>	<p>Care should be taken in the recording of income received at source to ensure it is an accurate record of the income received.</p>	<p><u>Response of The Chief Fire Officer</u> <i>There was a changeover of staff in the year and, since the audit, new procedures have been put in place to improve both the timeliness and accuracy of income recording.</i></p> <p><u>Date for implementation</u> <i>Already implemented</i></p> <p><u>Officer responsible for implementation</u> <i>Principal Accountant</i></p>

Audit Finding	Recommendation	Management Response
<p>3. Management of debtors Debtors are managed by an individual employee due to the limited number of invoices raised. It is understood that management do periodically discuss the outstanding debts and the collection of the income on an ad hoc basis. At present there is no formal documentation of these reviews performed by management.</p> <p>Risk: Lack of separation of duties may lead to misappropriation of funds.</p>	<p>Management reviews of debtors should be documented to show an adequate separation of duties has been achieved and that management are aware of debt levels.</p>	<p><u>Response of The Chief Fire Officer</u> <i>As indicated, a management review does take place on a regular basis, but this will now be formalised with a record kept of the review.</i></p> <p><u>Date for implementation</u> <i>Immediate</i></p> <p><u>Officer responsible for implementation</u> <i>Principal Accountant</i></p>
<p>4. Formal approval of debts paid by instalments The Fire Authority has a formal debt management procedural document which requires all payments by instalment to be approved by the Principal Accountant. From discussion the Principal Accountant is aware of all debts being repaid by instalments however there is no formal documentation showing her approval of the repayment terms.</p> <p>Risk: Delays in the collection of income due may adversely affect the cash flow of the Authority. Without written confirmation, payment terms may be breached.</p>	<p>Approval of debt being paid by instalments should be documented by the Principal Accountant.</p>	<p><u>Response of The Chief Fire Officer</u> <i>As indicated, payment plans are approved by the Principal Accountant, but this will now be formalised with a record kept of the approval.</i></p> <p><u>Date for implementation</u> <i>Immediate</i></p> <p><u>Officer responsible for implementation</u> <i>Principal Accountant</i></p>
<p>5. Separation of duties within the debt write off process. Whilst there is separation of duties within the debt write off process in that the debts are printed off and authorised manually, the same person carries out both of the two stage processes within Agresso to write off the debt.</p> <p>Risk: A lack of separation of duties within the debt write off process could lead to the unauthorised write off of debts.</p>	<p>To ensure adequate separation of duty, two people should be involved in the write off of debts within the Agresso system.</p>	<p><u>Response of The Chief Fire Officer</u> <i>The debt write-off process will be separated into two tasks which have to be carried out by different people.</i></p> <p><u>Date for implementation</u> <i>By 30th September 2015</i></p> <p><u>Officer responsible for implementation</u> <i>Principal Accountant</i></p>

To: Chief Fire Officer
Subject: SharePoint follow-up
Date: January 2016

1 Introduction

1.1 Our previous report on SharePoint (ref FRS/1513), contained only limited assurance concerning the controls. We have therefore followed up the progress made with implementing the recommendations in the action plan.

2 Audit opinion

2.1 We reviewed the progress made with implementing the recommendations to determine to what extent the risks are now being mitigated.

2.2 In our opinion the level of progress is: -

	Limited progress	
	REASONABLE PROGRESS	A further follow-up audit is not required
	Substantial progress	

2.3 It is pleasing to note that much work has been carried out to implement the agreed actions, but this has resulted in longer term projects that will deliver the required improvements in control over a lengthier period than originally anticipated. This is the rationale behind the above opinion, and we would expect substantial progress to have been made in a further 12 to 24 months.

3 Risk areas examined

3.1 The previous recommendations were made to mitigate the following key risks: -

<i>Risk description</i>
2. Lack of awareness and governance regarding SharePoint content.
3. Inadequate or non-existent audit trails for usage and administrative access.

4 Audit findings

4.1 Progress with implementation of the agreed recommendations may be summarised as follows: -

<i>Implementation progress</i>	<i>High Priority</i>	<i>Medium Priority</i>	<i>Low Priority</i>	<i>Total</i>
Recommendations agreed	1	5	0	6
Implemented		3		3
Work in progress	1	2		3
Outstanding	0	0		0

4.2 Following our work, and with reference to the information provided during the follow up review, we consider that good progress is being made in the following risk areas:

- Risk 2:
 - A review of arrangements in respect of records management and the management of policies has resulted in the commencement of work to remedy current weaknesses, including those identified in the Audit report.
 - A SharePoint development strategy is being developed, which will include the provision of training to users.
- Risk 3:
 - The SharePoint development strategy will include the provision of arrangements for monitoring audit and security logs.
 - Concerns about site ownership and permission levels have been addressed and controls established to ensure that new sites and sub-sites are properly managed.

4.3 The work that is currently in progress in respect of the SharePoint development strategy and the improvements to records and policy management arrangements is expected to take approximately two years to complete. This should result in a robust platform of management controls for the security of data held within the SharePoint system.

4.4 It is important that the initiatives referred to above receive the support of senior management and are delivered within the prescribed timescales.

4.5 There was one aspect of data security that has a remaining medium priority risk. A solution called Metlogix StoragePoint has been deployed, but the ability it has to encrypt data held within SharePoint has not been utilised. The attached Action Plan provides details of this weakness, and our recommendation to address it.

Audit conducted by: Paul Bellamy QICA, ICT Auditor

Audit supervised by: Rob Disney CPFA, Head of Internal Audit

Rob Disney CPFA, Head of Internal Audit

Audit Follow-up Finding	Further recommendation	Management Response
Medium priority areas (highly desirable for effective internal control, should implement recommendations to improve existing control arrangements)		
<p>1. Data encryption</p> <p>The Metalogix StoragePoint solution has been deployed and although it provides the capability to encrypt data held in SharePoint, this is not currently being used.</p> <p>The SharePoint Development Officer is to investigate the use of encryption and reference is to be made to advice available on Microsoft's website regarding Transparent Data Encryption (TDE).</p> <p>An examination of Corporate Services' proposed policy and strategy changes with regard to Information Management, noted reference to the provision of effective security measures to ensure that information and data is protected. The detailed report into records and information management makes reference to the encryption of certain documents before they are stored in SharePoint.</p> <p>Risk: Sensitive data could be accessed, changed or disclosed without authority.</p>	<p>Encryption of data using the functionality provided by Metalogix StoragePoint and Microsoft TDE should be further considered in respect of sensitive data.</p> <p>This should be done collaboratively with Corporate Services, with reference to the data classification scheme contained within the revised Records Management Policy.</p>	<p><u>Response of Head of Corporate Services</u></p> <p><i>The use of encryption solutions within the NFRS SharePoint solution will form part of the development of a new Microsoft SharePoint 2013 solution. The project to design the underpinning infrastructure of this new solution will commence on Monday 7th December 2015, with an estimated completion date of 31st January 2016.</i></p> <p><u>Date for implementation</u></p> <p><i>In total the project to upgrade the NFRS SharePoint solution has a total of 281 days effort estimated, so it is realistically expected that the new system will be made available to users towards the end of FY 2016-17.</i></p> <p><u>Officer responsible for implementation</u></p> <p><i>Head of ICT SharePoint Development Officer</i></p>