

**APPENDIX B****Reasons for original assurance levels given (below Excellent)**

N.B. The issues noted here may have been addressed since the original report was issued.

<b>AUDIT REVIEW</b>	<b>ASSURANCE LEVEL</b>	<b>ISSUES NOTED</b>	<b>Level at follow up</b>
Conferences and Group Travel	Adequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The contract template needs to be reviewed</li> <li>Retention of documentation needs to be improved</li> <li>Official names and addresses of businesses were not routinely requested or retained.</li> <li>The payment terms written into the contracts do not reflect those followed in practice.</li> </ul>	Due Oct
Benefits (Annual 14/15)	Well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Testing showed cases where overpayments were not being highlighted for recovery action</li> </ul>	N/A
Council Tax (Annual 14/15)	Well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The suspense account is not regularly checked and cleared.</li> </ul>	N/A
IT (Annual 14/15)	Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some gaps noted in an earlier IT Health check had not been addressed</li> <li>There is no current Disaster Recovery Plan</li> <li>There is no current Business Continuity Plan.</li> </ul>	N/A
Licences	Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No taxi licensing policy is in place.</li> <li>In some cases the Police had not been informed of suspended premises licences.</li> <li>In some cases there was no record of the consent form from the Designated Premises Supervisor.</li> <li>In some cases there was no record of criminal record disclosure checks.</li> <li>Debt recovery was found to be inconsistent.</li> <li>A process is not in place to ensure that taxi vehicles over 7 years old have biannual checks.</li> <li>Some vehicle suitability checks on file were found to have not been correctly completed.</li> </ul>	Due Oct

**APPENDIX B****Reasons for original assurance levels given (below Excellent)**

N.B. The issues noted here may have been addressed since the original report was issued.

<b>AUDIT REVIEW</b>	<b>ASSURANCE LEVEL</b>	<b>ISSUES NOTED</b>	<b>Level at follow up</b>
Leasing and Licensing	Adequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One instance where a licensee had been told to stop using a piece of land which was not followed up.</li> <li>• Rent reviews deferred with no reason noted.</li> <li>• Leaseholders insurance details out of date with no process in place for chasing information.</li> </ul>	Due Dec
Internet Controls	Adequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The list of those with access to systems shows staff known to have left the Council, duplicated entries and 984 entries of unknown names or other identification.</li> <li>• Issues around leavers from agencies or Towner not being notified to IT.</li> <li>• Use of personal drives is not made clear in the IT Acceptable Use Policy.</li> </ul>	Due Jan
Planning System	Adequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible Data Protection issues around data held on the website.</li> <li>• Issues with the current payment process which means applications may not be fully completed. Requires Civica upgrade.</li> </ul>	Due Jan
Telephones	Well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tariffs need to be reviewed to ensure that the best one is obtained for the authority.</li> <li>• The list of which officers hold which mobiles is out of date.</li> </ul>	Due Jan
Personal Loans	Well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The loans booklet states that managers must liaise with the Exchequer Manager before authorising loans but this is not being complied with.</li> <li>• Wording about repayment is not consistent on forms being used.</li> </ul>	Due Apl

**APPENDIX B****Reasons for original assurance levels given (below Excellent)**

N.B. The issues noted here may have been addressed since the original report was issued.

<b>AUDIT REVIEW</b>	<b>ASSURANCE LEVEL</b>	<b>ISSUES NOTED</b>	<b>Level at follow up</b>
Software Compliance	Adequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No structured process for obtaining and retaining licence statements.</li> <li>• No evidence retained of audits carried out by external agencies.</li> <li>• No central register retained to log: software held, no. of licences, no. of users.</li> <li>• No of reviews of no. of users actually accessing the software.</li> </ul>	Due Mar
CHRIS	Well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records are retained indefinitely.</li> </ul>	Due Jan
Contact Centre	Adequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apparent time lags in loading scripts.</li> <li>• Some confusion over evacuation procedures.</li> <li>• Documents being photocopied and then scanned.</li> <li>• A need to remind staff of data security issues.</li> <li>• Lack of Business Continuity Planning.</li> </ul>	Due Mar
Seafront Services	Well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe is of an old design and insured for less than it holds.</li> <li>• Wifi provider is not being regularly invoiced.</li> </ul>	Due Feb
Procurement	Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 22 suppliers with large (£75k+) annual expenditure but no contract in place.</li> <li>• 43 suppliers with a medium (£25 to £74,999) annual expenditure but no contract in place.</li> <li>• Unclear if all payments to main IT supplier are within the scope of the contract. (This was later checked by the Senior Head of Projects, Performance and Technology and payments were found to be correct and within contracts).</li> <li>• No comprehensive and up to date contracts database</li> </ul>	Due Feb

**APPENDIX B**

**Reasons for original assurance levels given (below Excellent)**

N.B. The issues noted here may have been addressed since the original report was issued.

		is in place.	
--	--	--------------	--