



Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire and Leicestershire Police

Internal Audit Annual Report 2016/17

April 2017

This report has been prepared on the basis of the limitations set out on page 13.

Contents

- 01 Introduction
- 02 Head of Internal Audit Opinion
- 03 Performance

Appendices

- A1 Audit Opinions and Recommendations 2016/17
- A2 Audit Projects with Limited and Nil Assurance 2016/17
- A3 Definition of Assurances and Priorities
- A4 Contact Details
- A5 Statement of Responsibility

01 Introduction

Purpose of this Report

This report summarises the work that Internal Audit has undertaken and the key control environment themes identified across Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire and Leicestershire Police during the 2016/17 financial year, the service for which is provided by Mazars LLP.

The purpose of the Annual Internal Audit Report is to meet the Head of Internal Audit annual reporting requirements set out in the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards (PSIAS) and the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2011. The PSIAS requirements are that the report must include:

- An annual internal audit opinion on the overall adequacy and effectiveness of the organisation's governance, risk and control framework (the control environment);
- A summary of the audit work from which the opinion is derived (including reliance placed on the work by other assurance bodies); and
- A statement on conformation with the PSIAS and the results of the internal audit quality assurance and improvement programme (QAIP), if applicable.

The report should also include:

- The disclosure of any qualifications to that opinion, together with reasons for the qualification;
- The disclosure of any impairments or restriction in scope;
- A comparison of the work actually undertaken with the work that was planned and a summary of the performance of the internal audit function against its performance measures and targets;
- Any issues judged to be particularly relevant to the preparation of the annual governance statement; and
- Progress against any improvement plans resulting from QAIP external assessment.

The Police and Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable are responsible for ensuring that the organisations have proper internal control and management systems in place. In order to do this, they must obtain assurance on the effectiveness of those systems throughout the year, and are required to make a statement on the effectiveness of internal control within their annual report and financial statements.

Internal audit provides the Police and Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable, through the Joint Audit, Risk & Assurance Panel (JARAP), with an independent and objective opinion on governance, risk management and internal control and their effectiveness in achieving the organisation's agreed objectives. Internal audit also has an independent and objective advisory role to help line managers improve governance, risk management and internal control. The work of internal audit, culminating in our annual opinion, forms a part of the OPCC and Force's overall assurance framework and assists in preparing an informed statement on internal control.

Responsibility for a sound system of internal control rests with the Police and Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable and work performed by internal audit should not be relied upon to identify all weaknesses which exist or all improvements which may be made. Effective implementation of our recommendations makes an important contribution to the maintenance of reliable systems of internal control and governance.

02 Head of Internal Audit Opinion

Opinions

From the Internal Audit work undertaken in compliance with the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards (PSIAS) for the year ending 31st March 2017, we can provide the following opinions:



Basis of the Opinion

Internal Audit applies a risk-based approach and our audits assess the governance framework, the risk management process, as well as the effectiveness of controls across a number of areas. Our findings on these themes are set out below. Overall, we can provide assurance that management have in place a robust control environment and, whilst further remedial actions are needed in some areas, we are assured that management have in place effective processes for the implementation of identified areas of weakness.

Corporate Governance

As part of our 2015/16 audit plan, we undertook an audit of the controls and processes in place in respect of the Joint Code of Corporate Governance. The specific areas that formed part of this review included: the Corporate Governance Framework, policies and procedures, decision making framework, roles and responsibilities and performance monitoring. We provided a significant assurance opinion and concluded that risks in terms of the joint corporate governance framework were being managed effectively.

Whilst no specific audit of Governance was carried out during 2016/17, we have carried out a number audits where governance arrangements were a key aspect. Through the delivery of the internal audit plan and attendance at Joint Audit, Risk & Assurance Panel (JARAP) meetings, we are satisfied that the governance framework for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire and Leicestershire Police has been effective for the year ended 31st March 2017.

Risk Management

As part of the 2015/16 Internal Audit plan we undertook an audit of the controls and processes in place in respect of risk management. The specific areas that formed part of this review included: policies and procedures; risk registers; risk mitigation; reporting arrangements and follow up of previous recommendations. We provided a significant assurance opinion and concluded that overall risk management within the Force and OPCC is deemed effective and, with the exception of a few housekeeping issues, controls processes tested were being consistently applied. It was evident throughout the audit that risk management is well embedded at a strategic level and responsible staff had the required knowledge, experience and expertise to ensure good systems of internal control.

During the course of delivering the 2016/17 audit programme, a key element of each audit scope was to evaluate the control environment and, in particular, how key risks were being managed. As summarised in the 'Internal Control' section below, we were able to place reliance on the systems of internal control and the manner in which risks were being managed by the Force and OPCC.

Internal Control

As illustrated in the tables below, we have noted that Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire and Leicestershire Police have a robust control environment. During the 2016/17 year, one (11%) internal audit was rated 'significant assurance', whilst all internal audits received "significant" or "satisfactory assurance". During 2016/17 no internal audits were rated 'limited assurance'. In addition, of the five collaborative audits covering the East Midlands policing region, four were rated 'satisfactory assurance', with one being rated 'limited assurance'.

The following tables provide a brief overview of the assurance gradings given as a consequence of audits carried out during 2016/17, split between those specific to Leicestershire and those undertaken as part of East Midlands regional collaborative audits. More details of the audit opinions and the priority of recommendations for all 2016/17 Internal Audit assignments is provided in Appendix A1 – Audit Opinions and Recommendations. In addition, further analysis of those areas where systems improvement are required are set out in Appendix A2 – Audit Projects with Limited and Nil Assurance 2016/17.

Leicestershire Only

Assurance Gradings	2016/17	
Significant	1	11%
Satisfactory	8	89%
Limited	0	0%
Nil	0	0%
Deferred to 2017/18	2	
Total	11	

Collaboration Audits

Assurance Gradings	2016/17	
Significant	0	0%
Satisfactory	4	80%
Limited	1	20%
Nil	0	0%
Total	5	

Issues relevant to Annual Governance Statement

The work of internal audit, culminating in our annual opinion, forms a part of the OPCC and Force's overall assurance framework and assists in preparing an informed statement on internal control. Internal Audit, through its annual programme of activity, has a duty to bring to your attention any areas of weakness we believe should be considered when producing the Annual Governance Statement. As part of this responsibility, we have highlighted any limited or nil assurance reports within Appendix A2.

Restriction placed on the work of Internal Audit

As set out in the Audit Charter, we can confirm that Internal Audit had unrestricted right of access to all OPCC and Force records and information, both manual and computerised, cash, stores and other property or assets it considered necessary to fulfil its responsibilities.

03 Performance

The following table details the Internal Audit Service performance for the year to date measured against the key performance indicators that were set out within Audit Charter.

No	Indicator	Criteria	Performance
1	Annual report provided to the JARAP	As agreed with the Client Officer	Achieved
2	Annual Operational and Strategic Plans to the JARAP	As agreed with the Client Officer	Achieved
3	Progress report to the JARAP	7 working days prior to meeting.	Achieved
4	Issue of draft report	Within 10 working days of completion of final exit meeting.	100% (9/9)
5	Issue of final report	Within 5 working days of agreement of responses.	100% (9/9)
6	Follow-up of priority one recommendations	90% within four months. 100% within six months.	N/A
7	Follow-up of other recommendations	100% within 12 months of date of final report.	N/A
8	Audit Brief to auditee	At least 10 working days prior to commencement of fieldwork.	100% (9/9)
9	Customer satisfaction (measured by survey)	85% average satisfactory or above	100% (3/3)

Quality and Conformance with the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards

In addition to the firm's overall policy and procedures, our internal audit manual and working papers are designed to ensure compliance with the Firm's quality requirements. Furthermore, our internal audit manual and approach are based on professional internal auditing standards issued by the Global Institute of Internal Auditors, as well as sector specific codes such as the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards.

Our methodology and work has been subject to review as part of our internal Quality Assurance Reviews undertaken by our Standards and Risk Management team as well as external scrutiny by the likes of external auditors, as well as other regulatory bodies. No adverse comments have been raised around our compliance with professional standards or our work not being able to be relied upon.

Appendix A1 - Audit Opinions and Recommendations 2016/17

Leicestershire 2016/17 Audits	Report Status	Assurance Opinion	Priority 1 (Fundamental)	Priority 2 (Significant)	Priority 3 (Housekeeping)	Total
Leicestershire Only						
Business Continuity	Final	Significant	-	-	3	3
Complaints Management	Final	Satisfactory	-	3	-	3
Vetting Procedures	Final	Satisfactory	-	5	2	7
Pensions Provider	Final	Satisfactory	-	1	1	2
Core Financial Systems	Final	Satisfactory	-	1	4	5
Payroll	Final	Satisfactory	-	2	2	4
Victims Code of Practice	Final	Satisfactory	-	4	4	8
ICT Review	Final	Satisfactory	-	2	2	4
Payroll Provider	Final	Satisfactory		1	3	4
Seized & Found Property	Deferred to 2017/18.					
Commissioning	Deferred to 2017/18.					
Leicestershire Total			-	19	21	40

Collaboration Audits 2016/17	Status	Assurance Opinion	Priority 1 (Fundamental)	Priority 2 (Significant)	Priority 3 (Housekeeping)	Total
Collaboration						
EM Shared HR Service Centre	Final	Satisfactory		1	3	4
EM Legal Services	Final	Limited	1	3	2	6
EMOpSS	Final	Satisfactory		3	3	6
EMS Commercial Unit	Final	Satisfactory		3		3
EMSOU	Final	Satisfactory		3	1	4
Collaboration Total		Total	1	13	9	23

Appendix A2 - Audits with Limited and Nil Assurance 2016/17

Audit	Grading	Summary of Key Findings
East Midlands Police Legal Services	Limited	<p>We raised one priority 1 recommendation, three priority 2 recommendations and two priority 3 recommendations where we believe there is scope for improvement within the control environment. The priority 1 and 2 recommendations are set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Management Board for EMPLS should be reinstated to provide oversight and assurance with regards the unit's performance and delivery of its objectives. <p>The Management Board members should ensure they have a timetable in place to attend meetings and carry out their responsibilities in line with the Section 22 agreement that is in place. (Priority 1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLS should review the current KPI's that are in place and should prepare updated KPI's that can be presented to the Management Board for scrutiny and approval. (Priority 2) • In accordance with Recommendation 4.1, once the Management Board meetings have been established they should include a review of performance and this should be noted or actions put in place to address areas of concern. (Priority 2) • The risk register should be updated to include a RAG rating between the target risk score and the current risk score to clearly identify the priorities for risk mitigation actions. The risk actions should be separated into ongoing actions and specific actions that will be taken on a set date, with the planned effect on the risk score clearly stated. <p>Review of the risk register should be a standard agenda item at EMPLS Silver Meetings and should be included in the reporting to the Management Board. (Priority 2)</p>

Appendix A3 – Definition of Assurances and Priorities

Definitions of Assurance Levels		
Assurance Level	Adequacy of system design	Effectiveness of operating controls
Significant Assurance:	There is a sound system of internal control designed to achieve the Organisation's objectives.	The control processes tested are being consistently applied.
Satisfactory Assurance:	While there is a basically sound system of internal control, there are weaknesses, which put some of the Organisation's objectives at risk.	There is evidence that the level of non-compliance with some of the control processes may put some of the Organisation's objectives at risk.
Limited Assurance:	Weaknesses in the system of internal controls are such as to put the Organisation's objectives at risk.	The level of non-compliance puts the Organisation's objectives at risk.
No Assurance	Control processes are generally weak leaving the processes/systems open to significant error or abuse.	Significant non-compliance with basic control processes leaves the processes/systems open to error or abuse.

Definitions of Recommendations	
Priority	Description
Priority 1 (Fundamental)	Recommendations represent fundamental control weaknesses, which expose the organisation to a high degree of unnecessary risk.
Priority 2 (Significant)	Recommendations represent significant control weaknesses which expose the organisation to a moderate degree of unnecessary risk.
Priority 3 (Housekeeping)	Recommendations show areas where we have highlighted opportunities to implement a good or better practice, to improve efficiency or further reduce exposure to risk.

Appendix A4 - Contact Details

Contact Details

David Hoose	07552 007708 David.Hoose@Mazars.co.uk
Brian Welch	07780 970200 Brian.Welch@Mazars.co.uk

Appendix A5 - Statement of Responsibility

Status of our reports

The responsibility for maintaining internal control rests with management, with internal audit providing a service to management to enable them to achieve this objective. Specifically, we assess the adequacy of the internal control arrangements implemented by management and perform testing on those controls to ensure that they are operating for the period under review. We plan our work in order to ensure that we have a reasonable expectation of detecting significant control weaknesses. However, our procedures alone are not a guarantee that fraud, where existing, will be discovered.

The contents of this report are confidential and not for distribution to anyone other than the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire and Leicestershire Police. Disclosure to third parties cannot be made without the prior written consent of Mazars LLP.

Mazars LLP is the UK firm of Mazars, an international advisory and accountancy group. Mazars LLP is registered by the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales to carry out company audit work.