

High Importance Recommendations at 22nd October 2021

<u>Audit Title (Director)</u>	<u>Summary of Finding(s) and Recommendation(s)</u>	<u>Management Response</u>	<u>Action Date (by end of) & extensions</u>	<u>Confirmed Implemented</u>
Reported June 2021				
Coroner Recharges (Chief Executives)	<p>Two HI recommendations were made: -</p> <p>1) The draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with Leicester City Council should be promptly reviewed and updated and then signed by both parties, with appropriate monitoring arrangements built into the agreement.</p> <p>2) Requirements to address areas of weaknesses identified such as, timeliness of receipt of financial information and documentation of reasons for budget adjustments, should be captured in the revised MOA. Adherence to the requirements in the MOA should be monitored.</p>	<p>1. Working to the finalised MOA</p> <p>2. Improvements have been built in with monthly monitoring in place. Information exchange is much improved since the appointment of a new City Council Coroners manager.</p>	<p>June 2021</p> <p>Extend to July 2021</p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p>
Travel, Subsistence and Related Allowances (COVID-19 related changes) (Consolidated Risk)	<p>No individual HI recommendations, but collective control weaknesses resulted in a partial assurance rating.</p> <p>Recommendations covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligning temporary instructions with policy • Accuracy of reporting and receipt evidence • Authorisation process 	<p>Further testing undertaken now the process has moved into Fusion expenses</p>	<p>June 2021</p> <p>July 2021</p> <p>Extend to November 2021</p>	

Reported November 2020				
Direct Payments (Personal Budgets)	<p>A review of the tableau dashboard of service users receiving an annual review revealed that as of 1st March 2020 there were 324 service users awaiting an annual review. Of these 35 were overdue by more than 12 months and 99 by between 6 and 12 months.</p> <p>1. Recommended annual reviews of all service users' care and support plans to establish whether client needs had changed, and the level of direct payment was appropriate to meet those needs.</p> <p>A review of Direct Payment Agreements found that where an arrangement was in place to pay a close member of family for providing care services, this was not recorded in the care and support plan, nor was approval obtained from the Head of Service as is required according to direct payments guidance. In addition, evidence was seen of expenditure that could potentially be considered to be contentious.</p> <p>2. It was recommended that the policy regarding paying close family members and carers living in the same house for providing care services should be adhered to. Where family members are used for providing care services, this should be recorded in the care and support plan, and contentious expenditure should be authorised by the Head of Service.</p> <p>The feasibility of a retrospective review (and authorisation at Head of Service level) of service users making payments to family members should be considered. If this is not feasible, it should be covered at the point of next annual review.</p>	<p>1. The number of DP users who have received a review, shows good improvement since April 2021. The numbers overdue were high during lockdown as the Domiciliary Review Service were re-deployed to support hospital discharge. This halted business as usual for the majority of 2020 and continued to be impacted by the pandemic to support peaks of hospital pressures into 2021. More recently the team have embarked on a 12 week programme to review domiciliary packages comprising 10 hours or more to address the current pressure on the domiciliary care market. This work is now nearing completion. From 1st November the focus will be back on DP reviews with high balances. This is not a new process and was there pre-pandemic though due to staff redeployment during COVID, there was impact on DP reviews. Explanation has been provided on how exactly</p>	<p>December 2020 May 2021</p> <p>Extended to July 2021</p> <p>December 2020 May 2021</p> <p>Extended to July 2021</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. Yes</p>

		<p>the processes will work and IAS will review a random number of cases in January.</p> <p>2. Guidance has been cascaded to care pathway staff with a specific focus on the arrangements for agreeing payments to close family members. This was also the focus of a services of briefings with Service Managers. Learning and Development are assisting the department to produce a suite of materials to upskill the workforce regarding direct payments and the payment of close family members.</p>		
Reported July 2020				
ICT Externally Hosted Contracts (Consolidated risk)	<p>Three HI recommendations were made: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confirm the circumstances of the contract before deleting records 2. Conduct an audit to determine whether valid contract are in place 3. Decide whether original (signed) contracts should be held centrally. <p>Recommendations have been expanded to cover the wider contracts database</p>	<p>1. The Procurement and Commissioning Support Manager confirmed that 90% of contracts are now on the contracts register. Oracle Fusion dictates that all orders >£25K to one supplier will require a contract and this is triggered. Greater transparency reporting will be required by the authority in April 2022.</p>	<p>Initial recommendations September 2020 December 2020 March 2021 June 2021 July 2021</p> <p>Retain as December 2021 for the Procurement toolkit</p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2&3 - not determined at the time of going to print</p>

		<p>2. ICT contracts are still being recorded on MARVAL. Further checks to ensure those (under £25K) are being recorded in the register.</p> <p>3. Still to be discussed with legal whether contracts are to be held centrally. Toolkit further delayed until end of this calendar year.</p>		
Rights of audit in procurement contracts (Consolidated risk)	<p>Two HI recommendations were made: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include rights of audit clauses within all corporate guidance and any subsequent toolkits/associated training 2. Consider requesting a variation to retrospectively include rights to audit clauses for any relevant contracts (balancing cost v benefit) 	<p>1. Contracts examined found that the Rights of audit in Procurement clause had been included. This is to be a requirement in the Toolkit.</p> <p>2. It has been decided that current contracts will not be updated retrospectively but the Procurement and Commissioning Support Manager confirmed that it is included in all new contracts. Evidence confirmed that instruction had gone out to departments.</p>	<p>September 2020 December 2020 March 2021 June 2021 July 2021</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. Yes</p>

Reported June 2020				
Records management (Consolidated Risk)	<p>Internal Audit randomly chose three sections within County Hall to undertake floor walks. The exercise identified some confidential and sensitive records that were not secured.</p> <p>Recommended</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communicate to staff that physical records containing personal and sensitive information should be held securely. 2. Ad hoc spot checks should be independently undertaken by the Information Governance Team or Internal Audit. 	<p>A further floor walk has been agreed by the Senior Information Risk Officer. This has been slight delayed to enable coordination with the Summer Sort Out project. Comms to staff has been drafted.</p> <p>Longer term plan is for continual auditing at set periods.</p>	<p>Immediate September 2020 December 2020 March 2021</p> <p>Extended to August 2021</p> <p>Extended to October 2021</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Yes

This page is intentionally left blank