
INTERNAL AUDIT ANNUAL REPORT

To: **Governance and Audit Committee: 22nd June 2011**

By: **Chief Executive (s.151 Officer): Sue McGonigal**

Subject: **INTERNAL AUDIT ANNUAL REPORT OF THE HEAD OF THE
AUDIT PARTNERSHIP FOR 2010-11.**

Classification: **Unrestricted**

Summary: **This report provides the summary of the impact of the work of the East Kent Audit Partnership for the year to 31st March 2011.**

For Information

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The primary objective of Internal Audit is to provide independent assurance to Members, the Chief Executive, Directors and the Section 151 Officer on the adequacy and security of those systems on which the Authority relies for its internal control. The purpose of bringing forward an annual report to members is to:

- Provide an opinion on the overall adequacy and effectiveness of the Council's internal control environment.
- Present a summary of the internal audit work undertaken to formulate the opinion.
- Draw attention to any issues the Head of the Audit Partnership judges particularly relevant to the preparation of the Governance Assurance Statement.
- Compare actual audit activity with that planned, and summarise the performance of Internal Audit against its performance criteria.
- Comment on compliance with the CiPFA Code of Practice for Internal Audit in Local Government, and report the results of the Internal Audit quality assurance programme.

1.2 The report attached as Annex A therefore summarises the performance of the East Kent Audit Partnership (EKAP) and the work it has performed over the financial year 2010/11 for Thanet District Council, and provides an overall assurance on the system for internal control based on the audit work undertaken throughout the year, in accordance with best practice.

1.3 The internal audit team is proactive in providing guidance on procedures where particular issues are identified during audit reviews. The aim is to minimise the risk of loss to the Authority by securing adequate internal controls. Partnership working for the service has added the opportunity for the EKAP to port best practice across the four sites within the East Kent Cluster to help drive forward continuous service improvement. For example;-

- The cemeteries review identified risks regarding headstone and monument maintenance, the best practice was ported to all partners.

- An audit regarding benefits in kind was paid for by the savings identified in National Insurance and Tax in that review.

The audit plan for this year has been delivered with an additional 25.47 days delivered as work in progress at the year-end. The performance figures for the East Kent Audit Partnership as a whole for the year show impressive performance against target, and indeed the EKAP has once again delivered financial savings against its agreed budget to all its partners in the delivery of the service.

4.0 Options

- 4.1 That Members consider and note the annual internal audit report for 2010-11.
- 4.2 That Members consider registering their concerns with Cabinet in respect of any areas of the Council's corporate governance, control framework or risk management arrangements in respect of which they have on-going concerns after considering the work or coverage of internal audit for the year 2010-11.

5.0 Corporate Implications

5.1 Financial Implications

- 5.1.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from this report. The costs of the audit work have been met from the Financial Services 2010-11 budget.

5.2 Legal Implications

- 5.2.1 The Council is required by statute (under the Accounts and Audit Regulations and section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972) to have an adequate and effective internal audit function.

5.3 Corporate Implications

- 5.3.1 Under the Local Code of Corporate Governance accepted by Cabinet on 8th December 2009, the Council is committed to comply with requirements for the independent review of the financial and operational reporting processes, through the external audit and inspection processes, and satisfactory arrangements for internal audit.

6.0 Recommendations

- 6.1 That the report be received by Members.

Contact Officers:	Christine Parker, Head of the Audit Partnership, ext. 7190
	Simon Webb, Audit Manager, ext 7190
	Sue McGonigal, Chief Executive (s.151 Officer) Ext. 7790

Annex List:

Annex 1	East Kent Audit Partnership Annual Report 2010/11
---------	---

Background Papers:

Title	Details of where to access copy
-------	---------------------------------

<i>Internal Audit Annual Plan 2010-11</i>	Previously presented to and approved at the March 2010 Governance and Audit Committee meeting
<i>Internal Audit Follow Up 2010-11</i>	Previously presented to Governance and Audit Committee Meetings in quarterly updates
<i>Internal Audit working papers</i>	Held by the East Kent Audit Partnership

Annual Internal Audit Report for Thanet District Council 2010-11

1. Introduction

The CIPFA Code of Practice for Internal Audit in Local Government for the United Kingdom 2006 defines internal audit as:

"An assurance function that primarily provides an independent and objective opinion to the organisation on the control environment comprising risk management, control and governance by evaluating its effectiveness in achieving the organisation's objectives. 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."

A more detailed explanation, of the role and responsibilities of internal audit, is set out in the approved Audit Charter. The East Kent Audit Partnership (EKAP) aims to comply with the CIPFA Code of Practice, and to this end has produced evidence to the s.151 and Monitoring Officers to assist the Council's review of the system of internal control in operation throughout the year.

The key aim of the EKAP is to deliver a professional, cost effective, efficient, internal audit function to the partner organisations. The EKAP aims to have an enabling role in raising the standards of services across the partners through its unique position in assessing the relative standards of services across the partners. The EKAP is also a key element of each council's anti fraud and corruption system by acting as a deterrent to would be internal perpetrators.

The four partners are all committed to the principles and benefits of a shared internal audit service, and have agreed a formal legal document setting out detailed arrangements. The statutory officers from each partner site (the s.151 Officer) together form the Client Officer Group and govern the partnership through bi-annual meetings.

This report is a summary of the year, a snapshot of the areas at the time they were reviewed and the results of follow up reviews to reflect the actions taken by management to address the control issues identified. The process that the EKAP adopts regarding following up the agreed recommendations will bring any outstanding high-risk areas to the attention of members via the quarterly reports, and through this annual report if there are any issues outstanding at the year-end.

2. Review of the Internal Control Environment

2.1 Risks and Assurances

The audit plan is agreed with members annually following a risk assessment of all the key systems and issues facing the Council. This assessment also ensures suitable time and resources are devoted to reviewing areas on a cyclical basis. The work of Internal Audit includes agreeing with service managers that a control risk exists and setting out a course of action to rectify this. The value of the advice given by Internal Audit is evidenced through the acceptance of the majority of audit recommendations, and the feedback from the customer satisfaction survey.

During 2010/2011, 206 recommendations were made in the agreed final audit reports to Thanet District Council. These are analysed as being High, Medium or Low risk in the following table:

Risk Criticality	No. of Recommendations	Percentage
High	112	54%
Medium	70	34%
Low	24	12%
TOTAL	206	100%

Naturally, more emphasis is placed on recommendations for improvement regarding high risks. Any high-risk recommendations where management has not made progress in implementing the agreed system improvement are brought to management and Members' attention through Internal Audit's quarterly update reports. During 2010-11 the EKAP has further analysed the Council's progress in implementing agreed recommendations - out of 206 recommendations whilst 88% were in the High or Medium Risk categories, none are so significant that they need to be escalated at this time.

Internal Audit applies one of four 'assurance opinions' to each review, please see Appendix A for the definitions. This provides a level of reliance that management can place on the system of internal control to deliver the goals and objectives covered in that particular review. Where the assurance level is either 'no' or 'limited', or where high risks have been identified a follow up review is undertaken and, where appropriate, the assurance level is revised.

The summary of Assurance Levels issued on 40 reports to Thanet District Council over the course of the year is as follows:

Assurance	No.	Percentage
Substantial	9	33%
Reasonable	13	48%
Limited	5	19%
No	0	0%
Work in Progress at Year-End	5	
Not Applicable	8	

NB: 'Not Applicable' is shown against quarterly benefit check work, special investigations or work commissioned by management that did not merit an assurance level.

Taken together 81% of the reviews account for substantial or reasonable assurance, whilst only 19% of reviews placed a limited or gave no assurance to management on the system of internal control in operation at the time of the review.

2.2 Follow Up

In agreeing the final Internal Audit Report, management accepts responsibility to take action to resolve all the risks highlighted in that final report. The EKAP carries out a follow up review at an appropriate time after finalising an agreed report to test whether agreed action has in fact taken place and whether it has been effective in reducing risk.

As part of the follow up action taken by the responsible auditor, the recommendations under review are either:

- “closed” as they are successfully implemented, or
- “closed” as the recommendation is yet to be implemented but is on target, or
- (for medium or low risks only) “closed” as management has decided to tolerate the risk.

At the conclusion of the follow up review the overall assurance level is re-assessed. The results for follow up for 2010/11 is set out below. The obvious shift to the right in the table from the original opinion to the revised opinion also measures the positive impact that the EKAP has made on the system of internal control in operation throughout 2010-11.

Total Follow Ups Done 31	No Assurance	Limited Assurance	Reasonable Assurance	Substantial Assurance
Original Opinion	1	7	17	6
Revised Opinion	0	3	20	8

There are no fundamental issues of note arising from the audits undertaken in 2010/11. There is however a number of matters reported in section 3 below.

Understandably, the follow up review is timed to allow the service manager sufficient time to make progress in implementing the agreed actions. To reassure the committee, those areas receiving limited or no assurance that are yet to be followed up are detailed in the following table, these areas are also recorded as an appendix to the quarterly report so that their progress is transparently monitored. The results of the follow up reviews will be reported to the quarterly committee at the appropriate time:

Area Under Review	Original Assurance	Follow Up Due
Homelessness/ Rent Deposit Scheme	Reasonable/Limited	Quarter 2 2011/12 Plan
Employee BIK Payments	Limited	WIP May 2011
Equality & Diversity	Limited	Summer 2011

2.3 Special Investigations and Fraud Related Work

The prevention and detection of fraud and corruption is ultimately the responsibility of management however, the EKAP is aware of its role in this area and is alert to the risk of fraud and corruption when undertaking its work. The EKAP will immediately report to the relevant officer any detected fraud or corruption identified during the course of its work; or any areas where such risks exist.

The EKAP is, from time to time, required to carry out special investigations, including suspected fraud and irregularity investigations and other special projects. Any such matters have been reported to the Governance and Audit Committee during the year as part of the quarterly update report.

2.4 Completion of Audit Plan

Appendix B shows the planned time for reviews undertaken, against actual time taken, follow up reviews and unplanned reviews resulting from a special investigation or management request. Going into 2010-11 the EKAP needed to deliver the 430 days from the agreed plan and the 10.57 days brought forward from the previous two years, a total of 440.57 days. In total 466.04 audit days (105.78%) were completed for

Thanet District Council during 2010-2011, consequently as we go into 2011-12 the EKAP is slightly ahead in the number of days due to Thanet District Council.

The EKAP was formed in October 2007 and fully implemented in April 2008. The progress in ensuring adequate coverage against the agreed audit plan of work is shown in the table below. The number of days 'owing' or 'ahead' as at the 31st March for projects that have started and are work in progress at the year-end is simply completed and adjusted for in the April of the following year:

	TDC Audit Days Required from EKAP			
	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Total
	400	408	430	1238
EKAP Days Delivered	397.61	399.82	466.04	1263.47
Percentage	99.4%	97.99%	108.38%	102.06%
Days rolled forward	-2.39	-8.18	+36.04	+25.47

3. Overall assessment of the System of Internal Controls 2010-11

Based on the work of the EKAP on behalf of Thanet District Council during 2010-11, the overall opinion is:

There are no major areas of concern, which would give rise to a qualified audit statement regarding the systems of internal control concerning either the main financial systems or overall systems of corporate governance. The Council can have very good level of assurance in respect of all of its main financial systems and the majority of its Governance arrangements. Many of the main financial systems which feed into the production of the Council's Financial Statements have achieved a Substantial assurance level following audit reviews. The Council can therefore be very assured in these areas. This position is the result of improvements to the systems and procedures over recent years and the willingness of management to address areas of concern that have been raised.

There were five areas where Limited Assurance and three areas where No Assurance was given which reflected a lack of confidence in arrangements, and this was brought to officers' attention. These reviews are shown in the tables above along with the details of our follow up activity.

4. Significant issues arising form in 2010-11

From the work undertaken during 2010-11, there were no instances of unsatisfactory responses to key control issues raised in internal audit reports. There are occasions when audit recommendations are not accepted for operational reasons such as a manager's opinion that costs outweigh the risk, but none of these are significant and require reporting or escalation at this time. It is particularly pleasing to report that after follow up there were no high-risk recommendations outstanding at the year-end.

5. Internal Audit Performance

5.1 EKAP Resources

The EKAP has provided the service to the partners based on a FTE of 8.2. Additional audit days have been provided via audit consultants or contractors in order to meet the planned workloads. How much Internal Audit resource is provided to each of the partner authorities depends on a variety of factors, including the council's historical

internal control environment and the new demands of meeting the requirements of corporate governance. Any changes in the agreed plans or the level of resources are reported quarterly to each audit committee and through regular meetings with each Section 151 Officer.

5.2 Skills and Development

The East Kent Audit Partnership is staffed by a mix of qualified and part-qualified officers, who all continue to develop their skills through a range of on-the-job training, external and in-house training courses and seminars and use of the corporate e-learning resource. Skills development during 2010-11 included:

- (a) Attendance by all Kent local authority internal audit staff at the Kent Audit Conference. This provides an opportunity to exchange knowledge and skills and to receive guidance on current developments in the internal audit profession.
- (b) Two members of staff continuing studies for ACCA with continued examination success during 2010-11.
- (c) In house training on the use of specialised auditing software used to manipulate and test databases called IDEA.
- (d) Use of modules on the corporate e-learning package to include diversity and equalities and child protection awareness.
- (e) Continuing to engage external audit providers, for specific audit assignments to maximise the skills that can be bought-in to enhance internal audit resources.

By using a mix of in-house expertise through the East Kent Audit Partnership and other outside resources the team is able to call upon a number of auditors with a wide range of skills and experience and also bring fresh insight into areas being audited as a means of securing the most effective and economic delivery of the service.

5.3. Plan Performance

The analysis in Appendix B shows the individual reviews that were completed during the year. As at 31st March 2011 the EKAP was slightly ahead and had delivered 466.04 days against 440.57 owed. These days will be adjusted in 2011/12 as part of the rolling three-year plan process.

5.4 Internal Audit Performance against its Targets

Internal Audit is committed to continuous improvement and has various measures to ensure the service can strive to achieve its goals and ambitions. When compared against the agreed audit plan for the year the performance measures and indicators for the year are shown in the table of performance measures at Appendix C.

5.4.1 Satisfaction with Internal Audit Service

EKAP uses an electronic client satisfaction questionnaire, which is issued at the conclusion of each audit to receive feedback on the quality and perception of the service. The results and comments made by auditees and service managers are reported quarterly to committee. Additional requests for advice and specific audit requests by management are also indicative of the value placed upon the service received from EKAP. Customer feedback is used to drive continuous improvement within the service, where appropriate constructive feedback is received it is discussed at a team meeting and any improvement actions taken as a result are reflected in a change to the Audit Manual, which records in detail all the work instructions to the auditors.

5.4.2 Internal Quality Assurance and Performance Management.

All internal audit reports are subject to review, either by the relevant EKAP Audit Manager or Head of the Audit Partnership. In each case this includes a detailed examination of the working papers, action and review points, at all stages of report. The review process is recorded and evidenced within the working paper index and in a table at the end of each audit report. Detailed work instructions are documented within the Audit Manual. The Head of Audit Partnership collates performance data monthly and, together with the monitoring of the delivery of the agreed audit plan carried out by the relevant Audit Manager, regular meetings are held with the s.151 Officer. The minutes to these meetings are additional evidence to the strategic management of the EKAP performance.

5.4.3 External Quality Assurance

The Audit Commission has always carried out an annual assessment each year and a detailed quality assessment of internal audit every three years. The Audit Commission reviewed the EKAP arrangements in detail during 2009/10 and the results of that review were reported to committee. It is pleasing to report that no areas for improvement were raised during that review and the EKAP was found to comply with the CIPFA code. The requirement for the Audit Commission to complete this review has been removed and the EKAP will look for other sources of assurance on the quality of its processes and outputs.

The EKAP self-assessment of the level of CIPFA Code compliance shows that EKAP is currently 97% compliant against a target of 97%. At present there are no identified actions to improve this score.

The Accounts & Audit Regulations require that each authority undertake an annual review of the effectiveness of internal audit arrangements and to report this alongside the Governance Assurance Statement within the Council's Statement of Accounts. Therefore this report, summarising the achievements of Internal Audit for the year to March 2011, is also designed to feed into that overall assessment process.

5.4.4 Liaison between Internal Audit and External Audit.

Joint liaison meetings with the Audit Commission's audit managers for the partner authorities and the EKAP audit managers are held regularly to ensure adequate audit coverage, to agree any complementary work and to avoid any duplication of effort. The EKAP has not met with any other review body during the year in its role as the Internal Auditor to Thanet District Council. Consequently, the assurance, which follows is based on EKAP reviews of Thanet District Council's services.

5.4.5 Financial Performance

Expenditure and recharges for year 2010/11 are all in line with the budget. The financial management of the Internal Audit cost centre held by Dover District Council (as host partner) has been on target, and 10% savings have been achieved.

As can be seen, the EKAP has been able to exceed its targets for financial performance for 2010/11. The EKAP now has a track record for bringing down daily rates (see table below). This daily rate excludes any internal recharges that are added to the service by the Council, which are not under the control or management of the EKAP. This equates to a saving of £32 per day against the original target for 2010/11 of £300/day; a total financial saving to Thanet District Council £13,676.48 for 2010/11 (or 10% against the original budget of £300/day).

Year	Cost / Audit Day
2006-07	£288
2007-08	£277
2008-09	£262 (Reserve Refunded to Partners)
2009-10	£281
2010-11	£268

The EKAP was formed to provide a resilient, professional service and therefore to achieve financial savings was not the main driver, despite this considerable efficiencies have been gained through forming the partnership. Additionally, any external fee earning work that has been carried out, this year some £17,255.75 was procured by other public sector bodies from EKAP reduces the costs to the partners. The net result is a reduced EKAP cost per audit day of some £32 per day below the original budget estimate. In the current climate this is excellent performance and the partner authorities have all enjoyed the savings generated by the EKAP.

6. Overall Conclusion

The Internal Audit function provided by the EKAP has performed well against its targets for the year. Clearly there have been some adjustments to the original audit plan for the year 2010/2011, however, this is as expected and there are no matters of concern to be raised at this time.

The work of Internal Audit and this report contribute to the overall internal control environment in operation within the Council, and also assists in providing an audit trail to the statements that must be published annually with the financial accounts. The EKAP assesses the overall system of internal control in operation throughout 2010/11 as providing reasonable assurance. No system of control can provide absolute assurance, nor can Internal Audit give that assurance. This statement is intended to provide reasonable assurance that there is an ongoing process for identifying, evaluating and managing the key risks.

AUDIT ASSURANCE

Definition of Audit Assurance Statements

Substantial Assurance

From the testing completed during this review a sound system of control is currently being managed and achieved. All of the necessary, key controls of the system are in place. Any errors found were minor and not indicative of system faults. These may however result in a negligible level of risk to the achievement of the system objectives.

Reasonable Assurance

From the testing completed during this review most of the necessary controls of the system in place are managed and achieved. There is evidence of non-compliance with some of the key controls resulting in a marginal level of risk to the achievement of the system objectives. Scope for improvement has been identified, strengthening existing controls or recommending new controls.

Limited Assurance

From the testing completed during this review some of the necessary controls of the system are in place, managed and achieved. There is evidence of significant errors or non-compliance with many key controls not operating as intended resulting in a risk to the achievement of the system objectives. Scope for improvement has been identified, improving existing controls or recommending new controls.

No Assurance

From the testing completed during this review a substantial number of the necessary key controls of the system have been identified as absent or weak. There is evidence of substantial errors or non-compliance with many key controls leaving the system open to fundamental error or abuse. The requirement for urgent improvement has been identified, to improve existing controls or new controls should be introduced to reduce the critical risk.

Performance Against the Agreed 2010/11 Audit Plan

Area	Original Planned Days	Revised Budgeted Days as at 31-03-11	Actual days to 31-03-11	Status and Assurance Level
FINANCIAL SYSTEMS:				
Housing Benefits – Shared Revenues and Benefits Database with Dover District Council	5	3.2	3.2	Finalised
Housing Benefits – Quarterly Testing	20	14.85	14.85	2009-10 Quarter 4 – Finalised 2010-11 Quarter 1 – Finalised 2010-11 Quarter 2 – Finalised 2010-11 Quarter 3 - Finalised
Payroll	5	3.47	3.47	Finalised
Car Parking and PCNs	8	0.17	0.17	Work-in-Progress (Qtr 1 of 2011-12)
Bank Reconciliation	5	5.91	5.91	Finalised - Substantial
Creditors and CIS	8	10.28	10.28	Finalised - Substantial
Miscellaneous Income/Cash Collection	8	0	0	Delete from plan to accommodate higher risk reviews. Include in 2011-12 plan.
Financial Stewardship	8	6.1	6.1	Finalised
Council Tax	12	12.68	12.68	Finalised – Substantial
Business Rates	12	8.32	8.32	Finalised - Substantial
External Funding Protocol	8	4.35	4.35	Finalised – Reasonable
HOUSING SERVICES:				
Housing Rents	10	9.89	9.89	Finalised – Substantial
Housing Repairs and Maintenance	10	10.73	10.73	Finalised - Reasonable
Leasehold Services	10	11.15	11.15	Finalised - Reasonable
HRA Business Plan	8	8.6	8.6	Finalised - Substantial
Rent Deposit Scheme/Homelessness	5	7.63	7.63	Finalised – Reasonable/Limited
Housing Estate Management	8	0	0	Delete from plan to accommodate higher risk reviews. Include in 2011-12 plan.
ICT SYSTEMS:				
ICT Change Control and File Security	8	0	0	Delete from plan to accommodate higher risk reviews. Include in 2011-12 plan.
HUMAN RESOURCES RELATED:				

Area	Original Planned Days	Revised Budgeted Days as at 31-03-11	Actual days to 31-03-11	Status and Assurance Level
Recruitment and CRB	8	0.17	0.17	Delete from plan due to low levels of recruitment at the present time. CRB element covered by Child Protection audit.
Employee Benefits-in-Kind	8	12.61	12.61	Finalised - Limited
GOVERNANCE RELATED:				
Asset Management	8	12.23	12.23	Finalised - Reasonable
Members' Code of Conduct and Standards Arrangements	8	8.34	8.34	Finalised - Reasonable
Officers' Code of Conduct and Whistleblowing Arrangements	8	7.64	7.64	Finalised - Reasonable
Performance Management	9	11.44	11.44	Finalised - Reasonable
Corporate/CMT/Committee	30	42.94	42.94	Finalised
East Kent Shared Services – Validation of Performance Indicators for Tranche 1 Services	2	0	0	Delete from plan to accommodate higher risk reviews.
CONTRACT RELATED:				
Contract Standing Order Compliance	10	0	0	Delete from plan to accommodate higher risk reviews. Include in 2011-12 plan.
Contract Monitoring	10	9.54	9.54	Finalised - Reasonable
Procurement	10	0.15	0.15	Work-in-Progress (Qtr 1 of 2011-12)
SERVICE LEVEL:				
Accommodation Strategy	7	5.04	5.04	Finalised - Substantial
Members' Allowances	8	8.99	8.99	Finalised - Reasonable
Public Health Burials	6	7.05	7.05	Finalised - Limited
Coast Protection/Management	9	11.81	11.81	Finalised - Reasonable
Cemeteries and Crematorium	9	10.18	10.18	Finalised - Reasonable
Planning, Building Control and s.106 Agreements	20	20.02	20.02	Finalised – Reasonable/Substantial/Substantial
Events Management	10	10.43	10.43	Finalised - Reasonable
Electoral Registration	8	0	0	Delete from plan to accommodate higher risk reviews. Include in 2011-12 plan.
Equality and Diversity	8	8.88	8.88	Finalised - Limited
Thanet Works	9	14.84	14.84	Finalised - Reasonable
Disabled Facilities Grants	9	9.57	9.57	Finalised - Substantial

Area	Original Planned Days	Revised Budgeted Days as at 31-03-11	Actual days to 31-03-11	Status and Assurance Level
Maritime – Visiting Yachts and Ancillary Services	10	11.34	11.34	Finalised - Reasonable
Maritime – Permanent Berths and let Properties	10	10.89	10.89	Finalised - Reasonable
Waste Management	10	11.77	11.77	Finalised - Substantial
OTHER				
Liaison With External Auditors	5	2.08	2.08	Finalised
Follow-up Reviews	13	31.83	31.83	Finalised
FINALISATION OF 2009-10 AUDITS				
Child Protection	20.57	41.31	7.38	Finalised – Reasonable
Homelessness			0.39	Finalised - Limited
Housing Benefit – Fraud Investigation Arrangements			1.11	Finalised – Reasonable
Thanet Leisure Force			6.75	Finalised – Substantial/Limited
Information Management, FOI and Data Protection			12.89	Finalised – Substantial/Reasonable/Limited
CSO Compliance			0.61	Finalised – Limited
Green Waste Service			4.36	Finalised – Substantial
Local Code of Corporate Governance			0.1	Finalised - Substantial
Choice Based Lettings			7.72	Finalised - Substantial
UNPLANNED WORK				
Creative Margate Consultancy Arrangements (Balance of time from 2009-10 audit)	0	0.07	0.07	Finalised - Limited
Overtime	0	6.01	6.01	Finalised – Reasonable
EK Services – Tranche 1 Performance Indicator Validation	0	3.27	3.27	Finalised
External Funding – ERDF Grants	0	13.55	13.55	Finalised – Reasonable
Standards Investigation	0	4.85	4.85	Finalised
Total (Including 10.57 days brought forward from 2009-10)	440.57	466.04	466.04	105.78% Complete as at 31-03-11
UNPLANNED ADDITIONAL WORK				
Meridian Village	2	2.07	2.07	Audit verification of costs deductible from income arising from development
Interreg Grant – Customer Services	4	5.45	5.45	First Level Controller sign off charged to project
MACH Grant	0	1.13	1.13	Audit costs for sign off of grant claim charged to project
Interreg Grant – Tudor House	4	5.42	5.42	First Level Controller sign off charged to project

Area	Original Planned Days	Revised Budgeted Days as at 31-03-11	Actual days to 31-03-11	Status and Assurance Level
Interreg Grant – Maritime (Off-Shore Wind Farm)	4	3.76	3.76	First Level Controller sign off charged to project



Thanet District Council Balanced Scorecard

<u>INTERNAL PROCESSES PERSPECTIVE:</u>	<u>2010-11 Actual</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>FINANCIAL PERSPECTIVE:</u>	<u>2010-11 Actual</u>	<u>Target</u>
	Quarter 4				
Chargeable as % of available days	88%	75%	Cost per Audit Day (Reported Annually)	£268	£300
Chargeable days as % of planned days	106%	100%			
Follow up Reviews;					
• Issued	31	-			
• Not yet due	10	-			
• Now overdue for Follow Up	2	0			
Percentage compliance with the CIPFA Code for Internal Audit 2006	97%	97%			

<u>CUSTOMER PERSPECTIVE:</u>	<u>2010-11 Actual</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>INNOVATION & LEARNING PERSPECTIVE:</u>	<u>2010-11 Actual</u>	<u>Target</u>
	Quarter 4		Quarter 4		
Number of Satisfaction Questionnaires Issued;	44		Percentage of staff qualified to relevant technician level	76%	75%
Number of completed questionnaires received back;	21		Percentage of staff holding a relevant higher level qualification	32%	32%
Percentage of Customers who felt that;			Percentage of staff studying for a relevant professional qualification	24%	24%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews were conducted in a professional manner 	100%	100%	Number of days technical training per FTE	3.07	3.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The audit report was 'Excellent or Very Good' 	100%	90%	Percentage of staff meeting formal CPD requirements	32%	32%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the audit was worthwhile. 	100%	100%	Number of business efficiency/ service Improvement recommendations introduced	35	-