

**AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE ACTIONLOG FOR COMMITTEE MEETING 14<sup>TH</sup> JULY**

<b><u>NO.</u></b>	<b><u>TITLE OF REPORT / MINUTE AND ACTION REQUESTED</u></b>	<b><u>LEAD</u></b>	<b><u>PROGRESS / RESPONSE</u></b>
<b>ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE 25<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER MEETING 2014</b>			
<b>1.</b>	<p><b>MINUTE 99 INTERNAL AUDIT PROGRESS REPORT (INCLUDING PROGRESS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MANAGEMENT ACTIONS) TO 31<sup>ST</sup> OCTOBER 2014</b></p> <p>a) Internal Audit Report on Safe Recruitment in Schools - Request from the Chairman for a written update on the number of responses received in relation to the reminders to the third of schools who had not completed the self-assessment audit. He advised that it would not be necessary to come back to Committee to present that information.</p> <p>Note: It was resolved unanimously at the 9<sup>th</sup> June meeting that</p> <p>i) a further update should be circulated to the Committee after the deadline of the end of the week (12<sup>th</sup> June) and an update included in the Minute Action Log for the next meeting in July.</p> <p>ii) <b>A follow up report should be provided in due course in relation to what lessons had been learnt.</b></p>	<p><b>Service Director Keith Grimwade / internal Audit</b></p>	<p>On 14<sup>th</sup> May it had been reported to the Chairman that ten schools (one infant, nine primaries; of the ten, nine are maintained, one is an academy) had not returned the self-audit. The ten schools were contacted by the relevant Area Senior Adviser for an explanation.</p> <p>At the 9<sup>th</sup> June it was orally reported that all but four schools had now completed their self-assessment forms, resulting in the return rate rising to 98.4%. The Committee agreed that the threat of sending Internal Audit into the still outstanding schools should be held off until after this deadline. There was concern expressed regarding the lack of an adequate explanation from those schools still outstanding.</p> <p>An update was e-mailed to Members on 16<sup>th</sup> June confirming that the four outstanding schools had provided their returns.</p> <p><b>The Committee may wish to consider when it would wish a follow up report to be presented.</b></p>

	b) The Head of Internal Audit to commence the audit process with a view to providing a full report.	Neil Hunter	The outcome of the Safer Recruiting audit is included on the current agenda.
<b>ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE 17<sup>th</sup> MARCH MEETING 2014</b>			
<b>2.</b>	<b>MINUTE 118 ACTION LOG FROM MINUTES</b>		
	<b>4d) Risk 26 – Increasing Manifestation of Busway Defects</b> It was suggested that the Economy and Environment Committee should, as part of their regular review report, consider whether this risk was at the appropriate level. Having received cautionary advice from External Audit on the need to ensure information was not disclosed which would prejudice future negotiations, <b>the Chairman indicated he would raise the issue directly with the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee. (Action)</b>	<b>Cllr Shellens</b>	<b>Action ongoing</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>MINUTE 120. INTERNAL AUDIT PROGRESS REPORT</b>		
a)	Business Continuity – Moderate assurance provided.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business Continuity – Actions were progressing but had not been completed. An update was requested by Internal Audit on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2015 (note March 2015 had been the target date)</li> <li>• Personal Budgets – The action was confirmed by management in May 2015 as having been implemented.</li> </ul> <p>(The above would be followed up for the September meeting)</p>
b)	Personal Budgets for Children - Substantial Assurance provided  <b>Action: The Chairman requested details outside of the meeting on the follow up to be taken to ensure the actions were undertaken to address the minor issues which had been identified.</b>		

4.	<b>MINUTE 127 - DRAFT AGENDA PLAN</b>		
a)	Councillor Sales request for a review of the General Purposes Committee decision to grant a lease to an organisation to manage the land as a community sports facility on the March Estover Road Site.		<p>At the June meeting it was reported that the investigations were still in progress.</p> <p>A draft report has now been prepared but has not yet been issued as it is still under review. The report is now scheduled to go to the September Committee meeting.</p> <p><b>Action ongoing.</b></p>

### **ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE 9<sup>TH</sup> JUNE COMMITTEE MEETING**

5.	<b>MINUTE 132 – MINUTES</b>		
a)	<p>Arising:</p> <p><b>Minute 117 Risk Management Report and Risk 22 - Cambridgeshire Future Transport Programme</b></p> <p>In relation to the text reading that the reconvened Cambridgeshire Future Transport Member Steering Group would report to the Economy and Environment Committee and that this Committee wished to see any final report, The Deputy Leader highlighted that the work of the Steering Group was not to be confused with the work of the Task Group. The former was engaged in looking at alternative transport arrangements for bus routes where the subsidy had been</p>		<p>Paul Nelson from Passenger Transport has provided the following helpful update:</p> <p>‘There is a Director level Officer Group the Home to School Transport Project Team administered by Helen Mendis from the Change Support Team (they are chaired by Keith Grimwade) managing the work to better commission home to school (mainstream and Special Education Needs (SEND)), adult social care transport, public transport and community transport. They have recently been renamed ‘Total Transport Project Board’.</p>

	<p>removed and would be ongoing, with a series of solutions on different routes, and these would not necessarily come back for approval at a Committee.</p> <p>It was agreed that the appropriate reporting arrangements, including any update on the timescale, would be clarified following the meeting. <b>Action: Democratic Services to check with Joseph Whelan / Paul Nelson.</b></p>	<p><b>RVS contact JW / PN</b></p>	<p>The CFT Member Steering Group is chaired by Cllr van de Ven. Membership of this group is Cllrs van de Ven, Cllr Ashcroft, Cllr Bailey, Cllr Butcher, Cllr Jenkins, Cllr Mason, Cllr McGuire and Cllr Whitehead. The group also includes some district members. The reporting process hasn't been finalised but is expected to report to Economy and Environment Committee as part of the Business Planning process, although there has been some discussion about whether it should report to GPC due to the wider cross cutting agenda following the GPC request in January. The terms of reference are attached as appendix 1 to this report.</p>
<p><b>b)</b></p>	<p><b>Minute 118 3a) Home to School Transport</b> – Linked to the above, the Deputy Leader had previously clarified that the Cambridgeshire Future Transport Member Steering Group had been re-convened through a decision by Full Council at their meeting in December, rather than by General Purposes Committee. However, the latter Committee at their meeting in January had requested that the Steering Group's scope should also include Home to School Transport. <i>(Note: This Committee had already indicated that they would also wish to receive any final report on recommendations on Home to School Transport, having previously expressed concerns at the scale of the budget overspend)</i></p> <p>An update was requested on the likely timetable for a final report at the next meeting. <b>Action: Democratic Services to check with Joseph Whelan.</b></p>	<p><b>RVS / JW</b></p>	<p>This request has been actioned and the CFT Member Steering Group have taken on board the remit to include in their scope Home to School Transport.</p> <p>The Director level Officer group managing the work is expected to liaise with CFT Steering Group on any recommendations on Home to School Transport before they go on to member level meetings, although the exact reporting lines are still to be confirmed.</p> <p>The work has recently started so there will not be a formal member report for some months. An exact date cannot yet be provided, but a further update position will be reported to the September Audit and Accounts Committee. The budget position of home to school transport will continue to be reported through existing channels in Resources and Performance reports to both General Purposes Committee and Children and Young People Committee.</p>

c)	<p><b>2) 4c) Minute 119 Key Risk 4 – The Council does not achieve best value from its procurement contracts</b></p> <p>Explanation was also provided in relation to a guidance checklist provided by the Procurement Team intended for use on new contracts valued at over £100,000. <b>There was a request that this checklist should be circulated to the Committee following the meeting.Action.</b></p>	<b>Paul White</b>	<p>A response with the checklist was provided in an e-mail to the Committee from Democratic Services dated 12<sup>th</sup> June 2015.</p> <p><b>Action completed</b></p>
d)	<p><b>As contract management was identified as the key risk area, the Interim Head of Internal Audit indicated that Internal Audit would carry out some assurance reviews during the year.</b></p>	<b>Neil Hunter</b>	<p>Reference is made from this key risk to a number of audits in the plan. The audits intended to include procurement contract review are as follows:</p> <p>IT Project Management Waste PFI Highways Services Contract Adults Contracts – Systems &amp; Processes</p>
e)	<p><b>Minute 126 Integrated Resources and Performance Report for period ending 30th January</b></p>		
	<p>There was a request that the Committee should receive the most recent copy of the individual detailed Adults and Children and Young People Integrated Resources and Performance Reports</p>	<b>Dan Thorp / Rob Sanderson</b>	<p>A response with the most recent reports as requested was provided in an email to the Committee from Democratic Services dated 11<sup>th</sup> June 2015.</p> <p><b>Action completed</b></p>
f)	<p><b>The Chairman requested that he should be sent the General Purposes Committee Overview Integrated Resources and Performance Report each time it went to that Committee.</b></p>		<p>Phil Emmett has undertaken to arrange this.</p>

6.	<b>MINUTE 134 ANNUAL RISK MANAGEMENT REPORT</b>		
a)	The table in paragraph 3.2 provided an analysis of Directorate Residual Risks as at May 2015. <b>Action: There was a request that the Members of the Committee be provided with a list of the titles of the 62 residual risks by Directorate outside of the meeting.</b>	Dan Thorp/ Sue Norman	This was issued as an attachment in an e-mail from Democratic Services to the Committee dated 24 <sup>th</sup> June.  <b>Action completed</b>
b)	Risk 1a) 'Failure to deliver a robust and secure Business Plan over the next five years' - <b>Action: There was a query of whether the word 'deliver' should in fact be changed to say 'produce'.</b> The officer would take this back and confirm.	Dan Thorp/ Sue Norman	This will be discussed at the next Corporate Risk Group on 4 <sup>th</sup> August 2015.  <b>action ongoing</b>
c)			
	Risk 14 - <i>Increased demand for services arising from increased financial</i> and social pressure on individuals, families and communities. Action: Confirmation requested that in relation to the action crossed out titled 'New Child Poverty Strategy to be developed' that the Strategy had been developed and implemented (and was on the web). It was suggested including a date in future on the register document would avoid such queries.	Dan Thorp/ Sue Norman	To be discussed at the next Corporate Risk Group on 4 <sup>th</sup> August 2015.  <b>action ongoing</b>
d)	Risk Number 15 'Failure of the Council's arrangements for safeguarding vulnerable children and adults' key control / mitigation 28 – change required by the Care Act 2014 overseen by the Safeguarding Adults Board <b>Action: request for a date to be inserted.</b> (to clarify when the specific risk under the provision of the 2014 Act was introduced)	SueNorman	To be discussed at the next Corporate Risk Group on 4 <sup>th</sup> August 2015.  <b>action ongoing</b>
e)	Risk Number 16 – 'Lack of capacity to resource future demand for services in respect of children and adults' – <b>Action:</b> It was suggested that under Key Control / mitigation – 1. 'Regular audits of assessment process and the use of trend data to identify children's	SueNorman	To be discussed at the next Corporate Risk Group on 4 <sup>th</sup> August 2015.  <b>action ongoing</b>

	<p>needs' <b>this also needed to reference adults.</b></p> <p>Lack of staff training / the use of agency staff was raised as an issue  - <b>Action: it was suggested that robust induction knowledge and verification should be added as a key control.</b></p> <p><b>Action: A number of the strategies had March 2016 as the target date. It was recommended that key milestones should be added for the September meeting to be able to check on progress.</b></p>	<p>Sue Norman</p> <p>Sue Norman</p>	<p><b>action ongoing</b></p> <p><b>action ongoing</b></p>
f)	<p>Risk number 22 – ‘The Cambridgeshire Future Transport Programme fails to meet its objectives within available budget’ – Result no 2.As referred to in discussion earlier in the meeting  <b>Action: the wording needed to be refreshed as reference was made to a revised programme and to a project being completed by the end of March. Clarification was required on which the project referred to was and whether it required to be reported on to any service committee.</b></p>	<p>Sue Norman / Joseph Whelan</p>	<p>Update from Paul Nelson in Joseph Whelan’s absence</p> <p>As always these things don't neatly fit into boxes. The three year programme probably refers to the one to reduce the public transport budget by 40% from £2.7m to £1.5m. This was a three year programme intended to finish in March 2015, to tie in with the original business plan decision in February 2012. Over the last three years, however, I have managed to achieve savings earlier than planned and along with an injection of additional funds in the Business Plan in February 2014 means that the required savings have been made. However, the actual review programme has taken longer than expected and hasn't actually finished by the original March 2015 timescale and will therefore continue until the end of the year. It really depends on what the original risk was, and I believe this to be the financial one and the savings have been achieved, therefore removing the risk. The programme was a means to achieve this and that hasn't been achieved, but hasn't had a substantive impact on achieving the required savings. Decisions on specific service changes are agreed through delegated powers</p>

			<p>to Joseph Whelan as Head of Service, in consultation with Cllr Bates as lead member.</p> <p>There are separate savings required for home to school transport but although this function is carried out under passenger transport this is on behalf of Children, Families and Adults (CFA) and therefore is a CFA rather than an ETE risk.</p>
g)	<p>Page 6 - The Cambridgeshire Future Transport Programme fails to meet its objectives within available budget' <b>On key control 7 'Updates are provided for Members via key issues' It was suggested that the words "provided on a monthly basis" should be added</b> to reflect that the Steering Group was meeting on a monthly basis.</p>	Sue Norman	<p>Confirmation has been received that the Steering Group meets on a monthly basis and therefore it is appropriate to add this additional wording.</p>
h)	<p>Major Fraud or Corruption – The Chairman challenged the wording of trigger 2 as he personally did not consider the current economic climate resulted in major fraud / corruption. <b>Action: to consider any response to this comment</b></p>	Sue Norman	<p>To be discussed at the next Corporate Risk Group on 4<sup>th</sup> August 2015.</p> <p><b>action ongoing</b></p>
i)	<p>Concerns were expressed regarding where target dates had been changed on more than one occasion. Particularly highlighted on page 5 was Risk 21 'Business Disruption' the action titled '4. Plan and Implement Phase 3 of IT Resilience, Programme – duplication of key systems – in progress' where the revised target date had changed five times since October 2013. <b>It was agreed that in relation to risk 21 the risk owner should be asked to prepare a note of explanation regarding the continual slippage of the target date and that the person should be invited to attend the next meeting to provide an update on what the IT issues / problems were. Action.</b></p>	Ian Farrer	<p>A response was sent on an e-mail from Democratic Services to the Committee dated 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2015. The response is reproduced as appendix 2 to this log.</p>

7.	<b>MINUTE ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK UPDATE</b>		
a)	The Chairman was concerned regarding whether all foreseeable risks were currently covered and whether there were any gaps / or whether risks were being shown at the right level. <b>Action: There was a request to provide an update report on any areas that the new Head of Internal of Audit identified might be gaps requiring further assurance work.</b>	Neil Hunter	A report will be prepared to the September meeting.
b)	AF3 'Workforce recruitment and retention' - It was suggested that monitoring of recruitment advertising should be added as an assurance <b>Action: Officer to review</b>	Sue N	This has been added  <b>Action completed</b>
c)	AF5 'Infrastructure Funding Shortage' – <b>Action: It was suggested that this should be re-worded as there was no realistic expectation of receiving sufficient infrastructure Section 106 payments to deliver all infrastructure / services / developments.</b>	Sue N	This is being reviewed.
d)	AF 6: 'Increased demand for services arising from financial and social pressures on individual families and communities' - third level of assurance first bullet titled – 'Internal Audit Review – Community Cohesion August 2012 - Limited Assurance' - <b>There was a request for an update on the recommendations made and whether they had all been implemented</b>	Sue N	Community Cohesion – 4 agreed actions were followed up by Internal Audit in line with the policy that the Audit team only follow-up agreed actions which are classed as being of significant or fundamental importance. In all cases, Audit have received physical evidence that actions have been completed.
e)	AF8: Lack of capacity to resource future demand for Children and Adults Services – it was suggested that an additional assurance should be 'Sufficient numbers of quality staff '	Sue N	This has been added  <b>Action completed</b>
f)	On the first level of assurance 'Adult safeguarding training available to all who work with adults and older people across Cambridgeshire' There was a query regarding the take up of the training, as this was a more reliable assurance. <b>Action: officer to look into.</b>	Sue N / Tom Barden	The relevant officer has been contacted who is currently seeking to compile the information.

g)	AF13 Information Management – highlighted that there had only been limited assurance on Capita One review - <b>There was a request for an update on the recommendations made and whether they had all been implemented</b>	Sue N	Capita One – 23 agreed actions were followed up by Internal Audit in line with the policy that the Audit team only follow-up agreed actions which are classed as being of significant or fundamental importance. In all cases, Audit have received physical evidence that actions have been completed.  <b>Action completed.</b>
h)	AF27 – Obtain assurance on the effectiveness of key controls – on the appropriate key controls it was suggested by the Chairman that they should include: public opinion, financial compliance and service delivery. <b>Action: Officer to review</b>	Sue N	This has been added  <b>Action completed</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>MINUTE 136. ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT</b>		
	To agree that the Audit and Accounts Chairman should be added to the names required to sign off the final version of the 'Annual Governance Statement' document.	Sue N	This has been added.  <b>Action completed</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>MINUTE 137 - REVIEW OF LGSS INTERNAL AUDIT (CAMBRIDGESHIRE) COMPLIANCE WITH THE PUBLIC SECTOR INTERNAL AUDIT STANDARD (PSIAS)</b>		
a)	The reference on page 6 to there being an independent Chairman of the Committee was incorrect as this only applied to Northamptonshire County Council and therefore required changing. <b>Action</b>	Richard(R) – Internal Audit	Reference to an independent Chairman removed in a revised version of the paper.  <b>Action completed</b>
b)	Paragraph 1.4 of the report Page 5 – '1000 Purpose, Authority and Responsibility' - reference was made to a review of the Audit Charter in 2015/16 which required a date to be added and Democratic Services informed in order to be able to update the Committee's Forward Plan. <b>Action</b>	R	Reference added to revised version of the paper for a reviewed Audit Charter to be presented to the March 2016 Audit & Accounts Committee.  <b>Action completed</b>

c)	Page 8 Quality Assurance – the Chairman requested that the wording should be revised, as the current text underplayed the role of the Committee in identifying priority areas and agreeing and monitoring changes to the Plan. <b>Action</b>	R	Reference added to a revised version of the paper:  As part of the audit planning process, requests are received from the Audit & Accounts Committee to ensure that audit coverage is being directed towards the areas of highest risk/current importance to the Council. In-year changes to the Audit Plan are approved by the Committee, with progress monitored against the overall Plan.  <b>Action completed</b>
d)	Page 11 - With reference to Customer Feedback Questionnaires issued with each final report, the Chairman had previously asked to see one and the request was still outstanding. <b>Action</b>	R	The questionnaire was sent to the Chairman and Vice Chairman via email on 2 <sup>nd</sup> July.  <b>Action completed</b>
<b>10. ANNUAL INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT 2014-15</b>			
a)	That more information on the issues involved should be provided in the report for those reviews which had only been able to provide limited assurance ('Street Lighting - Energy Management, Public Health Grant). In addition although it was orally reported that the recommendations for these two reviews had all been implemented, there was a request to have this information provided in an e-mail outside of the meeting <b>Action</b>	Neil Hunter	<u>Street Lighting</u> – 6 agreed actions were followed up by Internal Audit in line with the policy that the Audit team only follow-up agreed actions which are classed as being of significant or fundamental importance. In all cases, Audit have received physical evidence that actions have been completed (or in the case of ongoing actions e.g. compliance checks, evidence has been received that a system has been put in place for the checks to be carried out, and the first check has taken place).  <u>Public Health</u> – Personal assurance with regards to the implementation of actions was provided to the Audit and Accounts Committee in January by the Director of Public Health and the Chief Finance Officer. Internal

			Audit will be conducting a follow-up review of the Public Health Grant in 2015/16.
b)	With reference to page 11 there was discussion regarding the significant discrepancy in the Internal Audit Contribution in relation to the area of External Audit, where the planned days of 8 had been exceeded in eventual actual days by 269, a huge difference. In addition, as set out on page 12 Table 9, it was highlighted the performance indicator target for the delivery of agreed annual Internal Audit Plan Audit Reports had also significantly underachieved (81% against a target of 95%) In response, it was highlighted that in the first three months the Service had struggled as a result of the management and staffing changes which was why there had been no Internal Audit Progress report to the current meeting. The intention was to improve all three areas listed in table 9. <b>Action: There was a request that the information should include showing performance for the first three months and after.</b>	Neil Hunter	To be prepared for future Reports..
<b>11.</b>	<b>MINUTE 139. INTEGRATED RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE REPORT</b>		
a)	Making reference to the tables in paragraphs 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5, several of the figures showed considerable increases from the original estimate of children and adult clients compared with the final number. This poor forecasting record had been a recurring theme for a number of years and the Chairman questioned how they were carried out. <b>Action: He suggested that this was an area for review by Internal Audit.</b>	Neil Hunter	Head of Internal Audit will discuss with Executive Director

b)	In relation to information the Chairman had requested in advance of the meeting on activity data in relation to the above tables an oral update was provided which has been included as appendix 1 to these Minutes. There was concern that providing a snap shot of a day appeared to be a waste of resources. <b>The officer agreed they would review this approach, to see if there was a better way of presenting the information.</b>	<b>I Smith / Tom Bawden</b>	This was being looked into.
c)	Page 11 Performance targets - Corporate Priority titled 'Developing our economy' fourth indicator reading 'the proportion of pupils attending Cambridgeshire as schools judged good or outstanding by Ofsted' - the Chairman suggested that this was misleading, as it included two sets of activity relating to Secondary and Primary schools in the same indicator. In addition it also needed to differentiate between academy and non-academy schools, as the former were distorting the figures in a negative way. In response it was indicated that the presentation of the indicator was required by the Department for Education (DFE) / Ofsted in the current format but that General Purposes Committee had asked for a breakdown by the different types of schools. <b>Action: Authors of the information should be asked to make a further split between not only the types of school, but also between Academy and Non Academy schools.</b>	<b>I Smith / RVS</b>	General Purposes Committee have discussed and agreed a new set of corporate indicators for 2015/16, which they will monitor as part of the monthly IR&PR. This new set <u>does not</u> include "The proportion of pupils attending Cambridgeshire schools judged good or outstanding by Ofsted" indicator.
d)	Page 13 Customer Complaints – ETE – officers were requested to provide a written explanation on the reasons for the continued under performance.	<b>IS / ETE</b>	This was currently being reviewed.
e)	a) Page 14 – 'Key exceptions information relating to the number of people successfully quitting smoking with support from stop smoking services' – as only 76% of the stop smoking target had been	<b>Dr Liz Robin</b>	Response provided in an e-mail on behalf of Dr Liz Robin dated 18 <sup>th</sup> June 2015. The details are included in

	achieved for 2013/14 - a drop from 92% in 2012/13 - <b>Action - The Director of Public Health should be asked the value / justification for maintaining the level of investment in this area, and whether the resources should be re-directed / the level of investment reduced.</b>		appendix 3 to this report.  <b>Action completed.</b>
<b>12.</b>	<b>MINUTE 140 DRAFT AGENDA PLAN</b>		<b>Actions completed</b>

## APPENDIX 1

### TERMS OF REFERENCE CAMBRIDGESHIRE FUTURE TRANSPORT STEERING GROUP

The Cambridgeshire Future Transport (CFT) programme is a joint initiative with partners from across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough including local authorities, health services, community groups and transport providers, working together to find solutions to Cambridgeshire's transport and accessibility challenges.

**Objective: To steer the integration of the commissioning of transport services within Cambridgeshire**

#### **Purpose**

The purpose of the CFT Steering Group is to;

- Oversee the Cambridgeshire Future Transport Programme, providing strategic leadership
- To participate in and to inform the decision making process
- Build consensus
- Give local context
- Consider bids for the allocation of the Community Transport Fund and make recommendations in relation to those bids

- Challenge, facilitate, support and remove barriers to the implementation of integrated transport solutions.

The Group itself is advisory in nature and does not have any executive decision making powers.

The Steering Group will make recommendations to the County Council Committees on the integration of transport services within Cambridgeshire.

### **Meetings**

They will be held every month. More frequent meetings can be called as and when required. If a member of the group cannot make a meeting a suitable substitute may attend.

### **Review of the Terms of Reference**

These Terms of Reference shall be reviewed as and when required

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **BUSINESS DISRUPTION' THE ACTION TITLED '4. PLAN AND IMPLEMENT PHASE 3 OF IT RESILIENCE, PROGRAMME – DUPLICATION OF KEY SYSTEMS – IN PROGRESS'**

Dear Audit and Accounts Committee

At the 9<sup>th</sup> June Committee meeting during consideration of the Risk Register report concerns had been expressed regarding where target dates had been changed on more than one occasion. Particularly highlighted was

Risk 21 'Business Disruption' the action titled '4. Plan and Implement Phase 3 of IT Resilience, Programme – duplication of key systems – in progress'

where the revised target date had changed five times since October 2013. It was agreed that in relation to this risk the risk owner should be asked to prepare a note of explanation regarding the continual slippage of the target date and be invited to attend the next meeting to provide an update on what the IT issues / problems were.

An explanatory note has been provided for the Committee on behalf of Ian Farrar LGSS Director of IT Services as follows:

A previous update in February indicated that:“Unfortunately the real-time resilience project, whilst still progressing, has not yet reached final completion and is delayed due to circumstances beyond our control, which are detailed below. The project should now be completed by May 2015. The fallback servers are live and built and could be used in the event of an emergency now , but services from outside the county network do not yet have a live network feed. The systems supporting these services are fully resilient but there could be a loss of connectivity over the internet in the event of a major incident. This would affect the County website and remote access solutions.

The delays were forced by a combination of the need to address a number of urgent service issues which were caused by our main network supplier, Virgin Media late last year, coupled with requirements from central government to meet much tighter new security standards, the Public Sector Network Code of Compliance (PSN CoCo). The service issues badly affected council services on many sites and needed urgent action to address by Virgin Media, and whilst we have now seen significant improvements this has impacted on other planned work by them, including this project. The PSN work also required major work by ourselves and Virgin to achieve compliance, without which we would have been cut off from connection to central services. This was achieved and has indeed already been renewed for this year (because they insisted on an immediate renewal) but this has again delayed planned projects. While this has obviously been disappointing we believe there are no similar things likely to cause further delay, and that the work has also prevented future potential major incidents so there is a much higher degree of confidence in the current planned dates.”

In an email dated 1<sup>st</sup> July, Mark Salisbury Head of IT Service Delivery has been able to confirm that the work was completed with the final change being implemented on Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> May.

For any further information please contact:

Mark Salisbury  
Head of IT Service Delivery  
LGSS  
T: 01604 366597  
M: 07540 671466

'Key exceptions information relating to the number of people successfully quitting smoking with support from stop smoking services' – as only 76% of the stop smoking target had been achieved for 2013/14 - a drop from 92% in 2012/13 - **Action - The Director of Public Health should be asked the value / justification for maintaining the level of investment in this area, and whether the resources should be re-directed / the level of investment reduced.**

Dr Liz Robin provided the following information in response

This is a good question and one we have been considering within the public health directorate.

We are planning to take a report to Health Committee this autumn to inform business planning for 2016/17, evaluating current smoking cessation services and reviewing options for new ways of working/service models.

Key points for the Audit and Accounts Committee are:

- Smoking remains the most common single cause of avoidable death nationally
- The current model of smoking cessation services ('NHS stop smoking service') has been rigorously researched and evaluated both on health outcomes and economic outcomes. Using the service increases a person's chance of quitting smoking by four times, and has been clearly established by NICE as being cost saving to the health service and wider economy, due to reduced development of disease and disability by individuals using the service. .
- The percentage of adults in Cambridgeshire who smoke fell by around 25% between 2012 and 2013 according to a nationally run survey (the results should be regarded with caution, as the surveys were only a sample of residents). This wasn't known when the target for 2013/14 was set - so the achievement of 76% against the target may reflect the fall in the number of smokers in Cambridgeshire.
- Since a large part of the service is delivered by GP practices and pharmacies, who are paid a fixed sum per smoker that they treat, any underperformance leads to underspends against the allocated smoking cessation budget.
- In 2014/15 some of the underspend on smoking cessation services outlined in the previous bullet point was used for other smoking related purposes, e.g. paying for signage for the County Council smoking policy; social marketing insight work in Fenland where smoking rates are still high;a midwife to help pregnant smokers quit (employed by Addenbrookes); and outreach smoking cessation support to workplaces in Fenland.
- In the 2015/16 business plan a saving of £250k has been made against the smoking cessation service budget - a saving of about 17%.
- We are looking at making further savings against the smoking cessation budget given the national requirement to take £200M out of local authority ring-fenced public health grants in year. But because smoking cessation services have such a strong evidence base for

improving health outcomes and making cost savings, we need to ensure that the service is still available to any smoker who wants to quit - but that we are doing this in the most cost effective way possible.

- The best options for achieving this will be the subject of a paper to Health Committee to inform 2016/17 business planning