



Strathclyde Partnership for Transport and Strathclyde Concessionary Travel Scheme Joint Committee

Interim audit report

For the year ended 31 March 2017

March 2017

Contents

- Introduction..... 1
- Summary of findings..... 3
- Action Plan..... 5

1

Introduction

Introduction

1. Our External Audit Plan 2016/17 summarises the work we will carry out as part of our 2016/17 external audit of Strathclyde Partnership for Transport (“SPT”) and Strathclyde Concessionary Travel Scheme Joint Committee (“SCTSJC”). The core elements of our work include:
 - an audit of 2016/17 financial statements and related matters;
 - an interim audit, taking into consideration the work of internal audit, on key financial systems;
 - a review of the arrangements as they relate to the following four dimensions of wider-scope public audit; governance and transparency, financial management, financial sustainability, and value for money; and
 - any other work requested by Audit Scotland, for example, local performance audit work.
2. This report concludes our 2016/17 interim audit and summarises the results of our review of the key financial systems.
3. The report has been discussed and agreed with the Director of Finance and HR.
4. While this report is addressed to SPT and SCTSJC, it will be published on Audit Scotland’s website www.audit-scotland.gov.uk.

Reporting to those charged with governance

5. International Standard on Auditing (UK and Ireland) (ISA) 260 (Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance) requires the auditor to make those charged with governance or management aware, as soon as practicable, and at an appropriate level of responsibility, of material weaknesses in the design or implementation of internal financial controls which have come to the auditor's attention.
6. A material weakness in an internal financial control is a deficiency in design or operation which could adversely affect the entity's ability to record, process, summarise and report financial and other relevant data so as to result

in a material misstatement in the financial statements.

7. The results of our audit of the internal financial control framework at SPT and SCTSJC are included in management reports submitted following our audit visits and should therefore be seen as meeting the requirements of ISA 260.

Conclusion

8. Our audit work did not identify any significant deficiencies in the adequacy or design of internal financial controls over the key financial systems. We consider these systems to be well designed; however we did identify a number of areas with scope for improvement which, if addressed, would further strengthen internal financial controls.
9. We have performed our audit in accordance with International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland) (ISAs).
10. We would like to thank all members of SPT’s management and staff who have been involved in our work for their co-operation and assistance during our interim audit visit.



2

Summary of findings

Summary of findings

Review of key financial systems

11. Auditors are required to carry out the audit of financial statements in accordance with ISAs. To comply with the requirements of the ISAs we consider an organisation's key financial systems and internal financial controls and determine whether these are adequate to prevent material misstatements in the financial statements.
12. During our interim audit we have reviewed SPT and SCTSJC's key financial systems and tested a sample of internal financial controls to establish whether they provide adequate assurance to support the preparation of the financial statements. Our IT auditors reviewed the security and robustness of key IT systems.
13. We are pleased to report that our audit work did not identify any significant deficiencies in the adequacy or design of internal financial controls over the key financial systems. We did however identify a number of areas with scope for improvement which, if addressed, would further strengthen the internal financial control regime. Any areas of weakness, or where performance could improve, are detailed in our action plan at the end of this report along with recommendations to address these weaknesses.
16. We have also considered SPT's self-evaluation arrangements as they relate to the wider scope audit areas; financial management; financial sustainability; governance and transparency; and value for money. We have not identified any further risks at this stage other than those identified within our External Audit Plan. We will however review and update our assessment if we identify any issues during our audit.

Action Plan Points 1-3

Preparatory final accounts audit work

14. During our interim audit we undertook preparatory work for our final accounts audit. This included the following audit work:
 - Ledger opening balances testing;
 - Review of Transport (Scotland) 2005 Act under which SPT was established;
 - Review of the Partnership and committee minutes; and
 - Review of internal audit reports.
15. We identified no issues from this work. We will complete our testing on these areas as part of our final audit and will report our findings from this work within our Annual Report on the audit.

3

Action plan

Action Plan

17. Our action plan details the key weaknesses and opportunities for improvement that we have identified during this review. To assist management in assessing the significance of the issues raised and prioritising the action required to address them, the recommendations have been rated. It should be noted that the weaknesses identified in this report are only those which have come to our attention during the course of our normal audit work. The audit cannot be expected to detect all errors, weaknesses or opportunities for improvements in management arrangements which may exist.

Grade	Definition
5	Very high risk exposure - Major concerns requiring immediate attention
4	High risk exposure - Absence / failure of significant key controls
3	Moderate risk exposure - Not all key control procedures are working effectively
2	Limited risk exposure - Minor control procedures are not in place / not working effectively
1	Efficiency / housekeeping point

Title	Issue identified & Recommendation	Management Comments
<p>1. Finance policies and procedures</p> <p>Risk scoring (para 17)</p> <p>Grade: 2</p>	<p>Issue identified</p> <p>Financial policies and procedures are in place and made available to officers. Our audit work identified that these are not subject to periodic regular review.</p> <p>Clear policies and procedures are key to supporting business continuity and ensuring controls are implemented and processes are completed efficiently.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Finance policies and procedures should cover all SPT and SCTSJC activity and processes and highlight key controls to be implemented, in particular manual key controls. Procedures should also clearly allocate secondary responsibility of key tasks to additional officers to ensure business continuity.</p> <p>The policies and procedures should be subject to regular review to ensure completeness and remain relevant. The documents should be accessible to all officers and clearly state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • who has responsibility for the documents; • when they were last updated; • when they are next due to for review; and • what version the procedures are. 	<p>Financial policies and procedures will now be subject to an annual review and the core documentation will be updated to include the information detailed within the recommendation. With regard to secondary responsibility of tasks, SPT takes a risk based approach and therefore it is not always appropriate to identify a specific person to cover tasks. Due to the size of the department if someone is absent for a prolonged period of time it may result in the reallocation of many tasks to ensure the tasks of the absentee are covered.</p> <p>Responsible Officer:</p> <p>Chief Accountant.</p> <p>Completion date:</p> <p>30/06/2017.</p>

Title	Issue identified & Recommendation	Management Comments
<p>2. Approval of sales invoices >£10,000</p> <p>Risk scoring (para 17)</p> <p>Grade: 3</p>	<p>Issue identified</p> <p>Sales invoices which exceed £10,000 should be approved by an Accountant prior to the invoice being sent to the customer and posted to the nominal ledger. However, the TechnologyOne system does not enforce this control.</p> <p>Our walkthrough identified a sales invoice (value £13,636) which had not been approved by an Accountant, indicating that this control is not operating effectively. Subsequently, there is a risk that higher value invoices are being raised and issued incorrectly.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>The TechnologyOne system should be updated to enforce the approval of all sales invoices over £10,000 by an Accountant, before the invoice can be posted to the nominal ledger and subsequently issued to customers.</p> <p>Since the interim audit has ended, we understand that this recommendation has been actioned by management.</p>	<p>Workflow rules have been amended in the TechnologyOne system to enforce the approval of sales invoices over £10,000 by an Accountant.</p> <p>Responsible Officer:</p> <p>Chief Accountant.</p> <p>Completion date:</p> <p>Complete.</p>

Title	Issue identified & Recommendation	Management Comments
<p>3. Access rights to TechnologyOne</p> <p>Risk scoring (para 17)</p> <p>Grade: 3</p>	<p>Issue identified</p> <p>There is no regular review of current user access rights to TechnologyOne to confirm these are appropriate and up-to-date. In addition, where changes have been requested, there is no secondary review to ensure these have been processed by the system administrator correctly and in a timely manner.</p> <p>A review of current Technology One user accounts identified the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 22 user accounts had not logged in to TechnologyOne since July 2016; 17 of these had not logged in since August 2015; <li>• User accounts were still active for three employees who left the organisation over two years ago; and <li>• Two user accounts that had never logged into the system. <p>Our audit work also identified that all members of the finance team have access to view and amend the fixed asset register on TechnologyOne; however, only certain officers have responsibility for its maintenance. There is a risk of unauthorised, inappropriate or fraudulent activity through TechnologyOne with users acting outwith their current role.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Management should review user access rights to TechnologyOne at least annually to ensure access rights remain appropriate for their current role; evidence of the review should be retained and all inactive or inappropriate accounts should be disabled or modified.</p> <p>To prevent unauthorised or inappropriate requests to change a user's access level, formal amendment forms should be implemented and retained.</p> <p>Secondary checks should be performed to confirm accounts have been amended or disabled appropriately and in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The user amendments process in TechnologyOne will be reviewed, documented and specific user amendment forms created. All additions / amendments to users within the system will be verified by an Accountant or above. An annual review of user access will be incorporated into SPT's year-end tasks. With regard to the fixed asset module access will be restricted to appropriate members of Finance staff only.</p> <p>Responsible Officer:</p> <p>Chief Accountant.</p> <p>Completion date:</p> <p>30/06/2017.</p>



Scott-Moncrieff
business advisers and accountants