Private and Confidential

June Graves Head of Housing and Performance

**Statutory Housing Register** 

May 2010

**Final Report** 

Issued by: Laura Mayes (Auditor)

| Au | dit |
|----|-----|
|    | Au  |

# **Final Report**

| Con        | itents page              | Page Number |
|------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| <u>1</u>   | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY        | 1           |
| <u>1.1</u> | Background               | 1           |
| <u>1.2</u> | Overall Audit Opinion    | 1           |
| <u>1.3</u> | Summary of Main Findings | 1 & 2       |
| <u>2</u>   | DETAILED AUDIT FINDINGS  | 3 - 15      |
| <u>3</u>   | ACTION PLAN              | 16 & 17     |

## **<u>1.</u>** Executive Summary

### **<u>1.1</u>** Background

1.1.1 The 2009/10 audit programme included an allocation of time for the audit of control processes in place for the Statutory Housing Register. The Auditor was Laura Mayes and the audit was undertaken between 11<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> March 2010.

#### **<u>1.2</u>** Overall Audit Opinion

**1.2.1** In our opinion the controls within the systems and procedures reviewed during this audit are **satisfactory**.

### **<u>1.3</u>** Summary of Main Findings

# **1.3.1** To ensure the Council has an allocation scheme for determining priorities for the allocation of housing accommodation and that it is in line with key legislation/guidance.

We identified that the Council has in place an Allocation Scheme based on legislation and guidance however we do note that the current scheme has not been reviewed since 2007 See finding 01.01 recommendations 1. From a review of the management and administration of the Statutory Housing Register and the system used to record this information, it was noted that functions within Locata are not fully utilised to document client contact/ correspondence to ensure that a clear audit trail is in place and demonstrate compliance with processes and procedures See findings 01.03 & 01.04 recommendations 3 and 4. Furthermore the access listing within Locata had not been recently reviewed resulting in ex-employees retaining the ability to access client details via Locata See finding 01.02 recommendations 2. On occasion we found that clients had been entered onto the Housing Register and allocated "Live" status where either no identification had been provided or the items provided were expired at the time See finding 01.05 recommendations 5.

## **Internal Audit**

### **Final Report**

# **1.3.2** To ensure that there are adequate procedures and processes in place covering all aspects of the housing allocation process and these processes are being complied with.

We found that although the service has in place a process for reporting on applications and their status, Locata is not being fully utilised to produce the information and data is being extracted and manually reported. Manual reports produced are not client specific and therefore effective monitoring of client progress through the housing system cannot be undertaken i.e. it is not possible to determine those applications which remain outstanding week on week. See finding 02.04 Recommendation 6.

# 2 Detailed Audit Findings

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Risks</u>  | Expected<br>Controls   | Actual Controls | <u>Results</u>   | <u>Conclusions</u>                        | Recommendation ref. |  |  |  |  |
|------------|---|--|-----------------|--|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
|            | To ensure the Council has an allocation scheme for determining priorities for the allocation of housing accommodation and that it is in line with y legislation/guidance. |  |                 |  |   |                     |  |  |  |  |
| 01         | The<br>allocation<br>scheme is<br>not<br>appropriately<br>administered  | The allocation<br>process in place<br>should comply<br>with the Housing<br>Act 1996 section<br>1a. Controls<br>should in place to<br>ensure that<br>allocations of<br>housing are made<br>in compliance<br>with the<br>allocation<br>scheme. |                 | The Common Housing Register was<br>introduced in 2006 and was jointly<br>managed by WBC and Sovereign Housing<br>until March 2007 when Choice Based<br>Lettings was introduced and the Council<br>took over full management of the Register.<br>The West Berkshire Housing Allocation<br>Policy - Home choice West Berks - Choice<br>Based Lettings in West Berkshire dated<br>30/11/2006 was reviewed and found to<br>clearly document in detail the allocation<br>process including the points scheme, its<br>application during bidding and the partner<br>associations utilised by WBC to provide<br>housing. The Allocation Scheme and<br>Policy were found to be in line with<br>legislative requirements per the Housing<br>Act 1996.<br>The allocation of housing is based on a<br>points system. Registered clients are<br>awarded points based on their current<br>living accommodation, the facilities it | This area was found to be<br>satisfactory | 1                   |  |  |  |  |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Risks</u> | Expected<br>Controls  | Actual Controls  | <u>Results</u>  | <u>Conclusions</u>   | Recommendation ref. |
|------------|--------------|---|--|---|--|---------------------|
|            |              |   |  | provides, number of occupants including<br>the number and ages of any children,<br>disabilities, medical and social needs, post<br>natal requirements, and location which<br>includes proximity to suitable schooling.<br>This system of allocation is in line with the<br>Housing Act 1996 section 167 part 2 items<br>a - f.<br>We do note that Section 19 of the WBC<br>Allocation Policy states that the policy<br>should be reviewed and re-approved<br>annually. The last approval date is<br>documented on the policy as 30/11/2006.   |  |                     |
| 02         | are able to  | The register<br>should be held<br>securely with<br>access<br>appropriately<br>restricted.<br>Controls should<br>be in place to<br>ensure that<br>unauthorised<br>amendments to<br>the register cannot<br>be made and the<br>personal details of | access<br>appropriately<br>restricted.<br>Controls are in<br>place to ensure<br>that unauthorised<br>amendments to<br>the register cannot<br>be made and the<br>personal details of<br>individuals | The Locata software is utilised to record<br>and manage the housing register<br>electronically. Additionally paper client<br>files are maintained and held securely in<br>lockable cabinets and a lockable storage<br>room.<br>In respect of the Locata system, there are<br>currently 44 users listed with 14 having<br>full user rights. User rights are allocated on<br>the basis of job role requirements. These<br>users consisted of Housing Options<br>Officers, Housing Registers Assistants,<br>Tenancy Support Workers, Rent Deposit<br>Officers and the Housing Options Team | Locata user access is awarded in<br>line with job role requirements.<br>However via testing we did find<br>that the access list is not regularly<br>reviewed to ensure that ex-staff or<br>other users who no longer require<br>access are removed from the<br>system. | 2                   |

# **Internal Audit**

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Risks</u> | Expected<br>Controls                        | Actual Controls | Results   | <b>Conclusions</b> | Recommendation ref. |
|------------|--------------|---|-----------------|---|--------------------|---------------------|
|            |              | individuals<br>registered remain<br>secure. | secure.         | Leader, Housing Register Officer and<br>Specialist Housing Supervisor. These<br>officers are able to: record bids, amend<br>properties and members, make offers,<br>undertake partner admin, record offer<br>results, setup and edit questionnaires and<br>set up and edit user schemes and details.<br>Other access given to WBC employees and<br>external users from Sovereign Housing<br>Association is as above with the exception<br>of set up and edit of scheme users and<br>questionnaires. |                    |                     |
|            |              |   |                 | 16 of the 44 individuals with access rights<br>in Locator were not identifiable as current<br>Council employees. Four users were<br>verified as employees of Sovereign<br>Housing. Ten individuals, 3 of which have<br>full access rights, were identified as former<br>WBC employees who had not been<br>removed from the system.  |                    |                     |
|            |              |   |                 | In respect of individuals external to WBC,<br>all applicants / individuals listed on the<br>register create their own unique password.<br>Clients are restricted to accessing their<br>own personal details via password access.<br>Clients do not have access to the details of<br>others unless they are undertaking a mutual   |                    |                     |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Risks</u>   | Expected<br>Controls   | Actual Controls   | Results<br>exchange. Mutual exchange is agreed<br>between WBC Housing Officers and<br>clients.                              | <u>Conclusions</u>   | Recommendation<br>ref. |
|------------|--|--|---|---|--|------------------------|
| 03         | The<br>allocation<br>scheme is<br>not<br>appropriately<br>administered | The allocation<br>process in place<br>should comply<br>with the Housing<br>Act 1996 section<br>1a. Controls<br>should in place to<br>ensure that<br>allocations of<br>housing are made<br>in compliance<br>with the<br>allocation<br>scheme. | The allocation<br>process in place<br>complies with the<br>Housing Act 1996<br>section 1a.<br>Controls are in<br>place to ensure<br>that allocations of<br>housing are made<br>in compliance<br>with the<br>allocation<br>scheme. | Client information regarding the annual re-<br>registration can be found under section 7.5<br>of the WBC Allocation Policy. | Overall a process for the review<br>and removal of individuals from<br>the register is in place. However,<br>utilising the results of our sample it<br>was identified that Locata is not<br>fully utilised to record adherence to<br>the process. Furthermore, physical<br>evidence such as letters issued are<br>not routinely retained.<br>Clients had not been notified of<br>their right to appeal post removal<br>from the Statutory Housing<br>Register. | 3, 4                   |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Risks</u> | Expected<br>Controls | Actual Controls | Results   | Conclusions | Recommendation ref. |
|------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|---------------------|
|            |              |                      |                 | the client  |             |                     |
|            |              |                      |                 | iii) Where the review form is not received<br>and telephone call not answered the client<br>is removed from the Housing Register with<br>the reason code set in Locata as "failed to<br>re-register". |             |                     |
|            |              |                      |                 | iv) A manual printout is annotated for each application month stating the action taken for each client.   |             |                     |
|            |              |                      |                 | Since the annual review exercise<br>commenced in April 2009 there have been<br>3433 clients removed from the housing<br>register in total.  |             |                     |
|            |              |                      |                 | A sample review of 20 recent removals from the Statutory Housing Register was undertaken:   |             |                     |
|            |              |                      |                 | I) in 19 instances the client notes and CRM<br>journal function had not been utilised to<br>record actions taken, letters issued,<br>telephone call made and correspondence<br>received               |             |                     |
|            |              |                      |                 | ii) In 20 instances the client had not been<br>informed of their removed status. In all 20<br>cases the removed individual had not<br>reapplied to be placed on the register at the<br>time of audit. |             |                     |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Risks</u> | Expected<br>Controls   | Actual Controls | <u>Results</u>   | <u>Conclusions</u>   | Recommendation ref. |
|------------|--------------|--|-----------------|--|--|---------------------|
|            |              |  |                 | iii) In 20 instances copies of the annual<br>review letter issued had not been retained<br>in the client file or uploaded into Locata in<br>the electronic client file.  |  |                     |
| 04         | are able to  | The Housing<br>Register should<br>be regularly<br>reviewed and<br>maintained.<br>Controls should<br>be in place to<br>ensure that only<br>those<br>qualifying/eligible<br>individuals are<br>included and able<br>to make bids |                 | Client details are reviewed on the annual<br>anniversary of their addition to the housing<br>register.<br>We sampled tested 30 clients, 10 whose<br>details had been updated and 20 who had<br>been removed from the register sourced<br>from the annual review listing from Locata<br>for the month of February 2010.<br>In the case of the 10 updated clients we<br>found:<br>I) in only 7 cases were there copies of the<br>update letters issued held in the client<br>paper file although confirmation letters<br>agreed with the amendment request/annual<br>review form<br>ii) in only one instance was a PDF letter<br>attached to the client notes within Locata<br>In the case of the 20 removed clients we<br>found:<br>I) a copy of the annual review letter was<br>not held in the client file or recorded in the | Whilst we acknowledge there is a<br>process in place, as per finding<br>01.01.06, Locata is not consistently<br>and fully utilised to evidence<br>compliance with processes and<br>procedures. | 3                   |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Risks</u>   | Expected<br>Controls   | Actual Controls  | Results   | Conclusions   | Recommendation ref. |
|------------|--|--|--|---|---|---------------------|
|            |  |  |  | client notes on Locata as having been issued in all 20 cases.   |   |                     |
|            |  |  |  | ii) In all 20 cases Locata had been updated<br>to show that the client had been removed<br>from the register, the reason for removal<br>was set as "failed to re-register." |   |                     |
|            |  |  |  | None of our sample of removed clients<br>was found to have re-registered and been<br>reset to Live in Locata at the time of the<br>audit.                                   |   |                     |
| 05         | are included<br>within the<br>Housing<br>Register and<br>are able to<br>make bids on<br>housing. | The Housing<br>Register should be<br>regularly<br>reviewed and<br>maintained.<br>Controls should<br>be in place to<br>ensure that only<br>those<br>qualifying/eligible<br>individuals are<br>included and able<br>to make bids | regularly<br>reviewed and<br>maintained.<br>Controls are in<br>place to ensure<br>that only those<br>qualifying/eligible | Register (20 of which were online and 10 manual) and noted the following exceptions:  | Overall the application process for<br>both online and paper submissions<br>was found to be satisfactory.<br>However we do note that on<br>occasion clients are entered onto<br>the Common Housing Register and<br>set to Live status without having<br>provided the appropriate<br>identification. We further note that<br>in some instances identification<br>provided had in fact expired. |                     |
|            |  |  |  | For the 20 online applications:<br>i) in 2 instances no identification had been<br>provided in line with procedures yet the<br>clients had been allocated Live status in    |   |                     |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Risks</u> | <u>Expected</u><br><u>Controls</u> | Actual Controls | <u>Results</u>   | <b>Conclusions</b> | Recommendation ref. |
|------------|--------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------|---------------------|
|            |              |                                    |                 | Locata   |                    |                     |
|            |              |                                    |                 | ii) in one instance one household member<br>had provided expired identification  |                    |                     |
|            |              |                                    |                 | <ul><li>iii) in one instance no documentation was<br/>held from the Worker Registration<br/>Scheme in relation to the client where<br/>applicable.</li></ul> |                    |                     |
|            |              |                                    |                 | For the 10 manual applications:  |                    |                     |
|            |              |                                    |                 | i) in 2 instances it was noted that the identification provided had expired  |                    |                     |
|            |              |                                    |                 | ii) in 1 instance no ID could be found in<br>the client file yet the client had been<br>allocated Live status in Locata                                      |                    |                     |
|            |              |                                    |                 | iii) in one instance the same WBC staff<br>member had uploaded the information into<br>Locata and verified the application giving<br>it Live status.         |                    |                     |

02. To ensure that there are adequate procedures and processes in place covering all aspects of the housing allocation process and these processes are being complied with

| 01 | The           | Procedural       | Procedural       | The main legislation utilised by the service | Appropriate guidance was found to   | 1 |
|----|---------------|------------------|------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|
|    | allocation    | guidance should  | guidance is in   | upon which internal guidance is based are    | be in place.                        |   |
|    | scheme is     | be in place to   | place to ensure  | as follows: Communities and Local            | However we did note the following   |   |
|    | not           | ensure that      | that internal    | Government - Fair and Elevible: guidance     | minor points:                       |   |
|    | appropriately | internal members | members of staff | on social housing allocations for Local      | 1                                   |   |
|    | administered  | of staff have a  | have a thorough  | authorities in England 2009, The Housing     | i) the housing register application |   |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Risks</u> | Expected<br>Controls  | Actual Controls  | Results  | <u>Conclusions</u>   | Recommendation ref. |
|------------|--------------|---|------------------|--|--|---------------------|
|            |              | thorough working<br>knowledge of the<br>allocation scheme<br>and how it is<br>administered. | knowledge of the | Act 1996 and Homelessness Act 2002.<br>WBC has in place the following guidance:<br>Homechoice West Berks - Housing<br>Allocation Policy, WBC Common<br>Housing Register - Welfare and Social<br>needs housing matrix and WBC<br>Homechoice West Berkshire Scheme User<br>Guide. There are also four forms in place -<br>Two are completed by service staff at the<br>assessment stage: Common Housing<br>Register Notes for Medical Panel and<br>Common housing Register - Social Needs<br>Assessment All items of guidance can be<br>located on the WBC intranet and internet<br>pages.<br>In addition there are a series of internal<br>procedural instructions available to staff<br>regarding the input and management of<br>housing applications using Locata. These<br>are maintained by the Housing Register<br>Officer. Guidance documents how tp<br>upload manual applications, verification,<br>removal, suspension, editing, processing<br>online applications, the annual review and<br>CBL procedures. The guidance was found<br>to be sufficiently detailed and is available<br>to Housing staff within their shared drive | form does not document where a<br>medical or social needs assessment<br>would be required although the<br>WBC Allocation Policy does state<br>under sections 7.2 and 7.3 the right<br>to request a review of<br>medical/social needs<br>ii) Upon review we found that the<br>annual review had not been<br>undertaken for the Allocation<br>Policy or the Scheme User Guide. |                     |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Risks</u> | Expected<br>Controls   | Actual Controls  | Results allocation.   | <u>Conclusions</u>                         | Recommendation<br>ref. |
|------------|--------------|--|--|---|--|------------------------|
| 02         |              | available to<br>individuals<br>wishing to access<br>housing. Standard<br>application forms | available to<br>individuals<br>wishing to access<br>housing. Standard<br>application forms | Publicly issued guidance consists of<br>Homechoice West Berkshire Scheme User<br>Guide Version 3 Spring 2008. This<br>guidance gives detailed information on<br>how to bid, which properties will be<br>applicable and guidance regarding the next<br>steps where a client bid is successful.<br>Guidance is available on the WBC internet<br>site and is sufficiently comprehensive. The<br>guide states, under Step 1 - Membership,<br>how and where to obtain an application for<br>the Common Housing Register and which<br>WBC team to contact for advice. | This area was found to be well controlled. | N/a                    |
|            |              |  |  | The WBC Homechoice website links to the application form directly under the Register tab.   |  |                        |
|            |              |  |  | From the review of 30 new applications undertaken in test 01.08 we found that:  |  |                        |
|            |              |  |  | i) in only one instance had ID not been submitted in line with instructions   |  |                        |
|            |              |  |  | ii) in only one instance the paper<br>application had been returned to the client<br>to be re-submitted with ID This<br>demonstrates that the user guide provides<br>sufficient guidance on the application   |  |                        |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Risks</u>  | Expected<br>Controls   | Actual Controls  | Results<br>process and documentary requirements.   | <u>Conclusions</u>                         | Recommendation<br>ref. |
|------------|---|--|--|--|--|------------------------|
| 03         | register is<br>not<br>appropriately<br>administered | Guidance should<br>be available in<br>respect of an<br>applicant's right<br>to appeal.<br>Controls should<br>be in place to<br>ensure that<br>appeals are<br>recorded, dealt<br>with in a timely<br>manner and the<br>applicant notified<br>of any<br>resolutions/final<br>decisions.<br>Guidance should<br>be | Guidance is<br>available in<br>respect of an<br>applicant's right<br>to appeal.<br>Controls are in<br>place to ensure<br>that appeals are<br>recorded, dealt<br>with in a timely<br>manner and the<br>applicant notified<br>of any<br>resolutions/final<br>decisions.<br>Guidance is | Guidance provided to clients regarding<br>their right to appeal consists of that under<br>S17 of the Allocation Policy the Review<br>Procedure document.<br>It was confirmed with the HOTL that the<br>most recent appeal occurred in 2009. The<br>request for review form was received by<br>WBC 29/06/2009 with the review being<br>undertaken 31/07/2009 This appeal related<br>to a homeless client being moved from<br>temporary to permanent accommodation.<br>The decision letter was issued to the client<br>17/08/2009 stating that the original<br>decision was to be upheld. The time<br>between receipt of the request for a review<br>and decision was found to fall within the<br>eight week timescale required by the<br>Allocation Policy under S17 Right to<br>Review.<br>The appeal was found to have been<br>undertaken by the appropriate staff which<br>consisted of the Portfolio Member for<br>Housing, the Head of Housing and<br>Performance and the Housing Operations<br>Manager.<br>All appropriate documentation had been | This area was found to be well controlled. | N/a                    |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Risks</u>   | Expected<br>Controls   | <u>Actual Controls</u> | Results<br>retained including items received from the<br>client and correspondence from the<br>Council.   | <u>Conclusions</u>   | Recommendation<br>ref. |
|------------|--|--|------------------------|---|--|------------------------|
| 04         | The housing<br>register is<br>not<br>appropriately<br>administered | management<br>reports should be<br>generated to<br>ensure that<br>applications are<br>dealt with<br>appropriately and<br>in a timely<br>manner, the<br>register is up to |                        | Regular monitoring is undertaken within<br>the service via weekly management<br>meetings. The HRO Obtains data utilising<br>Locata and manual files to produce a<br>summary sheet titled Performance<br>Monitoring Process for Re-structure of<br>Housing Operations Service. Information<br>taken from Locata includes: removals,<br>suspensions, online applications awaiting<br>validation and current live total.<br>Information taken from manual sources<br>includes: total annual review forms<br>received for the week, total update forms<br>received for the week, paper applications<br>received, client updates undertaken and<br>paper forms awaiting input into Locata. On<br>a quarterly basis information is manually<br>obtained from Locata to document<br>Vulnerability Figures. This information is<br>limited and only gives the total for each<br>category and the number of clients<br>currently not bidding.<br>This information is reviewed against the<br>prior week and minutes of meetings record | Although the service has in place a<br>process for reporting on<br>applications and their status,<br>Locata is not being fully utilised to<br>produce management reports.<br>Information regarding outstanding<br>applications/ applications awaiting<br>processing is provided however<br>only the total numbers are stated<br>on the report to managers.<br>Therefore with no listing of client<br>names produced from the system<br>(where applications are online) and<br>from the post log (where<br>applications are manual) it is not<br>possible to determine whether<br>certain applications are outstanding<br>week on week. It was also noted<br>that the vulnerability figures<br>element of the report is only<br>completed on a quarterly basis and<br>does not provide detailed<br>information such as how long<br>clients have not been bidding or |                        |

| <u>Ref</u> | <u>Risks</u> | Expected<br>Controls | Actual Controls | <u>Results</u>   | <u>Conclusions</u>                     | <u>Recommendation</u><br>ref. |
|------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
|            |              |                      |                 | the proposed actions.<br>We noted that since April 2009 there have<br>been 729 paper applications and 2184<br>online applications. Information regarding<br>paper applications was obtained from the<br>manually updated post log maintained by<br>the Housing Operations Team. For the<br>week ending 05/03/02010 116 online<br>applications were made and awaiting<br>processing by the HRO, 218 had been<br>removed and 77 suspended. Ten paper<br>applications were awaiting processing and<br>at the time of our review were found to be<br>only four days behind.<br>The Housing Register is not subject to any<br>form of KPI monitoring. | whether they have already been housed. |                               |

# <u>3</u> <u>Action Plan</u>

| Recommendation  | <u>Weakness/</u><br>Significance | <u>Agreed/</u><br><u>Not</u><br><u>Agreed</u> | <u>Client Comments</u>   | Responsible Officer/<br><u>Timescale for</u><br>Implementation   |
|---|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 1. We recommend that the Allocation Policy be annually reviewed in line with the requirements of section 19.  | Minor /<br>advisory              | Agreed  | Working process is under regular<br>review from CBL working group<br>but will be raised at next meeting.   | 16 <sup>th</sup> June 2010<br>Housing Operations<br>Manager  |
| 2. We recommend that individuals who are no longer employed by<br>the Council or the applicable Housing Associations are promptly<br>removed from the Locata access listing.  | Moderate / necessary             | Agreed  | This action has been completed   | Housing Register<br>Officer  |
| 3. We recommend that Locata be fully utilised to record<br>correspondence with clients. This should include telephone<br>conversations.   | Moderate/<br>necessary           | Agreed  | Currently Points, change of circ<br>information is put on> It would<br>be too time consuming if all<br>review had to be inputted<br>However enhancements on Locata<br>will allow more information to be<br>entered regarding reviews | Revised package on<br>Locata will be<br>implemented by end<br>June 2010<br>Housing Operations<br>Manager |
| 4. We recommend that information on the right to appeal a decision<br>be forwarded to clients where they have been removed from the<br>Housing Register in line with the requirements of S17 of the WBC<br>Allocation Policy. | Minor/<br>advisory               | Agreed  | Amend standard letter  | Housing Operations<br>Manager End May<br>2010  |
| 5. We recommend that clients are not allocated Live status in Locata<br>until their personal details have been fully and independently<br>verified.   | Minor /<br>advisory              | Not<br>agreed                                 | <ol> <li>Officers try and get up to date<br/>documents before a case is made<br/>live</li> <li>sometimes it is difficult if<br/>expired passport received but it<br/>is out of date to request new one</li> </ol>                    | Housing Operations<br>Manager in<br>discussions with group<br>auditor                                    |

| Recommendation   | Weakness/<br>Significance | Agreed/<br>Not<br>Agreed | <u>Client Comments</u>   | Responsible Officer/<br>Timescale for<br>Implementation |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
|  |                           |                          | <ul> <li>which costs them money plus it raises expectations that they will be re housed (British passports)</li> <li>3) all cases are verified at the end before offer of property is made by the RSL</li> </ul> |   |
| 6. We recommend that Locata be fully utilised to produce electronic<br>monthly monitoring reports that not only focus on service demand<br>but also provide trend analysis on demand by vulnerable groups. | Moderate /<br>necessary   | Agreed                   | New enhanced package will be<br>able to provide this   | Housing Operations<br>Manager<br>End of June 2010       |

|             | Category of weakness           |           | Significance                             |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------|--|
| Fundamental | May result in a complete       | Mandatory | For statutory, council regulations or    |
|             | breakdown of the service and   |           | service instructions fundamental control |
|             | or fraud or other irregularity |           | weaknesses                               |
| Significant | May result in a breakdown in   | Necessary | For Significant or moderate control      |
|             | the service and or fraud or    |           | weaknesses                               |
|             | other irregularity             |           |  |
| Moderate    | May result in some impact on   | Advisory  | For minor control weaknesses or          |
|             | the service                    | -         | efficiency improvements                  |
| Minor       | Limited impact on the service  |           |  |
|             | *                              |           |  |

**Internal Audit** 

**Final Report**