

Audit Title	Assurance Level and Summary of Opinion	Significant Audit Findings
<p><b>Fleet Services</b> (DP &amp; DCP)</p>	<p>A <b>Partial Assurance</b> rating was given for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quotes / invoices provided by suppliers for vehicle bodywork repairs are not reconciled against the agreed schedule of rates contained within each Contract. Where reconciliations are not performed between the quotes / invoices to the schedule of rates in each of the Contracts, there can be no guarantee that charges levied by the suppliers are accurate and in line with the agreed contractual terms.</li> <li>▪ Staff responsible for assessing the quality of repairs made by a supplier have no knowledge of the agreed standards of repair contained within each Contract. Assessments of repairs are not formally documented by staff.</li> <li>▪ Budget coding errors in Agresso have caused what appears to be an overspend against the bodywork repairs budgets for both Dorset Police and Devon and Cornwall Police for 2016/17. This was attributed in part to the move to the Agresso finance system by Dorset Police to bring it in line with the system in place for Devon and Cornwall. Costs were 'hard coded' to alternative budgets codes (still within Alliance Fleet Services) by the system, meaning that expenditure for MOT's, parts, tyres etc. were charged to the budget for bodywork repair instead of the respective budget. As a result, due to system coding errors, we cannot isolate the expenditure solely attributed to bodywork repairs for 2016/17 and therefore cannot confirm whether the contracts put in place have achieved value for money. The Account Technician confirmed that this error has recently been addressed and therefore no recommendation was made.</li> <li>▪ Vehicles are repaired without formal documentation of authorisation or assessment of cost effectiveness for repair. There is a risk that Force vehicles may be repaired without due consideration given to the various options available and that the repairs are authorised without value for money in mind.</li> <li>▪ The agreements with the bodywork repair contracts do not stipulate the frequency or format of contract management mechanisms, such as performance meetings. From the evidence provided, we feel that performance management is undertaken proportionately, with communication between the Force and Contractors appearing to be good with periodic and ad hoc discussions taking place as necessary. No performance issues had been identified at the time of this audit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Whilst there were a number of findings from the audit as set out, none of these findings were deemed Significant Findings by audit</li> </ul>

<p><b>Injury on Duty</b> (DP &amp; DCP)</p>	<p>A <b>Partial Assurance</b> rating was given for the following reasons:</p> <p>We were able to verify in sample testing that the original applications for IOD awards had been administered in accordance with the requirements set out by the 2006 regulations. This opinion is based following a desktop review of a random sample of IOD ongoing awards, rejected applications and appeals.</p> <p>However, following the withdrawal in 2014 of Home Office Circular 46/2004, the Force has subsequently not been reviewing IOD awards on an ongoing basis. Due to the potential for changes in a claimant’s health, there is a current risk that some current IOD awards maybe being paid under an incorrect banding (although we acknowledge that under the regulations any change in award would require a pensioner's disablement to have been substantially altered before a revision would be applicable).</p> <p>We would suggest that at this present time the likelihood of any relevant changes is unknown, as neither Force has any current data or has undertaken recent reviews on their claimants.</p> <p>Due to the uncertainty over Home Office guidance, we recommend that the Force should look to gain further insight (e.g. the associated risks and opportunities) from other Police Forces, who have decided to instigate recent IOD reviews.</p> <p>A review of IOD awards identified that future review dates had not always been formally discussed and agreed with the applicant at the time the award was provided. We recommended that the Force need to ensure that where possible, to agree a process of review with the applicant, at the point when the award is provided.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Injury On Duty Awards given to former Police Officers have not been subject to a formal reassessment. This is due to uncertainty over the regulations and withdrawal of HO Circular 46/2004 in 2014.</li> </ul>
---	---	--