

## INTERNAL AUDIT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – THOSE AGREED &amp; COMPLETED SINCE June 2014 AND THOSE IN PROGRESS

Action plan 5	Sustainability 2012/13
Objective	There are policies and procedures in place for the prevention of pollution and effective waste management with clear lines of responsibility.
Observations	<p><b>ISO 14001</b> The Service is committed to providing an environmental management system (EMS) and achieving the ISO 14001 standard although no date has been set to achieve this. There are currently no policies and procedures in place for an environmental management system, although work is in progress to produce them.</p> <p><b>Waste Management</b> Examples of waste generated by the Service requiring disposal include electrical appliances, IT equipment, building materials, fire fighting foam and de-polluted cars. Items which are owned by HFRS are defined as non domestic waste whilst items owned by individuals are defined as domestic waste.</p> <p>If they are deemed to be non domestic waste they must be disposed of by appropriate registered companies with appropriate licences.</p> <p>Determining ownership and status of some items in use at fire stations is difficult as many of these items have been donated by staff and many are not recorded on an asset register.</p> <p>There are no policies, formal procedures, or guidance in place with regard to the definition, identification, storage, and disposal of non-domestic and domestic waste. Additionally there are implications regarding the insurance and liabilities of personal items whilst stored and in use on HFRS premises and additional costs to the Service if domestic items are disposed of as non domestic waste.</p> <p>It was established at the close of audit meeting that responsibility for ensuring that the storage and disposal of waste products used by the Service meets legal and statutory requirements has been allocated to the Environmental Impact Project Coordinator.</p> <p>The roles and responsibilities of this role and those of all staff within the Service with regards to waste management have not currently been clearly defined and communicated. This may result in legal and statutory requirements not being met, environmental damage and in severe cases, prosecutions, and reputational damage to HFRS.</p>

Management actions		Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete
Increase the resource allocated to the implementation of the Environmental Management System (EMS) to ensure full implementation; including the setting of an audit plan for the system.		High	Environmental Impact Project Coordinator	Head of Physical Assets	31/03/2014 Extended to 30/09/2014 Extended to April 2015	18/06/2015
<b>Comments:</b>						
<b>Action plan 1</b>		<b>Networked Fire Control Project 2013/14</b>				
Objective	Appropriate consideration has been given to how the Networked Fire Control Services Partnership and its implementation affects Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service and its employees.					
Observations	<p>Throughout the project implementation, the expected benefits of the project have been identified centrally for the project and recorded during each stage. Whilst the project lead on the measurement of benefits across the project as a whole is the Project Manager (PM) from Devon and Somerset FRS (DSFRS), it is down to individual Fire and Rescue Service to highlight their own benefits.</p> <p>Within HFRS we understand that the pressure of the implementation has impacted on the resources to capture, identify and measure the benefits being realised. Although this may not impact on the project itself, it may have implications when the project has been completed. If benefits are not seen to be realised there could be a reputational risk of the benefits of the project being called into doubt.</p>					
Management actions		Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete
Review partnership and FRS benefits alignment.		Medium	Fire Control Options PM / DSFRS PM	Area Manager Response Support	01/08/2014 Extended to 31/01/2015 *Extended to 30/09/2016	

## INTERNAL AUDIT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – THOSE AGREED &amp; COMPLETED SINCE June 2014 AND THOSE IN PROGRESS

Undertake further baseline benefits measurement (FRS).	Medium	Fire Control Options PM	Area Manager Response Support	01/08/2014 Extended to 31/01/2015 *Extended to 30/09/2016	
<b>Comments:</b> On track for target date.					

Action plan 2		Moodle 2014-15			
Objectives	There are documented responsibilities, policies and processes in place to ensure that there is effective governance of the software.				
Observations	We looked for policy and process documentation with regard to system administration (for example upgrade management), user administration, content creation and quality assurance of content. We were provided with process documentation for user administration but documentation for the other areas had yet to be written when the audit testing was completed. However we were verbally informed of the policy and processes which would be used for the system.				
Management actions	Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete
Policies and procedures will be written and embedded to ensure the system is maintained and a high level of security is retained.	High	Service Delivery Admin Manager	Head of Communications, Engagement and Administration	30/06/2015	27/07/2015
<b>Comments:</b>					

<b>Action plan 1</b>		<b>Programme and Project Management 2014/15</b>			
Objectives	Confirmation that progress has been achieved against the recommendations made within the Project Angels report.				
Observations	<p>The Project Angels report was approved by SMT in January 2014, at this meeting it was agreed that a plan would be drawn up to implement the recommendations. It was agreed that the plan should be available at the March 2014 meeting.</p> <p>We reviewed the minutes of the March 2014 meeting which noted discussions about the way forward, however there do not appear to be any specifics identified in terms of resourcing requirements or a timeline.</p> <p>One of the key elements identified by SMT was to appoint a dedicated project manager to drive the process forward. It was agreed that this should be a station manager (or equivalent) as a secondment for 12-18 months. As of December 2014 no officer had been assigned to this post. This has had a knock-on effect on the remainder of the recommendations.</p> <p>It is concerning to note that no further meetings were held to discuss the implementation and the progress of introducing the recommendations after the March 2014 meeting. The March 2014 minutes indicated that "interim progress should be reported to SMT six monthly aiming for delivery of improvements and realisation of initial benefits by November 2015".</p> <p>At the close of audit we were informed that at a recent away day held to discuss the Project Management Office (PMO) it was agreed by Senior Management that an external consultant would be engaged. This appointment would be for a three month period to identify and evolve a structure for the PMO.</p>				
<b>Management actions</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	<b>SMT</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Date signed off as complete</b>
An external consultant has been identified to act as an ongoing mentor for the Project Management Officer Manager. Consideration will be given to appointing a second consultant for a 3 month contract, at a later date	Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	01/10/2015	
<b>Comment:</b>					

## INTERNAL AUDIT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – THOSE AGREED &amp; COMPLETED SINCE June 2014 AND THOSE IN PROGRESS

Action plan 2		Programme and Project Management 2014/15			
Objectives	Confirmation that progress has been achieved against the recommendations made within the Project Angels report.				
Observations	<p>It was agreed as part of one of the recommendations that the project “life cycle” would be re-launched with an emphasis on business cases, planning and proper resource management.</p> <p>We noted that the web page which outlines the process is not up to date so reliance cannot be placed on the validity of the data to assist with any project management support. Whilst training was introduced for staff who have an interest in project management and those identified as project managers, this has stopped due to the availability of staff to carry out the training.</p> <p>At the present time there continues to be no clear and up to date guidance to support officers assigned as Project Managers.</p>				
Management actions	Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete
Initial relaunch of the current HFRS Project Management Methodology with a full review to be carried out by 01/06/2015	High	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	01/06/2015 Extended to 01/12/2015	
Development of an online forum for Project Managers to share learning, seek advice from peers and understand impacts between projects	High	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	01/06/2015 Extended to 31/10/2015	
Review of the current webpages.	Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	01/06/2015 Extended to 31/10/2015	

Review and relaunch of the current Project Health Check process to ensure project continuation decisions are documented at appropriate gateways	Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	31/12/2015	
Review of the current project governance documentation	Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	31/12/2015	
Full review and relaunch of the training provision to create a suite of national accredited training courses, using a blended learning approach. A new role will be created within the PMO to deliver this as well as support actions 1.1-1.6	High	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	01/04/2016	

**Comment:**  
Changes in department structure have incurred delays. It has also taken longer than anticipated to collate customer requirements (from Project Managers and understand their needs) to develop an online forum.

**Action plan 3 Programme and Project Management 2014/15**

Objectives	Confirmation that progress has been achieved against the recommendations made within the Project Angels report.
Observations	<p>The report recommended that a portfolio, delivery and support unit, incorporating the current Performance Review Team (PRT), the PMO and a team of professional project managers be introduced. The future structure of the PMO also needs to be considered alongside the Professional Services Redesign (PSR). This had not been implemented at the time of our audit, but was discussed in December 2014 as part of the Senior Management away day, when it was agreed that an external consultant would be engaged.</p> <p>At the present time the PMO is staffed by a mixture of seconded and temporary staff with only one dedicated project manager post. The work profiles of staff working within the PMO are largely administration based.</p> <p>To comply with the recommendation that the PMO requires “teeth” would require a balance to be obtained between the expectations of management and what can be achieved given the existing resource profile.</p> <p>Until the PMO has a permanent embedded structure it will be difficult to be clear on which of the recommendations can be achieved given the existing resources available.</p>

## INTERNAL AUDIT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – THOSE AGREED &amp; COMPLETED SINCE June 2014 AND THOSE IN PROGRESS

Management actions	Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete
This new structure (including the PMO Manager) will remain in place until 31.03.2017 at which point a decision will be made as to what resources will be required on a permanent basis. Work will be undertaken to design this model by the PMO Manager and be owned by the Head of Knowledge Management/ACO of Transformation	Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	31/03/2017	
Upskill the current PMO team with the necessary qualifications relating to Project Management methodologies and practices.	Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	31/12/2015	
<b>Comment:</b>					

<b>Action plan 1</b>		<b>Proactive Fraud – Purchasing Cards 2014/15</b>
Objectives	Procurement cards are managed in accordance with policy and procedures	
Observations	<p>In order to test that purchasing cards are managed in accordance with both HFRS and IBC policies and procedures, we looked at 14 claims (eight from April to September and six for October and November).</p> <p>Both the HFRS Card holder / Authoriser user guide and IBC guidance require that for purchases over £250 a full VAT invoice / receipt is required. For purchases under £250 a less detailed invoice/receipt is acceptable, although this must still meet HMRC requirements.</p>	

	<p>Twelve of the 14 claims tested had receipts missing for some purchases. This was for a total of 48 of the 136 transactions (31%).</p> <p>Through not holding relevant documentation HFRS are at risk of not identifying and reclaiming VAT correctly. If the VAT is reclaimed without a valid VAT receipt the Authority is then open to penalties from HMRC.</p>				
Management actions	Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete
All card holders to be reminded of the need to obtain and retain valid receipts.	Medium	Lead Business Partner	Chief Finance Officer	31/08/2015	07/07/2015
<p><b>Comment:</b> All cardholders were sent a reminder as part of their monthly reminder to submit claims. A reminder was also placed in Routine Notice.</p>					
Action plan 2 Proactive Fraud – Purchasing Cards 2014/15					
Objectives	Procurement cards are managed in accordance with policy and procedures				
Observations	<p>We tested a sample of 14 purchase card claims for 2014/15 which contained 136 transactions. We found that VAT was not reclaimed for 13 transactions because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A valid VAT invoice was held but the transaction had not been coded on SDOL for eight transactions. As a result £741.24 VAT was not reclaimed.</li> <li>• Paperwork held did not indicate to staff the VAT on purchases, therefore VAT was not reclaimed on SDOL for four transactions. £182.71 VAT was not reclaimed.</li> <li>• Paperwork included details of VAT charged but was not a valid VAT receipt and was therefore not suitable for reclaiming VAT for one transaction which included £15.13 VAT.</li> </ul> <p>Detailed testing also identified that for two transactions VAT was incorrectly reclaimed as a valid VAT receipt was not held.</p>				

## INTERNAL AUDIT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – THOSE AGREED &amp; COMPLETED SINCE June 2014 AND THOSE IN PROGRESS

Management actions	Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete
All card holders to be reminded of the need to obtain and retain valid receipts.	Medium	Lead Business Partner	Chief Finance Officer	31/08/2015	07/07/2015
All card holders to be reminded that each purchase must be coded on SDOL.	Medium	Lead Business Partner	Chief Finance Officer	31/08/2015	07/07/2015
<b>Comment:</b> All cardholders were sent a reminder as part of their monthly reminder to submit claims. A reminder was also placed in Routine Notice.					
<b>Action plan 3 Proactive Fraud – Purchasing Cards 2014/15</b>					
Objectives	Procurement cards are managed in accordance with policy and procedures				
Observations	<p>From October 2014 all purchasing cards are provided to HFRS by Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS) and managed under the IBC policies and procedures.</p> <p>All transactions made on purchasing cards during the month are uploaded daily to the RBS online system Smart Data Online (SDOL). Before the 5<sup>th</sup> day of the following month staff are responsible for confirming their previous months' transactions, coding expenditure and reclaiming VAT as well as filing paperwork. Managers are also required to authorise their staff's transactions before this date.</p> <p>From reviewing the complete HFRS December SDOL report (run on 30.01.2015) we confirmed that 197 transactions were made in December, however of these 66 were not completed by the user on SDOL. Through not entering these details onto SDOL we understand that VAT cannot be reclaimed and expenditure cannot be coded correctly.</p> <p>From reviewing all of the HFRS staff who hold RBS purchasing cards we found five members of staff who have not</p>				

<p>registered on SDOL. Of these staff two members are using their purchasing cards to make purchases but as they are not registered on SDOL they would not be able to confirm or code their purchases.</p> <p>Six of the claims tested under this audit were made using the new RBS card and we found that two of these claims had not been confirmed by the user on SDOL or approved by the line manager. These two claims included 8 Vat-able transactions with VAT totalling £741.24 which could have been reclaimed. (This is the same £741.24 as referred to in Action Plan 2)</p>					
<b>Management actions</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	<b>SMT</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Date signed off as complete</b>
Remind all card holders of the need to confirm all of their purchases every month.	Medium	Lead Business Partner	Chief Finance Officer	31/08/2015	07/07/2015
Remind all card holders that they need to register for SDOL on being issued their card, even when they have no immediate plan to use it.	Medium	Lead Business Partner	Chief Finance Officer	31/08/2015	07/07/2015
<p>Comment: All cardholders were sent a reminder as part of their monthly reminder to submit claims. A reminder was also placed in Routine Notice.</p>					

<b>Action plan 1</b>		<b>Pension Arrangements 2013/14</b>
Objectives	Information on new starters to the fire service is promptly sent to HCC Pension Services to enable them to join the scheme and those that have opted out are appropriately removed.	
Observations	<p>HFRS started auto enrolment in September 2013 and employees have to opt out if they do not wish to participate in the pension scheme. We tested a sample of four staff who had opted out and were able to confirm that their contributions had been correctly refunded. However, for three of the four there were no ST8B leaver forms on the pension system and the employees still have an active AXISe pension record.</p> <p>These employees are no longer paying pension contributions but the pension records are incomplete and there is no audit trail to show they have opted out of the pension scheme.</p>	

## INTERNAL AUDIT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – THOSE AGREED &amp; COMPLETED SINCE June 2014 AND THOSE IN PROGRESS

Management actions	Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete
Further work is currently being undertaken between H3, pension services and employers to ensure that relevant systems and responsibilities are fully understood between all parties.	Medium	Head of Finance	Head of Finance	31/08/2015	31/07/2015
<b>Comment:</b> New arrangements between H3 and pension services are now in place including a liaison forum specifically on Fire Pension matters. The intention is to replace the interface with a spreadsheet based system that is used by most employers and H3 are aware of the need to keep on top of the starter and leaver process. Regular performance monitoring will be a key feature of the liaison forum and the newly formed fire pension board.					
<b>Action plan 3 Pension Arrangements 2013/14</b>					
Objectives	Information on new starters to the fire service is promptly sent to HCC Pension Services to enable them to join the scheme and those that have opted out are appropriately removed.				
Observations	<p>New starters are set up on SAP and an interface process transfers data from SAP to AXISe. We tested a sample of 25 new starters records on SAP to confirm that they had been correctly set up in AXISe. We found that five out of the 25 do not appear to have a pension record on AXISe for this employment. SAP shows that two of these have paid pension contributions and HR confirmed that three have opted out of the pension scheme but there is no record of this on AXISe.</p> <p>Whilst ST8A new starter forms can be completed and sent to Pension Services to add people to the pension scheme, we only found this occurring in a few instances. In the main the interface between SAP and AXISe is relied upon to add new starters.</p>				
Management actions	Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete
The current process / interface for ensuring that starters are properly recorded in the pension system is under review between pension services and the IBC.	Medium	Head of Finance	Head of Finance	31/08/2015	31/07/2015

**Comment:** New arrangements between H3 and pension services are now in place including a liaison forum specifically on Fire Pension matters. The intention is to replace the interface with a spreadsheet based system that is used by most employers and H3 are aware of the need to keep on top of the starter and leaver process. Regular performance monitoring will be a key feature of the liaison forum and the newly formed fire pension board.

<b>Action plan 4</b>		<b>Pension Arrangements 2013/14</b>			
Objectives	Changes, leavers, retirements and deaths are notified to HCC Pension Services accurately and promptly, and dealt with appropriately.				
Observations	<p>We recalculated the annual pension calculations for a sample of 25 pensioners and identified small differences on 14 of the 25.</p> <p>The differences are due to the calculation of the CPD APB (Continuing Professional Development Additional Pension Benefit), and the pensions increase applied to the CPD APB and the LSI APB (Long Service Increment). An incorrect amount being used for the 2010 CPD payment (AXISe calculations are based on firefighters receiving £599 whereas the firefighters actually received £606) and changes in the contribution rates for 2012/13 and 2013/14 have not been updated in AXISe for the CPD calculation. The calculations then have pensions increase applied.</p> <p>Whilst we do not believe that the amounts involved are substantial HFRS are responsible for advising the pension provider of any changes in amounts or rates.</p>				
<b>Management actions</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	<b>SMT</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Date signed off as complete</b>
Further work is currently being undertaken between H3, pension services and employers to ensure that relevant systems and responsibilities are fully understood between all parties, including notification of amounts and rates.	Medium	Head of Finance	Head of Finance	31/08/2015	31/07/2015
<b>Comment:</b> New arrangements between H3 and pension services are now in place including a liaison forum specifically on Fire Pension matters. The intention is to replace the interface with a spreadsheet based system that is used by most employers and H3 are aware of the need to keep on top of the starter and leaver process. Regular performance monitoring will be a key feature of the liaison forum and the newly formed fire pension board.					

## INTERNAL AUDIT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – THOSE AGREED &amp; COMPLETED SINCE June 2014 AND THOSE IN PROGRESS

Action plan 5		Pension Arrangements 2013/14			
Objectives	Provision of the pensions contract is appropriately managed and monitored to ensure it is effective.				
Observations	<p>As part of our audit review we discussed with HFRS staff how they monitor the contract they have with Pension Services. We were advised that HFRS do not monitor the service provided. We understand that HFRS do not receive any regular reports from Pension Services to enable them to monitor the work undertaken, nor do they hold any regular monitoring meetings.</p> <p>Also a review of job descriptions could not find any reference to monitoring the pension contract or for pension tasks such as checking pension calculations, ensuring pension's compliance with regulations and completion of pension annual returns.</p> <p>We asked to see a copy of the current service level agreement (SLA) for this provision, but HFRS staff were not aware of one. We found a copy of an SLA dated 2008 in a previous internal audit file and a comparison of this with the 2012 generic SLA on the Pension Services website showed several additional tasks on the later along with some timescale changes.</p> <p>In the absence of a current SLA staff may not be fully aware of their responsibilities for pensions, the responsibilities of Pension Services to employers and the required time scales. This information will also enable the contract to be monitored effectively.</p>				
Management actions	Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete
Further work is currently being undertaken between H3, pension services and employers to ensure that relevant systems and responsibilities are fully understood between all parties, which will include regular meetings to ensure issues from all sides are escalated where appropriate.	Medium	Head of Finance	Head of Finance	31/08/2015	31/07/2015

An officer needs to be given specific responsibility for dealing with employer pension issues	Medium	Head of Finance / Director of Professional Services	Head of Finance / Director of Professional Services	31/08/2015	31/07/2015
Comment: New arrangements between H3 and pension services are now in place including a liaison forum specifically on Fire Pension matters. The intention is to replace the interface with a spreadsheet based system that is used by most employers and H3 are aware of the need to keep on top of the starter and leaver process. Regular performance monitoring will be a key feature of the liaison forum and the newly formed fire pension board.					

<b>Partnerships and Associated Contracts – South Central Ambulance Service</b>					
<b>Action plan 1</b>					
<b>2014/2015</b>					
Objectives	An agreement is in place which clearly documents the aims and objectives of the scheme, along with roles and responsibilities.				
Observations	<p>There is no current HFRS partnership policy for staff to follow when entering in to partnerships and associated contracts. Nor are there procedures for staff to follow when entering in to a new partnership agreement covering the processes, documentation and approvals required.</p> <p>On the HFRS website there is a list of formal, informal and statutory partners, however, the partnership with South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS) is not included.</p>				
<b>Management actions</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	<b>SMT</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Date signed off as complete</b>
Partnerships Policy to be updated and a Partnerships Register to be created. Both to be agreed by SMT and then presented to Standards and Governance Committee for sign off.	Medium	Collection Co-ordination and Intelligence Requirements Manager (CCIRM)	Head of Knowledge Management	31/01/2016	
Comment:					

## INTERNAL AUDIT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – THOSE AGREED &amp; COMPLETED SINCE June 2014 AND THOSE IN PROGRESS

Partnerships and Associated Contracts – South Central Ambulance Service 2014/2015					
<b>Action plan 2</b>					
Objectives	Systems are in place to enable monitoring of the partnership/contract (Including performance and payment arrangements) to ensure it remains appropriate.				
Observations	<p>Paragraph 9.4 of the Joint Working Agreement for the Co-Responder Scheme states that 'an annual review of the scheme will be undertaken and its performance will be reported to the senior management teams of the parties. The report will be compiled by the HFRS Co Responder Manager in partnership with the SCAS Responder Manager'.</p> <p>From our audit testing we found that a joint annual review of the Co-Responders scheme had not been undertaken recently and reported to the senior management of both parties. HFRS has however undertaken their own reviews.</p> <p>Without a joint annual review there is a risk that the parties will not gain a full understanding of the partnership from both points of view and they may arrive at different conclusions.</p>				
<b>Management actions</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	<b>SMT</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Date signed off as complete</b>
A joint annual review has been planned for June 2015.	High	Station Manager Response Delivery	Head of Community Response Delivery	Complete	04/08/2015
Comment:					

**FireWatch management information and access controls 2014/15**

**Action plan 1**

Objectives	Management information requirements have been clearly specified
Observations	<p>We requested documentation for the specification of management information requirements for FireWatch. A document from 2010 was made available to us titled "Customer Requirements Document for an Integrated Software Solution to support Availability, Training &amp; Development, Health &amp; Safety and Occupational Health". This contained annotations from Infographics in the "Management Information Reporting" section indicating whether or not FireWatch met the requirement.</p> <p>51 requirements were specified, 40 of these were marked as "Yes" for FireWatch compliance and designated a mandatory requirement for the software solution.</p> <p>We compared the text describing the requirement with what management information is available in FireWatch. In our opinion 17 are currently met either by FireWatch reporting or the reports Business Intelligence and Performance Review have provided via SQL queries from the database. Two are not applicable and 21 are not met. The text in the customer requirements document is open to different interpretations but we believe this analysis shows there is a gap between mandatory requirements for the software solution and what is currently available from FireWatch.</p>

Management actions	Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete
The 'FireWatch Optimisation' Project is due to be approved by senior management on 3rd August 2015. A high priority task of the project (work of which is already underway) is a full review of the customer requirements document to identify what has been delivered, what is still outstanding and how does this compare to current HFRS requirements.	Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	30/11/2015	

Comment:

INTERNAL AUDIT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – THOSE AGREED & COMPLETED SINCE June 2014 AND THOSE IN PROGRESS

Action plan 2						FireWatch management information and access controls 2014/15					
Objectives	Management information requirements have been clearly specified										
Observations	<p>We looked for a strategy or project plan for the specification and delivery of management information from FireWatch. We did not find evidence of a strategy or project plan which (for example) linked to service objectives, the mitigation of key risks or getting added value from FireWatch by improving on what was available in the previous system.</p> <p>The FireWatch team are currently working on improving the management information available, but at the time of the audit it was uncertain where responsibility for future development and maintenance would rest. We understand that this uncertainty has now been resolved by the Knowledge Management restructure where specific FireWatch accountabilities have been picked up between Knowledge Management and the IS department.</p> <p>Currently reports can be developed by the FireWatch team using the reporting tools in FireWatch with assistance from Infographics, or by request to Business Intelligence or members of the Performance Review team to write a SQL query which runs on the database.</p>										
Management actions	Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete						
Produce a documented transition plan for each Business As Usual area and assign owners. Publish to Heads of Service for Information and endorsement.	Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	30/09/2015							

Develop a Management Information Strategy.		Medium	Head of Knowledge Management (with significant input from IS)	Head of Knowledge Management	01/03/2016	
Comment:						
<b>Action plan 3 FireWatch management information and access controls 2014/15</b>						
Objectives	Management information requirements have been clearly specified					
Observations	An email to “specifically chosen WM’s/SC’s and GM’s requesting input” was sent in November 2014 by the FireWatch team for reporting requirements but the response rate was low with only 4 out of eighteen responses. We found no evidence of follow up or higher management support for input from the recipients.					
<b>Management actions</b>		<b>Priority</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	<b>SMT</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Date signed off as complete</b>
Covered in Action Plan 1.1		Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	30/11/2015	
Comment:						
<b>Action plan 4 FireWatch management information and access controls 2014/15</b>						
Objectives	Management information specified is available, up to date and accurate.					
Observations	We reviewed the management information available in FireWatch. There are reports which support management in maintaining the training requirements of firefighters, for example reports on when firefighter qualifications are due to expire, and on the maintenance of skills and competencies. Reports on retained firefighters meeting contractual obligations and where appliances have been taken off call because of crew availability are not available yet.					

INTERNAL AUDIT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – THOSE AGREED & COMPLETED SINCE June 2014 AND THOSE IN PROGRESS

The guidance available for reports was under review at the time of the audit. Some had not been updated since 2013 and screenshots were not of the current version of FireWatch.

We observed the running of reports where a guide was available on the intranet. We found the following issues.

“Training Course History” – runs but did not return any data.

“Verification Required” – runs and produces data but flagged events which required sign off from 2014, which indicates it may not be being used as intended.

“Courses Planned for Crew Members” – runs but did not return any data.

We understand that training reports are also currently under review and development.

Management actions	Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete
<p>Business As Usual Departments that have already gone live with FireWatch are responsible for their own data cleansing of data, with support from Knowledge Management.</p> <p>However, Action Plan 1.1 will cover any outstanding requirements which will support the Business As Usual team to manage their data effectively.</p> <p>Comment:</p>	Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	30/11/2015	

Action plan 5 FireWatch management information and access controls 2014/15	
Objectives	Access applied in FireWatch is in line with documented definitions, authorised and up to date.

<b>Observations</b>	<p>Access to data by reports within FireWatch is controlled by the access privileges assigned to each user. So if a user cannot navigate to data within FireWatch it won't be visible to them on a report either.</p> <p>Direct access to the SQL database to write reports from the tables is controlled by access to SQL Server 2008 or 2012 and the user id having the connection string and log in details for the FireWatch database.</p> <p>The ability to run the report queries created by the Business Intelligence team is granted by adding the user's network id to the specific query accessed from hfrs.net.</p> <p>Therefore the control of access to FireWatch data is currently the responsibility of separate teams. Any regular review of access to the data needs to cover all these areas.</p>
---------------------	---

<b>Management actions</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	<b>SMT</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Date signed off as complete</b>
As part of the FireWatch Optimisation Project the team will create a process for the maintenance of user accounts and security in FireWatch and hand over to Business As Usual teams. Knowledge Management (Research and Intelligence) will manage, review and update this process once handed over.	Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	30/10/2015	

Comment:

<b>Action plan 6 FireWatch management information and access controls 2014/15</b>	
<b>Objectives</b>	Access requirements, including those to personal and sensitive data, have been defined and documented.
<b>Observations</b>	We reviewed the access templates for FireWatch to determine if restrictions to personal and sensitive data were in place and appropriate. We found the template definitions to be appropriate.

INTERNAL AUDIT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – THOSE AGREED & COMPLETED SINCE June 2014 AND THOSE IN PROGRESS

<p>We were informed that personal or sensitive data types were not maintained in FireWatch so even if access was enabled there may not be data to view. We checked the database tables with the Business Intelligence Manager and the FireWatch Manager for a sample of personal or sensitive data types. We found the following:                  Ethnicity – 1733 entries in the database which were not “NULL”. A corresponding table defined what the entry codes meant.                   Sexuality – 53 entries which were not “NULL”. The table which defined what the entries mean was encrypted.                  Reg Disabled – 176 entries which were not “NULL”. This is a ‘tick box’ field where “1” means there is a tick in the box. In addition to the unexpected data being present we noted that the encryption of the definition tables was also inconsistent. A member of staff with direct access to the database could work out the ethnicity recorded, but not the sexuality.</p>					
Management actions	Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete
Action Plan 5.1 will mitigate further risk of this.	Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	31/10/2015	
Research and Intelligence will manage, review and update this process once handed over.	Medium	Research & Intelligence Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	Post October 2015	
Comment:					

**FireWatch management information and access controls 2014/15**

**Action plan 7**

Objectives	Access requirements, including those to personal and sensitive data, have been defined and documented.
Observations	<p>High privilege access to functions and/or data in FireWatch is controlled by the access controls within the software or controls over who has access directly to the database.</p> <p>Members of the implementation team have the highest level of access within the software. We tested who had this access applied to them and found two issues. Staff had moved teams but the access was still in place. These have since been removed.</p> <p>There was also an “Admin” account active in the software which was confirmed as no longer required with Infographics by the FireWatch manager. This has now been disabled.</p> <p>We also determined who had access directly to the FireWatch database using SQL Server 2008 or 2012. We found that 4 members of the Knowledge Management Team had this access route.</p>

Management actions	Priority	Responsible Officer	SMT	Target date	Date signed off as complete
Action 5.1 will mitigate this risk	Medium	Business Intelligence developer (Research and Intelligence Manager)	Head of Knowledge Management	31/10/2015	

## INTERNAL AUDIT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – THOSE AGREED &amp; COMPLETED SINCE June 2014 AND THOSE IN PROGRESS

Research and Intelligence will manage, review and update this process once handed over.	Medium	Research & Intelligence Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	Post October 2015	
Comment:					
<b>Action plan 8 FireWatch management information and access controls 2014/15</b>					
Objectives	Access requirements, including those to personal and sensitive data, have been defined and documented.				
Observations	We reviewed the members of staff with access to run the FireWatch reports written by the Business Intelligence team. The access to ten reports was covered, and one issue was found with a member of staff still having access to the "FireWatch Contract Checker" report. This member of staff was on secondment from the role which needed the access. The standard process is for the member of staff's line manager to advise the Business Intelligence Manager of role changes so access can be amended.				
<b>Management actions</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	<b>SMT</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Date signed off as complete</b>
Action 5.1 will mitigate this risk	Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	31/10/2015	
Research and Intelligence will manage, review and update this process once handed over.	Medium	Research & Intelligence Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	Post October 2015	

Comment:					
<b>FireWatch management information and access controls 2014/15</b>					
<b>Action plan 9</b>					
Objectives	Access applied in FireWatch is in line with documented definitions, authorised and up to date.				
Observations	<p>We compared the FireWatch access templates provided to us on 20th January with an access report from FireWatch run on 17th February.</p> <p>This test took 10 users and compared all their access privileges (totalling 270) with the template for their job. We found nine differences between what the template documented and what access was granted in FireWatch. Six of the 10 users had at least one difference.</p> <p>We were informed that the differences we found were down to the work being done at the time of the audit to review, change and simplify access.</p> <p>Retesting of the same 10 users on 13th April found six differences between the access assigned in FireWatch and the new template specification. Six of the 10 users had at least one difference. However all of the differences were down to the category "Sickness Details (Core)" being "Read/Write ROSelfSubordinates" in FireWatch but "Insert ROSelfRWAll" was specified in the template.</p> <p>On the 13th of April we also selected a different 10 users and compared all their access privileges (totalling 284) with the new template specification for their job. This test found a total of six differences, four of which were down to the same "Sickness Details (Core)" issue mentioned above.</p>				
<b>Management actions</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	<b>SMT</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Date signed off as complete</b>
Action 5.1 will mitigate this risk	Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	31/10/2015	

INTERNAL AUDIT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS – THOSE AGREED & COMPLETED SINCE June 2014 AND THOSE IN PROGRESS

<p>Research and Intelligence will manage, review and update this process once handed over.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Research &amp; Intelligence Manager</p>	<p>Head of Knowledge Management</p>	<p>Post October 2015</p>	
<p>Comment:</p>					
<p><b>Action plan 10 FireWatch management information and access controls 2014/15</b></p>					
<p>Objectives</p>	<p>Access applied in FireWatch is in line with documented definitions, authorised and up to date.</p>				
<p>Observations</p>	<p>We compared all 1040 user ids in FireWatch as at 17.2.15 with payroll output from SAP to check that users set up in the system were still active employees with HFRS.                  This resulted in the removal of 18 members of staff and one contractor who had left HFRS. It was also confirmed that six others not on the payroll were contractors but still had a need for the access.                  Four leavers removed were from 2012, two from 2013, eleven from 2014 and one from 2015.                  Three of the 2014 leavers were TUPE transfers to Hampshire County Council.</p>				
<p><b>Management actions</b></p>	<p><b>Priority</b></p>	<p><b>Responsible Officer</b></p>	<p><b>SMT</b></p>	<p><b>Target date</b></p>	<p><b>Date signed off as complete</b></p>
<p>Action 5.1 will mitigate this risk</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Performance Management &amp; Assurance Manager</p>	<p>Head of Knowledge Management</p>	<p>31/10/2015</p>	

Research and Intelligence will manage, review and update this process once handed over.	Medium	Research & Intelligence Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	Post October 2015	
Comment:					
<b>Action plan 11 FireWatch management information and access controls 2014/15</b>					
Objectives	Access applied in FireWatch is in line with documented definitions, authorised and up to date.				
Observations	Business Intelligence have provided an "Access and Privileges" report which can be used to identify all current users of FireWatch and what data and functions they have access to. This report is not currently being regularly run to review access or identify leavers missed by the notification processes.				
<b>Management actions</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	<b>SMT</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Date signed off as complete</b>
Action 5.1 will mitigate this risk	Medium	Performance Management & Assurance Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	31/10/2015	
Research and Intelligence will manage, review and update this process once handed over.	Medium	Research & Intelligence Manager	Head of Knowledge Management	Post October 2015	
Comment:					