

# Treasury Management & Prudential Code

## City of York Council

### Internal Audit Report 2014/15

Business Unit: Customer & Business Support Services  
Responsible Officer: Director, Customer & Business Support Services  
Service Manager: Corporate Finance Manager  
Date Issued: 27 March 2015  
Status: Final  
Reference: 10150/006

	P1	P2	P3
<b>Actions</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall Audit Opinion</b>	High Assurance		

# Summary and Overall Conclusions

## Introduction

The principal roles of the Treasury Management function are to:

- manage the council's cash flows,
- invest surplus money on the money markets to maximise the return on cash balances,
- ensure that the council's financial needs are met through long-term borrowing.

The actions of the section are governed by the Treasury Management Policy, approved annually by members.

During 2013-14 the average cash balance available for investment was £61.15m; for 2014-15 the average balance has been between £56.3m and £89.8m.

At the end of 2013-14 total borrowing was £258.6m, and has risen to £269.1m during 2014-15.

## Objectives and Scope of the Audit

The purpose of the audit was to provide assurance to management that procedures and controls within the system will ensure that:

- an appropriate Treasury Management policy is in place;
- decisions about loans and investments are reasonable and are appropriately authorised and documented;
- the financial ledger is promptly updated and periodic reconciliations are performed;
- prudential indicators are accurately calculated and appropriately monitored.

This audit was a health check of key controls.

## Findings and Overall Conclusions

It was found that procedures within the service were well managed and operating effectively. The policy and reporting arrangements were in line with expected (CIPFA) standards. Detailed testing demonstrated appropriate authorisation and documentation of decisions relating to loans and investments, as well as reconciliation of records to the financial ledger. Prudential indicators appeared to be calculated accurately on the basis of appropriate source data. On the basis of audit work completed over the course of recent years it is apparent that the department takes a pragmatic approach to treasury management to ensure optimum performance consistent with risk appetite.

It was found that the arrangements for managing risk were very good. An effective control environment appears to be in operation. Our overall opinion of the controls within the system at the time of the audit was that they provided High Assurance.

# Audit Opinions and Priorities for Actions

## Audit Opinions

Audit work is based on sampling transactions to test the operation of systems. It cannot guarantee the elimination of fraud or error. Our opinion is based on the risks we identify at the time of the audit.

Our overall audit opinion is based on 5 grades of opinion, as set out below.

Opinion	Assessment of internal control
High Assurance	Overall, very good management of risk. An effective control environment appears to be in operation.
Substantial Assurance	Overall, good management of risk with few weaknesses identified. An effective control environment is in operation but there is scope for further improvement in the areas identified.
Reasonable Assurance	Overall, satisfactory management of risk with a number of weaknesses identified. An acceptable control environment is in operation but there are a number of improvements that could be made.
Limited Assurance	Overall, poor management of risk with significant control weaknesses in key areas and major improvements required before an effective control environment will be in operation.
No Assurance	Overall, there is a fundamental failure in control and risks are not being effectively managed. A number of key areas require substantial improvement to protect the system from error and abuse.

## Priorities for Actions

Priority 1	A fundamental system weakness, which presents unacceptable risk to the system objectives and requires urgent attention by management.
Priority 2	A significant system weakness, whose impact or frequency presents risks to the system objectives, which needs to be addressed by management.
Priority 3	The system objectives are not exposed to significant risk, but the issue merits attention by management.

Where information resulting from audit work is made public or is provided to a third party by the client or by Veritau then this must be done on the understanding that any third party will rely on the information at its own risk. Veritau will not owe a duty of care or assume any responsibility towards anyone other than the client in relation to the information supplied. Equally, no third party may assert any rights or bring any claims against Veritau in connection with the information. Where information is provided to a named third party, the third party will keep the information confidential.