Protecting the Public Purse
Fraud Briefing December 2013 – Summary

Fraud Risk	Central Bedfordshire		Midlands and East of England metropolitan districts and unitary authorities 2012/13 (average)	
	Number of Detected Cases	**Value**	**Number of Detected Cases**	**Value**
		£		£
Housing Benefit and Council Tax benefit fraud	Not recorded	490,714	332	698,296
Council tax discount fraud*	0	0	188	53,054
Social Housing Fraud	0	n/a	36	n/a
Right to Buy fraud	0	0	5 (in total)**	168,590
Disabled Parking (Blue Badge) fraud	0	n/a	18	n/a
Procurement	0	0	5	963
Insurance	0	0	3	53,500
Social Care	1	7,000	5	140,874
Economic and Third Sector	0	0	1	34,730
Internal Fraud	0	0	6	17,791
Total value of detected cases		**497,714**		**1,167,798**

*An exercise has been undertaken at CBC during 2011/12 which generated savings in excess of £400k. These were not recorded as fraud.

** There were 5 cases in total across the metropolitan districts and unitary authorities. All other figures quoted are averages.

Interpreting the Results:

•Fraud detection results are open to often widely differing interpretation. For example - Does no fraud detected mean that there is no fraud being committed against the council, or rather that the council does not have adequate resources to detect fraud, or is not looking for fraud in the right way.

•The value of fraud can also sometimes be misleading. Single large value frauds can sometimes distort detection performance. Similarly, frauds that are detected early tend to be lower in value than frauds that have been committed repeatedly over several years. In such cases, low value of fraud detected may represent effective early identification of a fraud. This is why detection results can only be indicative, rather than definitive, when assessing fraud detection activities.

•Detected fraud results only provide part of the overall picture of counter fraud performance, prevention and deterrence are also equally important.