Appendix A

Details on those recommendations outstanding
Status – all Amber (Ongoing with deadline missed)

Improvement and Corporate Services

IT Disaster Recovery (including back up and restore arrangements)

Recommendation R1: (Carried forward from previous audits) A disaster recovery plan should be developed and approved. As a minimum, this should include: • the identification and prioritisation of key IT systems • the roles and responsibilities of relevant officers and third party suppliers • a set of IT procedures which should be executed initially to react to crises/disaster • escalation procedures • salvage procedures that deal with retrieval of items from affected • the recovery and reconfiguration of all IT and communications systems • details of additional accounts where monies may be sourced to aid recovery efforts • a schedule in respect of the testing of the plan
Rationale for Recommendation: As has been previously reported to the Committee, a thorough review of the existing data centre provisioning at CBC is in progress. It is anticipated that there will be significant changes made in the technologies in use and how they are supported. ICT is undertaking to deliver a refreshed and renewed DR plan.
Target Dates: September 2015 (Original) April 2016 (Revised, tender decision made)
Current Position and Explanation for Slippage: An OJEU Tender for new data centre capacity including Disaster Recovery was released to the market end of January 2016 with evaluation taking place the second week of March 2016. After the tender is completed in April 2016 it will be possible to update the DR strategy and plan for the Council.

Recommendation R2: A review of resources alongside disaster recovery processes should be undertaken to confirm if the Council could cope without third party support and expertise. Arrangements should be clearly documented in the DR Plan.
Rationale for Recommendation: The Council no longer has a contractual agreement with an external party for the recovery of services.
Target Dates: September 2015 (Original) April 2016 (Revised)
Current Position and Explanation for Slippage: This is subject to the agreed action in the recommendation above.

Recommendation R3:
Clarification regarding IT insurance arrangements at non CBC sites should be sought and reviewed. Arrangements should be clearly documented in the DR Plan.
Rationale for Recommendation:
It is not clear if the Council has appropriate insurance cover in place for equipment held at data centres Hoddesdon and Luton.
Target Dates:
September 2015 (Original)
December 2015 (Revised)
April 2016
Current Position and Explanation for Slippage:
The Council's Insurance Team has addressed this issue, in consultation with IT. It has been confirmed that insurance cover will be in place from 1st April 2016. .This recommendation will therefore be removed from future tracking reports.

Social Care, Health and Housing

Housing Tenancy Management

Recommendation R4: The Director of Social Care, Health and Housing and the Director of Regeneration and Business should clarify how housing responsibilities are allocated across their directorates. This should include the responsibility for and ownership of the Tenancy Strategy.
Rationale for Recommendation: The Housing Tenancy Strategy was drafted by the Assistant Director - Housing Services with an Executive Foreword jointly signed by the Executive member with responsibility for Social Care, Health and Housing and the Director of Social Care Health and Housing (SCHH). It was approved by the Executive in March 2013 however during the course of this review it became apparent that responsibility for and ownership of the strategy is unclear. Discussions between the Director of Social Care, Health and Housing and the Director of Regeneration and Business confirmed that housing responsibilities lie across 2 Directorates, SCHH and Regeneration and Business, and that both Directors will clarify how this will be addressed.
Target Dates: November 2015 March 2016 (revised)
Current Position and Explanation for Slippage: An action plan is being developed to ensure housing responsibilities across the directorates are agreed and implemented however this has been delayed due to other commitments. Discussions between the Director of Social Care, Health and Housing and the Director of Regeneration and Business are in progress and a revised target date of March 2016 has been agreed. At the time of drafting this report it was understood that work was ongoing to achieve this action.

Recommendation R5: A Monitoring Group should be established, with clear terms of reference, to monitor and review the effectiveness of the Tenancy Strategy.
Rationale for Recommendation: Each Provider is responsible for its own individual tenancy policies, as well as arrangements for review and appeals. However, the Tenancy Strategy proposed that the Council establish a monitoring group consisting of representatives of registered providers and other key stakeholders. This group is meant to support the Council in its role of monitoring and reviewing the effectiveness of this Strategy but the group is yet to be set up.
Target Dates: November 2015 March 2016 (revised)
Current Position and Explanation for Slippage: This will be addressed as part of the action plan being developed in response to the earlier recommendation.

Housing Repairs Commissioning

Recommendation R6: Housing Repairs expenditure in QL and SAP should be regularly reconciled.

Rationale for Recommendation: There is no reconciliation between Housing Repairs expenditure in QL and SAP. Actions to resolve this are defined within an invoice review process. Three specific objectives are to be achieved: 　1)　A robust interface between the SAP system and the QL system, so that these systems effectively function as one system within the Invoice Process. 　2)　A business process that includes pre-payment on account (subject to reconciliation) related to invoicing where work supplied is goods receipted and approved for payment, concurrent with the contractors process to provide an invoice for payment. 　3)　Updated procedures which define management accountability, including delegation of task related authority, to ensure that a robust reconciliation of Repairs works to invoices takes place. 　4)

Target Dates: End September 2014 End March 2015 (revised) End June 2015 (revised) October 2015 (revised, self billing) January 2016.(revised) June 2016 (see below)

Current Position and Explanation for Slippage: **Progress since last update**: Since the last update, the stakeholders for the QL/SAP interface have broadened to include Corporate IT and the software supplier. A new project structure has been set up, managed by IT and this has involved re-scoping the deliverables and a new timeline. **Action 1 -**A QL/SAP interface was delivered in 2015; however there were some ongoing problems with the reliability of interface files, and improvements to be made. Business processes supporting these updates to the QL/SAP link have been explored through a series of workshops, to which all stakeholders have been invited. A Business Requirements Document (BRD) was produced in January 2016 which proposes processes for the reconciliation of repairs works invoices. Work is being undertaken with the relevant managers to roll this process out to contractors and teams. The suppliers have been engaged to update the SAP/QL interface, which will be scoped, designed and tested by mid June 2016 **Action 2 -**The "business process including pre-payment on account" has been agreed and is being successfully trialled with a major contractor as a pilot. Final process reconciliation and sign off is underway with a completion date of 11 March 2016. The next step will initiate a roll-out plan with more contractors. A reconciliation test was carried out using a QL report to match orders that appeared in SAP with the orders correctly raised through QL as of the 1st Jan 2016, checking that they worked their way through the interface in the correct way. The test found that that there are still some occasions where orders are manually transferred to SAP and therefore are not showing up on the QL report. This issue is largely due to user error and is being addressed within the service and a further test will be carried out once resolved. This work is to be completed by the end of March 2016. **Action 3 -**Operational processes, delegation authorities and accountability have all been documented and signed-off as a result of the original project and audit requirements. These underlying key deliverable and audit requirements remain in

place as the foundation of any upcoming developments.

Regular audits of user authorisation levels and delegation (Separation of duties) are also carried out to ensure we meet audit recommendations.