

**MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN**

|                      |                          |
|----------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Directorate:</b>  | Change & Efficiency      |
| <b>Audit report:</b> | A00880/2013/14 - UNICORN |
| <b>Dated:</b>        | 23 June 2014             |

**PRIORITY RATINGS**

**Priority High (H)** - major control weakness requiring immediate implementation of recommendation

**Priority Medium (M)** - existing procedures have a negative impact on internal control or the efficient use of resources

**Priority Low (L)** - recommendation represents good practice but its implementation is not fundamental to internal control

I agree to the actions below and accept overall accountability for their timely completion. I will inform Internal Audit if timescales are likely to be missed.

The auditor agrees that the actions set out below are satisfactory.

Lead Responsible Officer (HOS) Paul Brocklehurst

Auditor Lyle Lumsden

Date 14/07/2014

Date 14/07/2014

| Para Ref | Recommendation | Priority Rating | Management Action Proposed | Timescale for Action | Officer Responsible | Audit Agree? |
|----------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|
|----------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|

|    |  |     |  |                 |              |  |
|----|--|-----|--|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 01 | The IT Contracts team is dealing with the supplier in a sufficient but unstructured manner. Using a more structured method in regards to documenting arising issues and risks across all areas, will reduce the risk surrounding the process of negotiating with the supplier. This would increase resilience within | Low | IMT will add arising BAU risks to risks currently being actively managed as part of the extended project close out. These will be managed and reviewed monthly by the Unicorn Partnership Client and reported to the relevant Governance Groups. | September 2014. | Robin Carter |  |
|----|--|-----|--|-----------------|--------------|--|

## MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN

| Para Ref | Recommendation   | Priority Rating | Management Action Proposed  | Timescale for Action | Officer Responsible | Audit Agree? |
|----------|--|-----------------|---|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| 02       | <p>the team as well as possibly facilitate the briefing of the relevant committee when in place.</p> <p>In light of the timescales indicated in the contract for acknowledging and formalising change requests and the failing of the supplier to achieve those targets. The auditor recommends that a time frame, such as six months or less is agreed to allow for this process to develop. After which if the change process has not aligned with the Contract KPIs senior management formally challenge the supplier to improve.</p> | High            | <p>IMT and BT have already agreed the list of outstanding CCN's and work has commenced. A more formal programme will be agreed, with aim of recovering the currently outstanding item by December 14.</p> | December 14          | Robin Carter        |              |
| 03       | <p>In light of the possible impacts that the consultants may have on SCC's interpretation of data from the supplier. A commitment should be</p>  | Low             | <p>[DN we do not fully understand the question, but have responded on the basis that the recommendation was referring to reporting data.</p>  | Completed            | Kasia Venus         |              |

## MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN

| Para Ref | Recommendation   | Priority Rating | Management Action Proposed  | Timescale for Action | Officer Responsible | Audit Agree? |
|----------|--|-----------------|---|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| 04       | undertaken to review a sample of historic data to ensure that SCC's position is up to date.<br><br>In line with the recommendation in 5.1.7, issues with the supplier should be captured in an issues log, possibly supported with a key communications log. This will aid in issue escalation and monitoring. | High            | <i>If this is not the case, please clarify.</i> 6 months historic reporting data was passed to specialist consultants (Spirit) in June 14 for independent review. Feedback is anticipated in July 14.<br>IMT will add arising BAU issues to issues currently being actively managed as part of the extended project close out. These will be managed and reviewed monthly by the Unicorn Partnership Client and reported to the relevant Governance Groups. | September 2014.      | Robin Carter        |              |

This page is intentionally left blank