

Audit & Governance Committee
22 May 2020

Surrey County Council Counter Fraud Strategy

SUMMARY AND PURPOSE:

The purpose of this progress report is to provide details of the main changes and rationale for updating and amending the Council's Counter Fraud Strategy (attached to this report as Appendix A).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Committee is asked to review and endorse the Counter Fraud Strategy.

BACKGROUND:

1. As with other organisations the Council is at risk of losses through fraud, bribery and corruption. The Council recognises that as well as causing financial loss such activities are also detrimental to the provision of services and damaging to the reputation of the Council and residents confidence in the Council. To safeguard itself the Council is committed to making sure that the opportunity for fraud, bribery and corruption is reduced to the lowest possible risk within existing resources.
2. This strategy outlines the Council's commitment and approach to tackling fraud, bribery and corruption and applies to all those who work for, or interact with the Council including employees, Members, contractors, suppliers and service users. It aims to help embed an anti-fraud culture within the Council and provides clear guidance on the roles and responsibilities of individuals.
3. In line with good practice the Council regularly assesses its exposure to fraud risk and ensures that its counter fraud arrangements and the resources allocated to managing the risks, are effective and aligned to best practice. As a result the Strategy has been updated to ensure that it is current and reflects sector guidance.
4. The amendments made include the following:
 - Post titles and contact details of senior management have been updated;
 - Increased emphasis of the role of culture in protecting public interest;
 - References to the Money Laundering Regulations 2007 have been replaced by the Money Laundering, Terrorist Financing and Transfer of Funds (Information on the Payer) Regulations 2017; and
 - In line with new money laundering regulations, guidance on the 'Identification of clients' has been replaced with a risk based approach to 'Customer due diligence' within the Anti-Money Laundering Policy.

IMPLICATIONS:

5. There are no direct implications (relating to finance, equalities, risk management or value for money) arising from this report.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

6. See Recommendations above.

REPORT AUTHOR: Russell Banks, Orbis Chief Internal Auditor
David John, Audit Manager (Surrey County Council)

CONTACT DETAILS: telephone: 01273 481447 e-mail: russell.banks@eastsussex.gov.uk
telephone: 020 8541 9191 e-mail: simon.white@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers: Counter Fraud Strategy.