



Audit, Resources and Performance Committee 20 March 2015
Item 10 Appendix 1

PDNPA Performance Management & Benchmarking

Peak District National Park Authority

Internal Audit Report 2014/15

Business Unit: Performance Management
Responsible Officer: Director of Corporate Services
Service Manager: Senior Performance Officer
Date Issued: 20th February 2015
Status: Final
Reference: 69160/001

	P1	P2	P3
Actions	0	0	0
Overall Audit Opinion	High Assurance		



Summary and Overall Conclusions

Introduction

Performance Management is a key contributor to the National Park Authority being held to account for its use of resources and the quality of the services it provides. It should help them drive improvement and understand how well it is doing in terms of delivering their Corporate Plan.

Our corporate objective relating to performance management is:

“Be a well run public body with proportionate and effective ways of working, delivering excellent customer service and living our values, with an associated success factor of: we have received an unqualified opinion from our external auditors on our financial statements and governance arrangements”.

Our service level action in relation to performance management under this is:

“Manage the provision and interpretation of timely and appropriate performance and risk information (facilitating forward planning, decision making and improvement)”.

In addition, a set of ‘family performance indicators’ are collected annually by all the English National Parks to show a collective assessment of progress – and for benchmarking purposes.

Objectives and Scope of the Audit

The purpose of the audit is to provide assurance to management that the controls it has put in place to manage key risks relating to Performance Management are effective.

The audit will assess the following key controls to ensure that:

- the performance management framework is robust and is linked to the authority’s objectives;
- targets set in relation to objectives are challenging and realistic;

- data collected in relation to performance indicators is both timely and accurate;
- poor performance is acted upon and appropriate action taken.
- performance data is compared against that of similar organisations

Key Findings

The key findings of the audit were that:

- A clearly defined and structured Performance Management Framework is in place. It is clearly linked to the Peak District National Park objectives that are detailed in the 5-year Management Plan.
- Targets examined appear to be realistic and challenging and are well monitored.
- Data used in the measuring of Performance is accurate, collected in a timely manner and suitably internally validated before being submitted. Data is also verified externally by other NPA representatives.
- Both good performance results and poor performance findings are well reported. , and
- Performance data is well managed and compared against other similar organisations where possible to do so. It is acknowledged that in some cases each National Park is unique so similar comparisons are not always possible.

Overall Conclusions

It was found that the arrangements for creating and managing Performance Management data were good and an effective control environment appears to be in operation, therefore no recommendations were made.

Our overall opinion of the controls in place at the time of the audit was that they provided **High Assurance**

Annex 1

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.