

# Protecting the English Public Purse Fraud Briefing 2015

## Lancaster City Council

Sponsored by



# Purpose of Fraud Briefing

1. Provide an information source to support councillors in considering their council's fraud detection activities
2. Extend an opportunity for councillors to consider fraud detection performance, compared to similar local authorities
3. Give focus to discussing local and national fraud risks, reflect on local priorities and the proportionate responses needed
4. Be a catalyst for reviewing the council's current strategy, resources and capability for tackling fraud

Sponsored by

# About TEICCAF

## *The European Institute for Combatting Corruption And Fraud*

Not for profit charity seeking to provide counter fraud and corruption strategic vision and thought leadership for public sector and charity organisations

Staffed by the former Audit Commission Counter Fraud Team

Continuation of expertise on the fraud risks facing councils

Continuation of the award winning '*Protecting the Public Purse*' reports

Working collaboratively with public sector bodies, charities and private companies across the UK, Europe and around the World

Sponsored by



# Understanding the bar charts

All data are drawn from council submissions for the TEICCAF annual fraud and corruption survey for 2014/15

Your council is compared with the other district councils across the North West and Yorkshire & the Humber taking part in the voluntary survey (NB there are no district councils in the North East)

*National district council submission rate: 59.7%*

*English councils surveyed submission rate: 59.5%*

*(County councils, district councils, metropolitan districts & unitary authorities and London boroughs)*

**Your council for detected cases is shown in Yellow**

**Your council for detected value is shown in Red**


All averages are 'mean' averages

In some cases, council report they have detected fraud and do not report the number of cases and/or the value - for the purposes of this fraud briefing these 'Not Recorded' records are shown as Nil

*NB it is always best practice to ensure counter fraud activity is accurately and comprehensively recorded, particularly for assessing fraud risk*

Sponsored by

# Total detected cases and value (excluding tenancy fraud)



**Your council - Total number of detected cases: 84. Total detected value: £171,506.**

**Comparator council average – Detected cases: 81. Detected value: £170,657.**

Sponsored by

# Housing benefit (HB) and council tax benefit (CTB)

The investigation of benefit fraud is transferring from councils to the Department for Work and Pensions Single Fraud Investigation Service (SFIS)

Some councils have already transferred their benefit fraud investigators to SFIS, the remaining councils should have done so by March 2016


This makes the comparison of HB/CTB of little value, as some council did not investigate HB/CTB in 2014/15, or others only a part of the year

However, you may wish to ask:

- Does my council have enough counter fraud resource to tackle non-benefit fraud post SFIS?
- Does my council's counter fraud resource have the skill sets to tackle the wide and varied range of non-benefit frauds?
- Is there a partnership working arrangement available that helps provide a counter fraud resource and value for money?

Sponsored by

# Council tax discount fraud




**Your council - Total number of detected cases: nil. Total detected value: nil.**

**Comparator council average – Detected cases: 11. Detected value: £6,094.**

Sponsored by

# Tenancy fraud

*(only councils with housing stock)*




Your council - Total number of recovered properties: nil

Comparator council average— Recovered properties: 1

Sponsored by



# Right to Buy fraud



**Your council - Total number of detected cases: nil. Detected value: nil**

**Comparator council average – Detected cases: nil. Detected value: nil.**

Sponsored by

# Other frauds

## Procurement fraud

Your council - Total number of detected cases: nil.

Comparator council average – Detected cases: 1. Detected value: £921.

## No recourse to public funds fraud

Your council - Total number of detected cases: nil.

Comparator council average – Detected cases: nil. Detected value: nil.

## Business rates

Your council - Total number of detected cases: nil.

Comparator council average – Detected cases: nil. Detected value: nil.

## Internal fraud

Your council - Total number of detected cases: nil.

Comparator council average – Detected cases: 1. Detected value: £1,031.

Sponsored by

# Further information and support

The 'Protecting the English Public Purse 2015' (PEPP) report and the 'Protecting the London Public Purse 2015' (PLPP) report are available at [www.teiccaf.com](http://www.teiccaf.com)

These reports also contain a counter fraud checklist for councils to use – questions you may wish to ask:

- Are local priorities reflected in our approach to countering fraud?
- Have we considered counter-fraud partnership working?
- Are we satisfied that we will have access to comparative information and data to inform our counter-fraud decision making in the future?

If you have any questions concerning:

- this fraud briefing;
- TEICCAF; or
- how TEICCAF can support you in counter fraud, counter corruption and anti-money laundering?

Please contact Duncan Warmington, Secretary to the Board at [duncanw@teiccaf.com](mailto:duncanw@teiccaf.com)

TEICCAF, and our sponsor, 'INTEC for business', hope you found this fraud briefing useful and encourage your council to participate in the 2015/16 TEICCAF annual fraud and corruption survey

Sponsored by