Annex 2

Protecting the London Public Purse
Fraud Briefing 2015

Kingston Council
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
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 London boroughs taking part in the voluntary survey. London boroughs submission rate: 93.9%. 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.
Total detected cases and value (excluding Tenancy fraud)

Your council - Total number of detected cases: 42. Total detected value: £1,648,000.

London borough average per council – Detected cases: 604. Detected value: £1,876,446.
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?
Your council - Total number of detected cases: nil. Total detected value: nil.

Tenancy fraud
(only councils with housing stock)

Your council - Total number of recovered properties: 20

London borough average per council – Recovered properties: 57
Right to Buy fraud

Your council - Total number of detected cases: 11. Total detected value: £1,100,000.

Your council - Total number of detected cases: 16.

London borough average per council – Detected cases: 26.

NB It is difficult to calculate the value of Blue Badge fraud. However, fraud causes social, as well as financial, harm – particularly the undermining of public confidence in public services.
Other frauds

**Procurement fraud**
Your council - Total number of detected cases: nil.
London borough average per council – Detected cases: 1. Detected value: £40,694.

**No recourse to public funds fraud**
Your council - Total number of detected cases: nil.

**Social care fraud**
Your council - Total number of detected cases: nil.
London borough average per council – Detected cases: 1. Detected value: £16,453

**Insurance fraud**
Your council - Total number of detected cases: nil.
London borough average per council – Detected cases: 1. Detected value: £20,453.

**Economic and third sector fraud**
Your council - Total number of detected cases: nil.
London borough average per council – Detected cases: 1. Detected value: £16,189.

**Internal fraud**
Your council - Total number of detected cases: 3. Total detected value: £500.
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

The PEPP report 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;
• LBFIG; or
• TEICCAF and the PEPP report, please contact Kevin Campbell-Scott, chair of LBFIG at chair@lbfig.org, or Duncan Warmington, Secretary to the TEICCAF Board at duncanw@teiccaf.com