



Internal Audit Progress Report – April 2026.

The Head of Internal Audit is required to provide a written status report to Senior Management and the Committee, summarising internal audit activity.

Table of contents

- Role of Internal Audit3
- The purpose of the report.....4
- Performance dashboard.....5
- Analysis of 'live' audit reviews7
- Executive summaries limited and no opinions11
- Planning and resourcing.....12
- Appendix 1 – Overdue management actions.....14

Role of Internal Audit

The requirement for an internal audit function in local governance is detailed within the Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2015, which states that a relevant body must:

'Undertake an effective internal audit to evaluate the effectiveness of its risk management, control and governance processes, taking into account public sector internal auditing standards and guidance.'

The standards relevant for the financial year 2025/26 relating to proper practices are laid down in the Global Internal Audit Standards, 2024 and the Application Note: Global Internal Audit Standards in the UK Public Sector, 2025.

The role of internal audit is best summarised through the purpose statement contained within the Standards, which states:

"Internal audit strengthens the organisation's ability to create, protect, and sustain value by providing the board and management within independent, risk-based and objective assurance, advice, insight and foresight.

Internal auditing enhances the organisation's:

- *Successful achievement of its objectives.*
- *Governance, risk management and control processes.*
- *Decision-making and oversight.*
- *Reputation and creditability with their stakeholders.*
- *Ability to serve the public interest.*

Internal audit is most effective when:

- it is performed by competent professionals in conformance with the GIIA Standards, which are set in the public interest.
- The internal audit function is independently positioned with accountability to the board.
- Internal auditors are free from undue influence and committed to making objective assessments.

The Council's response to internal audit activity should lead to the strengthening of the control environment and, therefore, contribute to the achievement of the organisation's objectives.

The Purpose of the Report

In accordance with the proper internal audit practices (Global Internal Audit Standards), and the Internal Audit Charter, the Head of Internal Audit is required to provide a written status report to Senior Management and Members summarising:

- the status of live internal audit reports.
- an update on progress against the internal audit plan.
- a summary of internal audit performance, planning and resourcing issues; and
- a summary of significant issues that impact on the Head of Internal Audits annual opinion.

Internal audit reviews culminate in an opinion rating on the assurance that can be placed on the effectiveness of the framework of risk management, control and governance designed to support the achievement of management objectives of the service area under review. Assurance opinions are categorised as follows:

Substantial A reliable system of governance, risk management and control exist, with internal controls operating effectively and being consistently applied to support the achievement of objectives in the area audited.

Adequate There is a generally reliable system of governance, risk management and control in place. Some issues of non-compliance or scope for improvement were identified which may put at risk the achievement of objectives in the area audited.


Limited Significant gaps, weaknesses or non-compliance were identified. Improvement is required to the system of governance, risk management and control to effectively manage risks to the achievement of objectives in the area audited.

No Immediate action is required to address fundamental gaps, weaknesses or non-compliance identified. The system of governance, risk management and control are inadequate to effectively manage risks in the achievement of the objectives for the area audited.

Internal quality assurance checks are undertaken at multiple points throughout assurance and advisory reviews. This culminates in the Head of Internal Audit signing off each audit report prior to its release which includes the approval of the final assurance award. This approach provides consistency in assurance ratings and robustness in the level of assurance the committee can take from assurances.

Performance Dashboard

Figure 1



Feedback is an essential aspect of our internal quality assurance programme. Post audit feedback questionnaires (PAQs) are issued after every audit assignment. For completed 2025/26 audits officers provided feedback responses to ten of the ten requests issued following completed audit assignments. The feedback when broken down was 102 Excellent, 26 Very Good, 1 Good and 1 Poor response.

Figure 1 summarises the feedback received from the following reviews risk register, ICT cyber security, leisure services, Section 106, health and safety actions, capital budget monitoring, PSPS contract management, administration of grants, Identification and Monitoring of Savings

feedback from the advisory review relating to values. As demonstrated by the data, the majority of feedback received has been positive. The poor graded feedback concerns the ICT cyber security review delivered by a specialist third party, was discussed at the November audit committee.

Figure 2 audit plan delivery




Figure 2 the internal audit plan is progressing as expected, with 100% of the plan completed by the end of quarter four. Tracking processes have been a focus for development during the current year along with improving and communicating the importance of tracking delivery and performance. The delivery model has delivered efficiency as a result of improvements made.

This financial year to date as seen the internal audit team adequately resourced to deliver the agreed audit plan, advisory engagements, and follow-up activity. The team utilised contingency within the annual audit plan to address risk-based needs arising during the year. In addition, the team continued to enhance its advisory function with the intention to and raise awareness and sharing lessons learned to support strong governance, effective risk management, and robust control processes.

There has been no recruitment during the current year as the team has no vacancies. All senior auditors are supervised by a qualified and skilled principal auditor. Management and quality processes have been sufficient to monitor conformance with the IIA’s Global internal Audit Standards and CIPFA’s Application Notes.

Analysis of ‘live’ Audit Reviews

Table 1

Internal audits in progress				
Assignment Area	Audit Profile	High Level Risks	Completion Due	Audit Sponsor

Table 2

Draft internal audit reports issued, awaiting management responses				
Assignment Area	Report due to Committee	Management Responses Overdue	Assurance Rating	Audit Sponsor

Final internal audit reports completed		
Assignment Area	Assurance rating	Findings Summary
Identification and monitoring of savings	Insufficient Controls	The audit was unable to establish sufficient first or second-line controls to test for adequacy and fulfil the agreed assignment scope to provide a reliable assurance rating. Seven key findings were reported with five root causes identified. The recommendations included for management to take immediate action to implement effective, formal and management led controls to provide a foundation level for the control environment and that an assurance driven audit is rearranged to provide an update on systems and processes implemented. A repeat audit will be undertaken once sufficient controls have been implemented. This anticipated to be in quarter four.
Risk Register Review	Adequate	The review identified one high, four medium and one low rated finding requiring management action to address. Risk register for Boston Borough Council met core requirements, but several risk entries lacked measurable outcomes, assigned ownership, and strategic objective alignment. Controls and mitigations were inconsistently recorded, with no formal validation process or assessment of effectiveness. Risk appetite was referenced but not formally defined or applied. Training records were unavailable due to the absence of a central tracking system. While oversight, by the Audit Committee and senior leadership was evident, report formats and executive summaries were often unclear or overly detailed. Strengthening

		documentation, formalising risk appetite, and improving strategic alignment and oversight would enhance risk management effectiveness.
ICT Cyber Security	Adequate	The review identified five medium rated findings requiring management action to address. Cyber security controls across Boston Borough Council were generally well-managed, supported by a formal strategy, ICT roadmap, and structured governance. The IT team had defined roles and processes, with cyber risks reviewed and reported appropriately. A successful ransomware simulation and appropriate network monitoring were noted. Testing identified the absence of documented procedures for threat escalation, undefined remediation timescales, and unresolved vulnerabilities without senior approval. Threat scanning intervals did not align with vendor guidance, and oversight reports lacked full visibility of identified risks. Addressing these areas would strengthen cyber resilience and assurance.
Values (Advisory)	N/A	The review identified seven key findings. Internal Audit identified that Boston Borough Councils commitment to its values framework through the workforce development strategy, though its revision for 2025/26 was delayed. Testing identified that values were not consistently linked to staff conduct codes, and the workforce strategy lacked provisions for accountability or consequences. Induction processes did not include a standard checklist for values training, limiting assurance. Communication methods varied, with some staff missing key information, and appraisals did not require reflection on values. Delays in completing appraisals further hindered performance discussions. Strengthening links between values, conduct, and performance processes would improve consistency and accountability.
Capital Budget Monitoring	Adequate	The review identified one medium rated finding requiring management action to address. Internal audit testing confirmed that updates to the capital budget monitoring process, completed in preparation for the 2025/2026 financial year, had been implemented effectively in Quarter one. Meetings with budget holders were documented using software, and agreed actions were recorded on SharePoint for monitoring, with relevant mitigations completed. Outcomes of these meetings were shared with Assistant Directors, and regular discussions were held with the Section 151 Officer regarding the position of budgets within the capital programme. Audit testing evidenced a clear audit trail for amendments to capital budgets, in line with financial regulations and procedures at each council. The Section 151 Officer had developed guidance for the 2026/2027 budget-setting process, including a review of the capital programme to ensure future revenue impacts were considered. The Capital Monitoring Team operated at full capacity, and further development was planned to ensure all expenditure was included in monitoring. Overall, internal audit testing confirmed that key risks relating to capital budget monitoring were managed effectively.
PSPS Contract Management	Adequate	The review identified eight medium and one low rated finding's requiring management action to address. Audit testing confirmed that the contract had been monitored by the Shareholder Board, Stakeholder Board, and Client Liaison Group, attended by councillors and officers from the partner councils and PSPS. KPIs were in place within individual Service Level Agreements and monitored through regular

		liaison, with systems established to ensure compliance with TECKAL guidance. A medium risk relating to the PSPS relationship was recorded in the partnership risk register, although one council's operational register did not include PSPS-related risks. The audit noted ongoing reviews of resourcing in finance and service delivery in light of potential Local Government Reorganisation changes. Separation of duties existed for PSPS Board members; however, not all councillor board members had declared their roles in published interests. While specific contract management was not in place, governance arrangements covered key elements effectively, though some internal controls required strengthening to maintain effectiveness.
Leisure Services Procurement	Substantial	No findings were identified during the review. Audit testing confirmed full compliance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 during Stages 1 and 2 of the procurement, with legal scrutiny applied at each stage and governance evidenced through senior leadership oversight, member briefings, and Joint Scrutiny Committee involvement. Documented procedures and templates had been followed, and evidence showed clear segregation of duties across procurement design, bid evaluation, legal review, and decision-making. Whistleblowing arrangements were in place across the councils and PSPS, reducing bias and supporting impartiality in line with Regulation 24. Testing of Stage 3 found no issues, and the procurement was expected to conclude within anticipated timelines, meeting regulatory requirements and strategic objectives. Overall, substantial assurance was provided that controls and processes for managing the procurement were operating effectively.
Section 106	Adequate	The review identified five medium rated findings requiring management action to address. Internal audit testing confirmed that documentation for the allocation of s106 funds was accurate and supported by regular stakeholder engagement. Monitoring records aligned with published Infrastructure Funding Statements (IFS) as required under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, and budget monitoring was integrated with financial reporting. However, the statutory deadline for IFS publication was missed at ELDC and BBC, and s106-related risks were not formally recognised within operational risk registers. Delays in implementing the Uniform planning system also affected progress towards aligning planning processes across the partnership. While key risks were managed effectively, internal audit identified areas where controls could have been strengthened.
Administration of Grants	Adequate	The review identified four medium rated findings requiring management action to address. Audit testing confirmed that grant income had been accurately coded, aligned with expenditure, and fully reconciled across all three councils. Sampled grants were compliant with all terms and conditions and had complete audit trails from award to year-end reporting, with required returns submitted to oversight bodies. Although key controls had been operating effectively, the audit identified areas for improvement, including clearer responsibility assignments, more standardised monitoring, better continuity planning, and the need for a centralised grants register and stronger risk oversight. Good practice was noted in the preparation and review of Note 32 working papers, particularly at SHDC and BBC.

Health and Safety Actions	Adequate	The review identified four medium and one low rated finding requiring management action to address. The review identified that the Partnership had strengthened oversight of Health and Safety actions through a shared action tracker, regular clinics and improved reporting to SLT, which enhanced accountability and closure evidence. Controls had been operating effectively, though inconsistent update timeliness, informal escalation routes and the lack of a formal training or reporting framework indicated where further standardisation was needed. The tracker and clinics had improved monitoring and communication across all three councils, and interviews showed growing ownership of H&S responsibilities. Recent improvements and closer collaboration with PSPS and council leadership demonstrated a proactive approach to embedding more consistent and robust H&S practices.
Planning	Adequate	<p>The review identified one high, one medium and two low rated findings requiring management action to address. The review found that the SELCP Planning Service had established effective governance, statutory processes, and performance monitoring, with overall performance meeting national standards. All councils had adopted Local Plans, but each had exceeded the required review period, and one council did not have a five-year housing land supply, which increased planning appeal risks.</p> <p>Shared service transition arrangements had been put in place, although documentation of wider staff feedback and the accuracy of recorded mitigation actions required improvement. Monitoring of the Planning Guarantee had relied on manual processes due to system limitations, though no breaches were identified. The planned implementation of automated reporting within the new system was expected to strengthen assurance and reduce risk.</p>
ICT AI Governance	Adequate	<p>The review identified three medium and three low rated findings requiring management action to address. The review found that the Partnership had an emerging but effective framework for governing AI and automation, supported by clear policies, oversight arrangements, and DPIAs for higher-risk automated processes. AI use had been limited to low-risk, assistive tools, and informal governance had worked effectively in practice, with no data protection breaches identified.</p> <p>However, this informal approach had led to inconsistent awareness and limited central visibility of AI use, including early impacts such as AI-generated correspondence. The audit concluded that improvements were needed in operational guidance, service-level oversight, risk management, and training. Lower-risk tools had been managed through proportionate information governance processes, which would require ongoing review as AI adoption increased.</p>
Disability Facilities Grants	Adequate	The review identified one medium and two low rated findings requiring management action to address. The review found that the Partnership had effective controls in place for managing DFGs, with policies, clear approval processes, and appropriate checks throughout grant administration. Sample testing showed grants had been processed in line with statutory requirements.

		<p>Although some legacy systems and varied documentation remained, key controls had operated effectively through system workflows, manual approvals, and management oversight. As the service continued integrating, improvements were needed in inspection verification and standardising documentation and workflow processes.</p> <p>Overall, the control framework had worked well for the stage of integration reached, with further system unification expected to strengthen consistency and governance.</p>
Finance Resilience including Skills Capacity and Management Code Compliance	Adequate	<p>The review identified one high and seven medium rated findings requiring management action to address. The review found that the PSPSL Finance Service had operated effective financial management and controls across SELCP, supported by appropriate governance and performance monitoring arrangements. While senior management oversight supported operational delivery, workforce planning and capability arrangements had not been formally assessed or embedded within a structured control framework.</p> <p>Skills development, professional assurance, and workforce planning processes were underdeveloped, and the finance service level agreement was outdated. Overall, the control environment had been adequate, but improvements had been required to strengthen workforce planning, capability monitoring, and professional assurance arrangements.</p>

Executive Summaries of ‘Limited’ or ‘No’ Assurance Opinions

There has been one finalised limited or no assurance awarded for April to March 2026.

Identification and Monitoring of Savings	Limited	<p>The review identified three medium rated findings requiring management action to address. Audit testing found that since the completion of the previous audit in quarter 1 of 2025/26, a governance process has been implemented to deliver monitoring and oversight of the required savings in 2026/27. Members of the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and the Section 151 Officer were actively involved. As 2026/27 is the first year of the new process, there is currently limited assurance over the effectiveness and consistent embedding of the new methodology, and a residual financial risk remains over delivery of savings until it is fully tested.</p> <p>Testing of the 2026/27 budget setting process for the three councils found that no efficiency targets were required within the balanced budgets for the forthcoming year. Internal work had been completed to reduce potential deficits that were presented for scrutiny in two of the councils in January 2026.</p> <p>The audit also identified that although processes are in place to monitor savings, there is no formally documented escalation process for any savings proposals that are not on schedule to be delivered within the year.</p>
------------------------------------------	---------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Planning and Resourcing

Table four shows delivery progress against the annual audit plan agreed by the Committee in March 2025.

Table five shows delivery progress for advisory engagements. The team retain a flexible approach to regularly reviewing our plan to ensure we can respond adequately to the council’s risk needs and profile should that change mid-year and agree to share changes or amendments with the audit committee along with risk-based rationale and any arising implications.

The audit team is adequately resourced to deliver the remainder of the audit plan for 2025/26. An annual report and opinion will be presented to the audit committee in July 2026 which will include all outcomes. It is expected the audit programme will be delivered in its entirety and will be sufficient to inform the annual audit opinion.

Table 4 – Audit plan delivery

Audit Review	Audit Sponsor	Scoping	Audit Objective	Fieldwork	Draft Report	Final Report	Assurance Opinion or Equivalent
ASSURANCE WORK 2024/2025							
Risk Register Review	Monitoring Officer	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Adequate
Capital Budget Monitoring	S151 Officer	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Adequate
ICT Cyber Security	AD Corporate	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Adequate
Identification and Monitoring of Savings	S151 Officer	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Insufficient Controls Report
PSPS Contract Management	S151 Officer	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Adequate
Leisure Services Procurement	AD Leisure & Local Services	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Substantial

Administration of Grants	S151 Officer	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Adequate
Section 106	AD Planning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Adequate
Health and Safety Actions Implementation	Director of Communities	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Adequate
Planning	AD Planning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Adequate
Finance Resilience including Skills Capacity and management Code Compliance	Section 151 Officer	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Adequate
ICT AI Governance	AD Corporate	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Adequate
Identification and Monitoring of Savings	S151 Officer	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Limited
Disability Facilities Grants	AD Communities and Housing Services	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Adequate

Table 5 – Advisory assignment delivery

Audit Review	Audit Sponsor	Scoping	Audit Objective	Fieldwork	Draft Report	Final Report	Assurance Opinion or Equivalent
ASSURANCE WORK 2024/2025							
Values	Monitoring Officer	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Not Applicable

Appendix 1 Overdue management actions

Table 6 below shows all actions now under internal audit management and oversight. During quarter four, follow up reviews are to be conducted covering 12 management actions. 58 actions were not due at the time of extracting the data. The audit team have improved follow up procedures now that the team are proficient in assessing the adequacy and effectiveness of management actions. A programme of delivery is in place to provide the committee with the residual risk should management actions remain outstanding after the agreed implementation date, or if actions fail to mitigate the finding and associated risk to the council.

Future reports will inform the committee should any dates be delayed by management alongside their rationale.

Table 6 All Management Actions

Audit Year	Audit	Audit Report Date	Audit Sponsor	Assurance Opinion	Management Actions Total	Management Actions - Closed	Management Actions - Not Due	Management Actions - Follow Up Required	Open Management Actions - Risk Analysis			
									Critical	High	Medium	Low
2021/22	Boston BC - Key Controls	Jun-22	S151 Officer	Substantial	6	5	1	0	0	0	1	0
2024/25	Budget Monitoring - Revenue	Mar-25	S151 Officer	Adequate	4	3	1	0	0	0	1	0
2024/25	Capacity, Aims and Priorities	Apr-25	AD, Corporate	Adequate	4	3	1	0	0	0	1	0
2024/25	Insurance	Jan-25	S151 Officer	Limited	8	6	2	0	0	2	0	0
2024/25	Towns Fund	May-25	Director, Econ Dev	Adequate	4	1	3	0	0	0	3	0
2024/25	Housing Benefits and Council Tax Support	Nov-24	S151 Officer	Substantial	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
2025/26	Risk Register Review	Jul-25	AD, Governance	Adequate	6	0	6	0	0	1	4	1
2025/26	ICT Cyber Security	Aug-25	AD, Corporate	Adequate	5	4	1	0	0	0	1	0
2025/26	Capital Budget Monitoring	Sep-25	S151 Officer	Adequate	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
2025/26	Section 106	Oct-25	AD, Planning	Adequate	5	0	5	0	0	0	5	0
2025/26	PSPS Contract Management	Oct-25	S151 Officer	Adequate	9	0	9	0	0	0	8	1
2025/26	Health and Safety Actions	Jan-26	Director, Communities	Adequate	8	0	8	0	0	0	8	0
2025/26	Grants Administration	Jan-26	S151 Officer	Adequate	4	0	4	0	0	0	4	0
2025/26	Disabled Facilities Grants	Mar-26	AD, Communities and Housing Services	Adequate	3	0	3	0	0	0	1	2
2025/26	AI Governance Review	Mar-26	AD, Corporate	Adequate	6	0	6	0	0	0	3	3
2025/26	Identification of Savings - 2nd R	Mar-26	S151 Officer	Limited	3	0	3	0	0	0	3	0
2025/26	Planning	Mar-26	AD, Planning	Adequate	4	0	4	0	0	1	1	2
TOTAL					75	17	58	0	0	4	45	9