

CIPFA

The Chartered Institute of
Public Finance & Accountancy

fraud and corruption tracker

Summary Report 2019



**CIPFA COUNTER
FRAUD CENTRE**

Contents

3	Foreword
4	Introduction
5	Executive summary
6	Main types of fraud – Council tax – Disabled parking (Blue Badge) – Housing – Business rates
12	Other types of fraud – Adult social care – Insurance – Procurement – No recourse to public funds/welfare assistance – Payroll, recruitment, expenses and pension – Economic and voluntary sector support and debt – Mandate fraud and manipulation of data
16	Serious and organised crime
17	Sanctions
17	Cyber fraud
18	Whistleblowing
18	Counter fraud structure
19	Joint working/data sharing
20	Fighting Fraud and Corruption Locally
21	Recommendations
22	Appendices

Foreword



Rob Whiteman
Chief Executive, CIPFA

As stewards of public money, it's the responsibility of each and every public sector organisation to take an active role in the fight against corruption, bribery and fraud. The impact of financial crime on the public sector is enormous. The diversion of funding from vital public services undermines public trust, financial sustainability, organisational efficiency and makes the vulnerable people in our communities that much worse off.

The CIPFA Fraud and Corruption Tracker (CFaCT) aims to provide a current national picture of public sector fraud and corruption for local authorities and to help identify counter fraud actions that must be taken. The report's findings provide valuable insights designed to help counter fraud practitioners in local government better understand national trends and emerging risks.

This publication is part of CIPFA's commitment to support the public sector and promote the principles of strong public financial management and good governance. Not only do our findings shed valuable light on the fraudulent activities happening in public organisations across our country, but they also showcase the important role that counter fraud measures play in the larger fight against fraud and corruption.

The findings from the 2019 CFaCT survey should not be understated. Understanding the emerging risks that similar sectors face can help organisations in the broader public sector increase their individual awareness, collaborate more effectively and take tailored action to prevent illegal activity from growing in the public sphere.

By working together, all agencies involved in protecting public resources can improve clarity and efficiency in tackling fraud. Ultimately the improved outcomes that result will benefit all communities.

The survey was supported by:



The CIPFA Counter Fraud Centre

The CIPFA Counter Fraud Centre (CCFC) was launched in 2014. Building on CIPFA's 130-year history of championing excellence in public finance management, we offer a range of products and services to help organisations detect, prevent and recover fraud losses. We support the national counter fraud and anti-corruption strategy for local government, Fighting Fraud and Corruption Locally and were named in the UK Government's 2014 Anti-Corruption Plan and in the 2017–22 Anti-Corruption Strategy as having a key role to play in combating corruption, both within the UK and abroad. Through the annual CFaCT survey, we lead on measuring and monitoring fraud, bribery and corruption activity across local government.



Acknowledgements

CIPFA would like to thank all the organisations that completed the survey along with those that helped by supporting, contributing insights and best practices, including:

- Local Government Association
- Home Office
- The Fighting Fraud and Corruption Locally board


Introduction

CIPFA recognises that each pound lost to fraud represents a loss to the public purse and reduces the ability of the public sector to provide services to people who need them. According to the Annual Fraud Indicator 2017, which provides the latest set of government sanctioned estimates, fraud costs the public sector at least £40.3bn annually, £7.8bn of which is specifically in local government.

Fraud is a widespread cause of concern in the public sector and remains a constant financial threat to local authorities. This is an ongoing issue in the sector and partners such as the Local Government Association (LGA), the National Audit Office and the Home Office actively work towards new ways of finding solutions to the challenges unique to government.

CIPFA conducted its fifth annual CFaCT survey in May 2019, with the aim of creating a national picture of the types of fraud and amount prevented or detected in local authorities. The results were received from local authorities in all UK regions, allowing CIPFA to estimate the total figures for fraud across England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Response rate





This report highlights the following:

- the types of fraud identified in the 2018/19 CFaCT survey
- the monetary cost of fraud in 2018/19
- the impact of counter fraud and prevention activities to improve the public sector budget
- the emerging risks and threats impacting the fraud and corruption landscape.



Executive summary

For local authorities in the UK, CIPFA has estimated that the total value of fraud detected or prevented in 2018/19 is approximately £253m, averaging roughly £3,600 per fraud case. In 2017/18 there was an estimated value of £302m with a similar average of £3,600 per case detected or prevented.



The decrease in the total value can be largely attributed to the successful work by public authorities in housing, which has seen a year-on-year reduction in the total number of unlawfully sublet properties and false right to buy applications.


Improvements in the review of allocations and applications by many local authorities have limited the risk of new fraud cases and strengthened overall degrees of prevention. Together with low rates of tenancy turnover associated with the current social housing stock, this prevention strategy has been highly effective.

Councils reported that approximately 71,000 instances of fraud had been detected or prevented in 2018/19, which is lower than the approximate 80,000 reported by CIPFA in 2017/18. Council tax fraud represents 78% of these identified instances of fraud with an estimated value of £30.6m followed by disabled parking concession (Blue Badge scheme) and housing frauds representing 10% and 5% of the total cases of UK public sector fraud, respectively.

The area that has grown the most in the last year is council tax single person discount (SPD) with an estimated increase of £3.6m since 2017/18.

The three highest perceived fraud risk areas for 2018/19 remain unchanged from the previous iteration of this survey: procurement, council tax SPD and adult social care respectively.

Survey results show that nationally, the primary perceived issue that respondents think needs to be addressed to effectively tackle the risk of fraud and corruption is capacity – ie sufficient counter fraud resource. Better data sharing and effective fraud risk management follow as secondary and tertiary areas for improvement. Results from respondents have shown that they expect to increase the number of counter fraud specialist staff by 9% over the next year, a continuation of an upward trend for employing counter fraud specialists in councils.



In the last year, the value of fraud detected and prevented by local authorities in the UK was

£253m



Major fraud areas

For 2018/19, the CFaCT survey has shown that the four main areas of fraud (by volume) that local authorities are tackling are:

- council tax
- disabled parking (Blue Badge)
- housing
- business rates.



Council tax

Council tax has continued to be the largest area of identified fraud over the last three years and is the top fraud risk for districts and unitaries, 43% and 26%, respectively. Although the volume is significantly higher when compared to other fraud risk areas, council tax does not represent the highest cumulative value amongst all surveyed types of fraud, estimated to total £30.6m. This high volume/low value continues to be a leading trend each year.

Table 1: Estimated council tax fraud

	2016/17		2017/18		2018/19	
	Volume	Value	Volume	Value	Volume	Value
SPD	50,136	£19.5m	46,278	£15.8m	44,051	£19.4m
CTR	6,326	£4.8m	8,759	£6.1m	8,973	£7.2m
Other	674	£1.1m	2,857	£4.5m	2,831	£4.0m
Total	57,136	£25.5m	57,894	£26.3m	55,855	£30.6m

The total number of detected and prevented fraud cases for council tax fell in 2018/19 after rising in previous years. However, the average values of frauds, especially for SPD, has risen resulting in an increase in the total value.

55,855

instances of council tax fraud amounted to



£30.6m

in the last year



Disabled parking (Blue Badge)

The survey has identified misuse of the Blue Badge scheme as one of the fraud risk areas that is increasing steadily. Although the number of cases has nearly halved since last year, the national estimated average value per case has increased from £499 to £657 in 2018/19. Although this value does not include cases with a normal cancellation upon death of the individual, the increase is likely to continue with new criteria in guidance released by the Department for Transport and Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG).

This guidance states that the Blue Badge scheme now extends to individuals with less 'visible' disabilities, such as dementia or anxiety disorder – one of the biggest changes to the scheme in nearly 50 years. These extended criteria came into effect in August 2019 and coincide with the launch of a new task force to aid local authorities in the prevention and detection of Blue Badge fraud.¹

This indicates that although procurement, council tax SPD and adult social care are identified nationally as the three main fraud risk areas,

Blue Badge fraud is an area of increasing risk and prominence.

Due to the varying nature of cases and local authorities' individual calculation methods, at present there is no standard means of calculating the value of Blue Badge fraud. It is challenging to directly compare the value of fraud cases detected/prevented across all UK authorities.

For example, Greater London authorities place a higher value against the fraud loss in comparison to other local authorities, with an average value of £3,340 per case compared to counties who had an average of £260 per fraud case; this is partially due parking fees being much higher in Greater London.



Fraud from the misuse of the Blue Badge scheme is a fraud area that is steadily increasing.



The average case of Blue Badge fraud has increased from **£499** to **£657**



¹ www.gov.uk/government/news/review-of-blue-badge-fraud-as-scheme-is-extended-to-those-with-hidden-disabilities



Housing and tenancy fraud

In relation to housing fraud, councils record the income lost using different valuations that can range from a notional cost of replacing a property to the average cost for keeping a family in bed and breakfast accommodation for a year. These different approaches make it challenging to formulate clear comparisons. On a national scale, the value of fraud detected or prevented is considered in the two following ways:

- if the cases were pertaining to new-build accommodation
- if the cases were pertaining to temporary accommodation.

Table 2: Estimated housing fraud

Type of fraud	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
	Volume	Volume	Volume
Right to buy	1,284	1,518	652
Illegal sublet	1,829	1,051	826
Other*	2,825	2,164	2,154
Total	5,938	4,733	3,632

*Other includes tenancy frauds that are neither right to buy nor illegal sublet, and may include succession and false applications.

3,632

instances of housing fraud
occurred in the UK last year



In cases regarding new-build accommodations an average of £150k per fraud case is applied, compared to £18k for cases regarding temporary accommodations. This can be further explored by examining the comparison by tier (see Table 2).

There has been a steady downward trend in the number of housing and tenancy related frauds detected/prevented, decreasing by roughly 20% year-on-year. This trend likely indicates successful efforts by local authorities to tackle housing fraud and remove illegally sublet properties from the system.



Business rates

Business rate fraud represents 2% of the total estimated number of fraud cases detected or prevented in 2018/19. This represents a marginal increase from the previous year's figure of 1.7% and is reflected in the fact that councils reported it as the fifth highest fraud risk area on a national scale and third highest specific to districts.

Examples of business rates fraud include fraudulent applications for exemptions, tax

relief and the failure to list properties as being a business address. It often takes a visit from someone in the fraud team to discover the truth.

Even with the increased percentage overall, the estimated loss decreased to £8m from £10m the previous year.

Business rate fraud represents



2%

of all detected and prevented cases of fraud in the UK

Other types of fraud

This section of the report examines survey responses related to other notable types of fraud that did not emerge as major types of fraud within the national picture. This section includes the following fraud types, among others²:

- adult social care
- insurance
- procurement
- no recourse to public funds/welfare assistance
- economic and voluntary sector support and debt
- payroll, recruitment, expenses and pension
- mandate fraud and manipulation of data.



Adult social care

Table 3: Estimated adult social care fraud

Type of fraud	2016/17		2017/18		2018/19	
	Volume	Value	Volume	Value	Volume	Value
Personal budget	264	£2.7m	334	£3.2m	234	£9.6m*
Other	182	£2.8m	403	£3.5m	246	£4.1m
Total	446	£5.5m	737	£6.7m	480	£13.7m*
Average value per fraud		£12k		£9k		£29k*

*Please note that this figure is inflated by a small number of authorities and though it is not comparable, it shows the scope of fraud possible in this area.

In 2018/19, there was a reversal of the trend of a steady decline in the average value per fraud of adult social care. In 2018/19 the average value of personal budget fraud increased, primarily as a result of a small number of very high value frauds identified in two councils. Excluding these cases, the decline in the value and volume of personal budget frauds continued. Other fraud also showed a decline in numbers of cases identified but the average value increased.

² An explanation of each fraud can be found in the Glossary on page 23.



Insurance fraud

This year's survey reports an estimated number of 318 insurance fraud cases, valued cumulatively at £12.6m. In comparison to the previous year, both the estimated volume and value of insurance fraud cases in the UK more than doubled.

Respondents who identified insurance fraud also reported two confirmed insider fraud cases with a combined value of £43k.

Local authority insurance fraud cases included in this survey are a mixture of both one-off,

high-value employer liability claims (such as injury at work) and frequent, low-value public liability claims (such as 'slips and trips' or property damage).

Through pro-active risk management, many risks faced by councils are being effectively identified, treated and managed. In turn, these actions have led to more effective controls and better review and management of red flags against high risk claims, contributing to higher levels of fraud prevention or detection.



Procurement fraud

For the third year in a row, procurement fraud is seen as the highest fraud risk area. Services are constantly being procured by councils and fraud can take place at any point in the supply chain, making it difficult to both detect and measure especially once a contract has been awarded. Councils also undertake large value infrastructure and regeneration projects, usually subjected to outsourcing. As councils are responsible for the funding of these large projects, when procurement fraud does occur the sums can be significant.

This year, there was an estimated number of 125 prevented or detected procurement frauds with 12% of cases reported being insider fraud and 5% classified as serious and organised crime. This is a continued decline from 142 estimated fraudulent cases with a value of £5.2m in 2017/18 and 197 cases with a value of £6.2m in 2016/17.

Table 4: Estimated procurement fraud

2016/17		2017/18		2018/19	
Volume	Value	Volume	Value	Volume	Value
197	£6.2m	142	£5.2m	125	£20.3m*

*Please note this figure is attributable to mainly one organisation and though it is not comparable to other respondents, it shows the scope for fraud in this area.

This year, there was an estimated number of

125

prevented or detected procurement frauds.

Over the past 12 months MHCLG has been leading a review into the risks of fraud and corruption in local government procurement as committed to in the UK Government's Anti-Corruption Strategy 2017-2022.



Welfare assistance and no recourse to public funds

In 2018/19, the estimated number of fraud cases related to welfare assistance dropped significantly to 24. In 2017/18 and 2016/17 there were an estimated 109 and 74 cases, respectively. The scope for the volume of cases authorities can receive in this area was demonstrated last year where the average number of cases per authority was over three times the level identified in 2018/19.

2018/19 saw the number of no recourse to public funding cases fall to an estimated 148, down from an estimated 334 cases in the previous year. This decline can possibly be attributed to fewer respondents detecting/preventing fraudulent activity in this area.



Economic and voluntary sector (grant fraud) and debt

The number of grant fraud cases reported by local authorities responding to the survey has reduced to six cases with an average value per fraud loss of approximately £4,000. In the 2016/17 survey, there were 17 actual cases of grant fraud reported, which increased in 2017/18 to 24 cases with an average estimated loss of £14,000 per case.

The number of debt cases reported has increased to 53, and is valued at over £495,000 this year, compared to 38 reported cases in 2017/18 valued at over £150,000. This year, both the number and value of debt fraud cases increased, despite a decline in the survey's response rate. This might indicate that debt fraud likely has a higher scope for fraudulent activity than previously expected.



The number of grant fund fraud cases reported by local authorities has gone down to six.





Payroll, expenses, recruitment and pension

The total value of the fraud loss for these four areas in 2018/19 was an estimated £9.42m. This figure was inflated by one incident of payroll fraud that was prevented by an authority and though it is not comparable on a national basis, it reflects the scope of fraud for this area.

Measuring the cost of these frauds can be quite difficult as they carry implications that include reputational damage, the costs of further recruitment and investigations into the motives behind the fraud. This could indicate that some organisations are less likely to investigate or report investigations in these areas.


Payroll has had the highest volume and value of fraud out of these four areas (payroll, expenses, recruitment and pension) for every year since 2016/17. Recruitment fraud has the second highest with an estimated average per case of £11,381.

Table 5: Estimated payroll, expenses, recruitment and pension fraud

Type	2016/17		2017/18		2018/19	
	Volume	Value	Volume	Value	Volume	Value
Payroll	248	£1.0m	167	£1.01m	168	£8.77m*
Expenses	75	£0.1m	34	£0.03m	32	£0.04m
Recruitment	46	£0.2m	52	£0.49m	33	£0.38m
Pension	228	£0.8m	164	£0.57m	153	£0.23m
Total	597	£2.1m	417	£2.1m	386	£9.42m*

*Please note this figure is attributable to mainly one organisation and though it is not comparable to other respondents, it shows the scope for fraud in this area.

Changes in fraud volume



Manipulation of data (financial or non-financial) and mandate fraud

CIPFA estimates that across the UK in 2018/19 there were 34 cases of manipulation of data fraud, which is an increase from the estimated cases in 2017/18 following a dip compared to the year before that.

There were 322 estimated cases of mandate fraud in 2018/19 compared to 257 estimated cases detected or prevented in 2017/18.

Serious and organised crime

Organised crime often involves complicated and large-scale fraudulent activities which cross more than one boundary, such as payroll, mandate fraud, insurance claims, business rates and procurement. These activities demand considerable resources to investigate and require organisations to co-operate in order to successfully bring criminals to justice.

The 2018/19 survey identified 24 cases of serious and organised crime, a decrease from the 56 in 2017/18 which had doubled from the year before that. All of this year's cases come from metropolitan, districts, London boroughs and counties. This may indicate that larger and more complex authorities bear a greater risk of being targeted by serious and organised crime. The responses show that councils share a significant amount of data both internally and externally,

with 72% sharing data with the Cabinet Office/ National Fraud Initiative, 52% sharing data with the police and 49% sharing data with their peers (other councils).


Of the organisations that responded, 35% identified serious and organised crime within their organisation's risk register.



Sanctions

The following shows some of the key findings from sanctions that are being used in CFaCT 2018/19:

- 674 prosecutions were completed in 2018/19. Of these 17 involved insider fraud and 14 of those insider fraud cases were found guilty.
- The number of cautions increased from 9% in 2016/17 to 13% in 2017/18 but reduced to 7% in 2018/19.
- The percentage of other sanctions dropped from 53% in 2016/17 to 46% in 2017/18 but increased to 55% in 2018/19.



Cyber fraud

Results from the CFaCT survey show that 74% of respondents last underwent a cyber/e-fraud risk assessment during or after 2018/19 and 78% state that the IT team/senior information risk owner is responsible for the management of cyber risk in their organisation.

Twenty seven percent of respondents stated that their organisation had been a victim of hacking/distributed denial of service attacks in the last month.

In response to the threat of cybercrime against local government, the LGA has set up a Cyber Security Programme and a stakeholder group, working to address the issues.

The LGA's Cyber Security Programme received three years of funding from the National Cyber Security Programme (NCSP) in 2018 to help councils remain safe from cyber attacks and put appropriate arrangements in place to deal effectively with a cyber incident should it occur, ie both prevention and response.

Whistleblowing

This year, 67% of respondents said they annually reviewed their whistleblowing arrangements in line with BS PAS 1998:2008 Whistleblowing Arrangements Code of Practice. Councils also named other codes of practices with which they are aligning.

Of those questioned, 86% confirmed that staff and the public had access to a helpdesk and 70% said that the helpline conformed to the BS PAS1998:2008.


Respondents reported a total of 755 whistleblowing cases logged, made in line with

BS PAS 1998:2008, representing disclosures in all areas – not just with regard to suspected fraudulent behaviour. This is an average of six cases logged per authority, double last year's average of three per authority. Responses showed that the majority of cases were logged by London councils and metropolitan districts.

Counter fraud structure

Fraud teams across local government continue to detect and prevent a significant amount of fraud, although counter fraud resource is the main perceived issue that need to be addressed to tackle fraud. Councils are responding to this perceived need and expect the number of counter fraud specialist staff to grow by around 9% in the next year, followed by a small increase in 2021.


Counter fraud structure breakdown



Adopting a shared services structure is increasingly popular and this year it was reported that 19% of respondents have such a structure compared to 14% last year. Some smaller authorities have likely adopted this approach for its associated resiliency and cost efficiency.

There has been a decrease in authorities that have a dedicated counter fraud team – from 51% in 2017/18 to 40% in 2018/19. However, it is worth noting there may be a potential bias in this figure as those who have a dedicated counter fraud team are more likely and able to return data for the CFaCT survey.

The number of available in-house qualified financial investigators has increased from 31% in 2017/18 to 44% in 2018/19. In addition, the percentage of authorities that have a non-Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) qualified financial investigator increased from 23% in 2017/18 to 25% in 2018/19. However, the number of authorities that don't have a qualified financial investigator available to their organisation has increased from 41% last year to 43%.



Joint working/data sharing


Eighty-nine percent of survey respondents have stated that they share data internally, mainly with housing, council tax and revenue/benefits departments.

Ninety-six percent of local authorities share data externally which is an increase of 2% from 2017/18. This data is mainly shared with Cabinet Office/National Fraud Initiative (72%), police (57%), other authorities/similar organisations (55%) and the DWP (50%).


The sort of data that is shared relates to persons of interest, areas of interest and emerging frauds. Some authorities also highlighted that the kind of data they share is for data-matching purposes.

Of the CFaCT respondents, 72% say they work jointly with other similar organisations/peers, 52% work with the police and 49% with the DWP. Further breakdown is shown in the following chart.

Share/exchange data with:




Work jointly with:



Fighting Fraud and Corruption Locally

The Fighting Fraud and Corruption Locally (FFCL) Strategy 2016-2019 was developed by local authorities and counter fraud experts and is currently being reviewed. It is the definitive guide for local authority leaders, chief executives, finance directors and all those with governance responsibilities.



This strategy is available for councils to use freely, so that everyone can benefit from shared good practice, and is aimed at local authority leaders. It provides advice on how to lead and communicate counter fraud and corruption activity for the greatest impact, as well as covering resource management and investment in counter fraud operations.

To measure the effectiveness of its 2016-2019 strategy, the FFCL board includes questions in the CFaCT survey. The questions ask respondents whether they agree or disagree that their organisation is carrying out certain actions, based on FFCL recommendations. The diagram to the left illustrates the results; lines closest to the outside edge indicate strong agreement while those towards the centre indicate disagreement.



The FFCL strategy is the definitive guide for local authority leaders. Everyone can benefit from good practice.



Recommendations

CIPFA recommends

- **The cumulative value of fraud prevented/detected by local authorities has declined year-on-year.** Public sector organisations must remain vigilant and determined in identifying and preventing fraud throughout their procurement processes.
- **This year's findings show that shared services counter fraud structures are becoming more popular amongst authorities.** Effective practices for detecting and preventing fraud should be shared and adopted across the sector. Fraud prevention should be embedded in 'business as usual' across an entire organisation to improve the effectiveness of preventative measures.
- **Although the number of qualified investigators has increased over the past year, the survey shows a decline in the number of authorities with a dedicated counter fraud team.** All staff, across all public sector work functions, should receive fraud awareness training in order to better identify fraud risks, fraud attempts and implement effective controls.
- **According to respondents, a lack of adequate counter fraud resources is the main perceived issue that needs to be addressed to effectively tackle fraud.** All organisations should ensure that they have strong counter fraud leadership at the heart of senior decision-making teams. Fraud teams and practitioners should be supported in presenting business cases to resource their work effectively.
- **The survey shows that the overwhelming majority of authorities share data externally, however vast discrepancies exist among the organisations that receive that shared data.** Public sector organisations should continue to maximise opportunities to share data and to explore innovative use of data, including sharing with law enforcement bodies and third party experts.
- **In the past year, 89% of local authorities shared fraud-related data internally.** Where counter fraud functions are decentralised within an authority, counter fraud leads should ensure effective inter-departmental collaboration (ie between housing, IT (cyber security), revenues, etc). For some authorities, necessary collaboration could be achieved through the formation of a counter-fraud working group.
- **In-line with the FFCL Strategy 2016-2019,** the importance of the fraud team's work should be built into both internal and external communication plans. Publicly highlighting a zero tolerance approach can work to improve the reputation and budget position of authorities.



The importance of the fraud team's work should be built into both internal and external communications plans. ”

Appendix 1: Fraud types and estimated value/volume

The table below shows the types of frauds reported in the survey and the estimated volume and value during 2018/19.

Types of fraud	Fraud cases	% of the total	Value	% of the total value	Average
Council tax	55,855	78.9%	£30.6m	12.1%	£548
Disabled parking concession	6,951	9.8%	£4.6m	1.1%	£657
Housing	3,632	5.1%	£135.6m	53.6%	£37,332
Business rates	1,404	2.0%	£7.7m	3.0%	£5,455
Other fraud	616	0.9%	£6.0m	2.4%	£9,779
Adult social care	480	0.7%	£13.7m*	5.4%*	£28,534*
Schools frauds (excl. transport)	391	0.6%	£0.7m	0.3%	£1,893
Mandate fraud	322	0.5%	£4.7m	1.8%	£14,506
Insurance claims	318	0.5%	£12.6m	5.0%	£39,636
Payroll	168	0.2%	£8.8m*	3.5%*	£52,270*
Pensions	153	0.2%	£0.2m	0.1%	£1,498
No recourse to public funds	148	0.2%	£1.4m	0.6%	£9,483
Procurement	125	0.2%	£20.3m*	8.0%*	£161,565*
Debt	77	0.1%	£0.6m	0.2%	£7,278
Manipulation of data	34	0.1%	na	na	na
Recruitment	33	0.1%	£0.4m	0.2%	£11,381
Expenses	32	0.1%	£0.0m	0.0%	£1,124
School transport	31	0.0%	£4.8m	1.9%	£154,601
Welfare Assistance	24	0.0%	£0.0m	0.0%	£1,824
Children social care	19	0.0%	£0.4m	0.2%	£22,076
Economic and voluntary sector support	14	0.0%	£0.1m	0.0%	£4,005
Investments	2	0.0%	na*	na*	na*

*The figures for investments are not available as only one response was received and thus the amount is not representative of the national average. The other figures in this table are affected by a small number of councils that had high value frauds not indicative of the national average.

Appendix 2: Methodology

This year's results are based on responses from 142 local authorities. An estimated total volume and value of fraud has been calculated for all local authorities in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. Missing values are calculated according to the size of the authority and for each type of fraud an appropriate universal measure of size has been selected, such as local authority housing stock for housing frauds.

From the responses, the number of cases per each unit of measurement is calculated and used to estimate the missing values. Then, for each missing authority, the estimated number of cases is multiplied by the average value per case provided by respondents to give an estimated total value. As an illustration, if the number of housing

frauds per house is 0.01 and a missing authority has 1,000 houses in its housing stock, we estimate the number of frauds as 10. If the average value per case is £100,000 then the total estimated value of fraud for that authority is £1m.

Appendix 3: Glossary

Definitions below are taken from CIPFA's CFaCT survey, the Annual Fraud Indicator and other government sources.

Adult social care fraud:

Adult social care fraud can happen in a number of ways but the increase in personal budgets gives a greater opportunity for misuse.

Investigations cover cases where:

- direct payments were not being used to pay for the care of the vulnerable adult
- care workers were claiming money for time they had not worked or were spending the allocated budget inappropriately.

Blue Badge:

The Blue Badge is a Europe-wide scheme allowing holders of the permit to parking concessions which are locally administered and are issued to

those with disabilities so they can park nearer to their destination.

At present, a badge issued to a deceased person is classified as fraudulent, even if it is not being used for fraudulent purposes.

Business rates fraud:

Business rates fraud is not a transparent landscape for the fraud investigator, with legislation making it difficult to separate evasion and avoidance. Business rate fraud may include the fraudulent applications for exemptions and reliefs and unlisted properties, and fraud staff may be used to visit properties in question.

Cautions:

Cautions relate to a verbal warning given in circumstances where there is enough evidence to prosecute, but it is felt that it is not in the public interest to do so in that instance.

Council tax fraud:

Council tax is the tax levied on domestic properties and collected by district and unitary authorities in England and Wales and levying authorities in Scotland.

Council tax fraud is split into three sections:

- Council tax single person discount – where the council tax payer claims for occupiers who don't exist they are the only occupant eligible to pay.
- Council tax reduction support – where the council tax payer fails to declare their income correctly.
- Other types of council tax fraud – eg claims for exemptions or discounts to which the council tax payer has no entitlement.

Debt fraud:

Debt fraud includes fraudulently avoiding a payment of debt to an organisation, excluding council tax discount.

Disciplinary outcomes:

Disciplinary outcomes relate to the number of instances where as a result of an investigation by a fraud team, disciplinary action is undertaken, or where a subject resigns during the disciplinary process.

Economic and voluntary sector (grant fraud):

This type of fraud relates to the false application or payment of grants or financial support to any person and any type of agency or organisation.

Housing fraud:

Fraud within housing takes a number of forms, including sub-letting for profit, providing false information to gain a tenancy, wrongful tenancy assignment and succession, failing to use the property as the principle home abandonment, and right to buy.

Insurance fraud:

Insurance fraud includes any insurance claim that is proved to be false, made against the organisation or the organisation's insurers.

Mandate fraud:

Action Fraud defines mandate fraud as "when someone gets you to change a direct debit, standing order or bank transfer mandate, by purporting to be an organisation you make regular payments to, for example a subscription or membership organisation or your business supplier".

Manipulation of data fraud:

The majority of manipulation of data frauds relate to employees changing data in order to indicate better performance than actually occurred and staff removing data from the organisation. It also includes individuals using their position to change and manipulate data fraudulently or in assisting or providing access to a family member or friend.

No recourse to public funds:

No recourse to public funds prevents any person with that restriction from accessing certain public funds. A person who claims public funds despite such a condition is committing a criminal offence.

Organised crime:

The widely used definition of organised crime is one planned, co-ordinated and conducted by people working together on a continuing basis. Their motivation is often, but not always, financial gain.

Payroll fraud:

Payroll fraud covers a wide range of areas such as ghost employees on the payroll, diversion of payments into fraudulent accounts, employees set up to receive higher salaries than they are entitled to by either grade or hours worked and false overtime claims.

Procurement fraud:

The procurement of goods and services often accounts for a significant proportion of an organisation's expenditure and is open to a wide range of potential fraud risks. This is because there are usually multiple individuals involved in a process who often do not work closely together: ie the person who wants something purchased does not always work directly with the people who initiate orders and with those responsible for paying.

This includes any fraud associated with the false procurement of goods and services for an organisation by an internal or external person(s) or organisations in the 'purchase to pay' or post contract procedure, including contract monitoring.

Recruitment fraud:

Recruitment fraud includes applicants providing false CVs, job histories, qualifications, references, immigration status (ie the right to work in the UK) or the use of a false identity to hide criminal convictions or immigration status.

Right to buy:

Right to buy is the scheme that allows tenants that have lived in their properties for a qualifying period the right to purchase the property at a discount. Fraud is committed when an applicant has made false representations regarding the qualifying criteria, such as being resident in the property they are purchasing for a 12 month continuous period prior to application.

Welfare assistance:

Organisations have a limited amount of money available for welfare assistance claims so the criteria for applications are becoming increasingly stringent. Awards are discretionary and may come as either a crisis payment or some form of support payment.

Whistleblowing:

Effective whistleblowing allows staff or the public to raise concerns about a crime, criminal offence, miscarriage of justice or dangers to health and safety in a structured and defined way. It can enable teams to uncover significant frauds that may otherwise have gone undiscovered. Organisations should therefore ensure that whistleblowing processes are reviewed regularly.



Registered office:

77 Mansell Street, London E1 8AN

T: +44 (0)20 7543 5600 F: +44 (0)20 7543 5700

www.cipfa.org

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy.
Registered with the Charity Commissioners of England and Wales No 231060

