Title of the Audit: Glasgow City Region City Deal – Business Continuity and Resilience

1. Introduction

- 1.1 As part of the agreed Internal Audit Plan, we have undertaken a review across the City Region PMO and member authorities to consider their response and capability to adapt to the challenges presented by the pandemic, specifically in relation to their City Deal programme.
- 1.2 The review included discussion with key officers, a review of evidence, and a short self-assessment by representatives of the PMO and member authorities of their organisation's response to the pandemic, and ability to continue to operate to deliver projects should a business continuity event occur in the future.
- 1.3 The purpose of the audit was to gain assurance that the member authorities developed robust arrangements to adapt to challenges which emerged due to the pandemic, while ensuring that key roles and functions relating to their City Deal programme operated, and will continue to operate, effectively to deliver projects. The scope of audit included a review of:
 - Incident management arrangements, including where appropriate, business continuity plans, disaster recovery plans and business impact assessments;
 - Roles and responsibilities of key officers and teams;
 - Communication, reporting and governance arrangements;
 - Record keeping;
 - Renewal and recovery measures, and
 - Lessons learned exercises and actions.

2. Audit Opinion

2.1 Based on the work carried out a reasonable level of assurance can be placed upon the control environment. The audit has identified scope for improvement in existing arrangements and three recommendations which management should address.

3. Main Findings

- 3.1 We are pleased to report that key controls are in place and generally operating effectively. In general, member authorities reported that arrangements that were in place prepandemic, such as agile working, allowed them to respond to the pandemic in a manner which minimised disruption to the City Deal programme (notwithstanding delays outwith their control, such as construction site lockdowns). Three of the member authorities reported lessons learned exercises had been carried out with recommendations made to improve their recovery and their ability to respond to future incidents.
- 3.2 Each member authority had arrangements in place to keep staff informed during the pandemic, and communication with stakeholders was maintained. Governance and decision-making arrangements were maintained as project board meetings moved online, an action that was reported to have increased participation. All member authorities also confirmed that record keeping arrangements were successfully maintained.

- 3.3 However, our audit testing found that there are some areas where improvements could be made. We identified that business continuity plans (BCPs) are in place and largely covered the critical functions relevant to the City Deal Programme, however the information, detail and format within them vary to large degrees between the member authorities.
- 3.4 From a review of the BCPs provided we identified that four of the nine plans were overdue for review. All member authorities hold BCPs on their network drives accessible to relevant staff however three of the member authorities advised that backup paper copies were not held.
- 3.5 An action plan is provided at section four outlining our observations, risks and recommendations. We have made three recommendations for improvement. The priority of each recommendation is:

Priority	Definition	Total
High	Key controls absent, not being operated as designed or could be improved. Urgent attention required.	0
Medium	Less critically important controls absent, not being operated as designed or could be improved.	1
Low	Lower level controls absent, not being operated as designed or could be improved.	2
Service Improvement	Opportunities for business improvement and/or efficiencies have been identified.	0

- 3.6 The audit has been undertaken in accordance with the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards.
- 3.7 We would like to thank officers involved in this audit for their cooperation and assistance.
- 3.8 It is recommended that the Head of Audit and Inspection submits a further report to Cabinet on the implementation of the actions contained in the attached Action Plan.

No.	Observation and Risk	Recommendation	Priority	Management Response
Var. C				
	control: BCPs clearly identify the requirements of ea			Γ=
1	We identified that business continuity plans (BCPs)	The Region PMO should develop more	Medium	Response:
	are in place at each of the member authorities	detailed guidance on the key content		PMO to issue detailed guidance to
	however the format, level of detail and information	expected within each of the member		Lead Officers and to include this is
	within them vary to large degrees between the	authorities' BCPs which are applicable to		within the Programme Management
	member authorities. Examples of information	City Deal projects.		Toolkit
	included in some but omitted from others includes			
	the listing of key IT systems, contact details for			Officer Responsible for
	internal and external stakeholders, and version			Implementation:
	control. As some member authorities have City			Assistant Head Glasgow City
	Deal project teams rather than established			Region City Deal Programme
	departments, City Deal is not explicitly mentioned			Management Office
	within their BCPs.			
				Timescale for Implementation:
	The City Deal Assurance Framework sets out the			30 th November 2021
	requirement for member authorities to maintain			
	their own BCPs but does not mandate their			
	content.			
	The clear identification of resources required,			
	interdepartmental dependencies and the			
	prioritisation for the restoration of functions within			
	each member authority facilitates better decision			
	making if BCPs are enacted.			
	BCPs which do not clearly identify the			
	requirements of each City Deal team increase the			
	risk that the response to incidents will be delayed			
	or incomplete.			

No.	Observation and Risk	Recommendation	Priority	Management Response	
Key C	Key Control: BCPs are subject to regular review.				
2	From a review of the BCPs provided we identified that four of the nine plans provided by member authorities were overdue their anticipated date of next review. Appropriate review allows BCPs to be updated and adapted to the needs of the authority and lessons learned to be incorporated into them. This increases the risk that BCPs are not updated to reflect changes within the member authorities.	authorities of the importance of ensuring that BCPs are reviewed and updated at appropriate intervals.	Low	Response: PMO to issue annual reminder to Lead Officers regarding BCP reviews. Officer Responsible for Implementation: Assistant Head Glasgow City Region City Deal Programme Management Office Timescale for Implementation:	

No.	Observation and Risk	Recommendation	Priority	Management Response	
Key C	Key Control: BCPs are accessible to staff.				
3	All member authorities hold BCPs on their network drives accessible to relevant staff. Three of the member authorities advised that backup paper copies were not held. Without paper copies or off network copies member authorities are reliant on network availability. There is a risk that a network failure will reduce member authorities' ability to respond promptly and effectively to incidents which require BCPs to be invoked.	authorities to put arrangements in place to	Low	Response: PMO to issue detailed guidance to Lead Officers and to include this is within the Programme Management Toolkit Officer Responsible for Implementation: Assistant Head Glasgow City Region City Deal Programme Management Office Timescale for Implementation: 30th November 2021	