

Clause No. 1 in Report No. 1 of the Audit Committee was adopted, without amendment, by the Council of The Regional Municipality of York at its meeting held on February 20, 2014.

1

AUDIT SERVICES BRANCH REPORT

Audit Committee recommends adoption of the recommendation contained in the following report dated January 15, 2014 from the Director of Audit Services:

1. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that this report be received for information.

2. PURPOSE

This report provides an update on the activities of the Audit Services Branch since the last Audit Committee meeting.

Attachment 3, Tables C and D, follow-up of outstanding audit points are private attachments as they address concerns regarding the security of the property of the Region.

3. BACKGROUND

On October 11, 2000, the Audit Committee approved the development of the Audit Services function through the report of the Chief Administrative Officer. The Audit Committee Charter indicates the Audit Committee is to meet at least twice a year. In practice, the Audit Committee usually meets three times a year to receive updates on the activities of the Audit Services Branch.

4. ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS

Audit Plan Execution

The Audit Services Branch has been actively executing the approved 2012 – 2014 Three Year Audit Plan and other consulting engagements. A summary of the activities since the previous Audit Committee meeting is outlined in *Attachment 1*.

Audit Reports Issued

The audit reports issued since the last Audit Committee meeting are:

- Finance – Owner Controlled Insurance Program (OCIP) Audit Report (*Attachment 2*)
- Outstanding Audit Recommendations Follow-Up Audit Report (*Attachment 3*)

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

None.

6. LOCAL MUNICIPAL IMPACT

None.

7. CONCLUSION

A follow-up of outstanding audit recommendations for audit reports issued prior to December 31, 2013 indicates that management remains cognisant and active in implementing Audit Services recommendations.

Audit Services continues to work with Region management at all levels to provide them with an independent, objective assurance and consulting activity designed to add value and improve the Region's operations. Audit Services does this by bringing a systematic, disciplined approach to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of risk management, control, and governance processes through guidance provided by the *International Standards for the Professional Practise of Internal Auditing*.

Attachments (3)

YORK REGION AUDIT SERVICES BRANCH ACTIVITIES

Project Name	Status
1. Owner Controlled Insurance Program	➤ Completed
2. Outstanding Audit Recommendations Follow -Up	➤ Completed
3. Steering Committee – ACL review	➤ Completed
4. Corporate Services – POA Courts Audit	➤ In progress
5. C&HS – Controls over Fictitious Clients Audit	➤ In progress
6. Management Request – Rapidco Review	➤ In progress
7. Management request – Review of Water Metering and Billing Processes	➤ In progress
8. Transportation and Community Planning – Audit of Capital Projects	➤ In progress
9. Various Fairness Monitoring Projects	➤ In progress
10. Steering Committee – HRIMS and Payroll Review	➤ Advisory role
11. Member – Corporate Mobile Strategy Working Group	➤ Advisory role
12. ITS Governance – Portfolio Management Committee	➤ Advisory role
13. York Region Audit Services staff volunteer their time and collectively hold the following positions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair, Treasurer and Director of the Canadian Association of Local Government Auditors • Member, Association of Local Government Auditors Association Awards Committee and Advocacy Committee 	➤ Volunteer Association work



***Finance - Owner Controlled Insurance
Program (OCIP) Audit Report***

December 2013

Table of Contents

1.0	MANAGEMENT SUMMARY	2
2.0	INTRODUCTION.....	2
3.0	OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE	4
4.0	DETAILED OBSERVATIONS	5
4.1	FINANCE SHOULD REPORT THE USE OF AN OCIP PROGRAM TO REGIONAL COUNCIL.....	5
4.2	DEVELOPMENT OF SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS UNDER A SEPARATE OCIP (NON BLANKET OCIP).....	5
4.3	DEVELOPING REGULAR REPORTING FOR OCIP RELATED PROJECTS TO ENSURING CONSISTENT REPORTING FROM THE CLAIMS & CERTIFICATE REPORTING (CCS) SYSTEM.....	6
4.4	THE CURRENT I&RM POLICY SHOULD BE UPDATED TO INCLUDE THE REGION'S USE OF OCIPS.....	6
4.5	AMOUNTS OWED BY CONTRACTORS RELATING TO OCIP CLAIM COSTS SHOULD BE DEDUCTED FROM PAYMENTS TO CONTRACTORS TOGETHER WITH INTEREST PENALTY CHARGES (FOR LATE PAYMENTS) ..	7
4.6	I&RM SHOULD ENSURE DATA ENTERED INTO CCS IS ACCURATE AND COMPLETE, SO AS TO ALLOW FOR INCREASED INTERNAL REPORTING, AND POTENTIALLY EXTERNAL REPORTING TO OTHER REGION DEPARTMENTS	8
4.7	RECONCILING INVOICED INSURANCE CLAIMS REIMBURSEMENT FROM CONTRACTORS TO CCS	8

1.0 Management Summary

We have completed an audit of the Insurance and Risk Management (I&RM) OCIP program. I&RM operates within the Finance – Treasury Office.

Our audit was conducted in accordance with the *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing*.

We have concluded that the OCIP program for eligible capital projects has had an estimated premium dollar savings to the Region of \$4.692 million since inception in 2007. However, additional detailed cost and benefit analysis needs to be performed by I&RM in order to establish a reporting method that could be used to report the health of the OCIP program on a periodic basis to Regional Council.

Observations were also noted relating to the creation of service level agreements (SLAs), updating OCIP program documentation and collection of aged receivables.

Should the reader have any questions or require a more detailed understanding of the risk assessment and sampling decisions made during this audit, please contact the Director, Audit Services.

Audit Services would like to thank I&RM staff and management for their co-operation and assistance provided during the audit.

2.0 Introduction

In 2007, as part of Finance's efforts to increase the Region's control and risk protection over projects, and garner savings in insurance costs and claims, an OCIP program was piloted for one capital delivery project. The OCIP pilot program required the Region to determine, obtain and pay for the insurance coverage required for the project. In the past, the Region determined the amount of coverage, and the contractor was responsible for the cost of the premiums.

There were numerous learnings that resulted from that pilot. In order for the OCIP program to operate more effectively, there needed to be:

- Increased communications with the capital delivery team.
- Better definition of the role of the project manager in the handling of a potential claim.
- Better explanation of the structure of how an OCIP worked.
- Adjustment to the deductible required for the contractor. Contractors are still required to carry commercial general liability insurance. For most capital projects the deductible is \$25,000 per occurrence.
- The creation of a blanket OCIP for regular capital and general infrastructure capital projects, and separate OCIPs for higher risk projects, i.e. for projects involving waterways, tunneling.

I&RM has attempted to resolve these issues through various methods, including Corporate Learning and Workforce Development courses, and more recently, an OCIP Workgroup Committee to identify ongoing and new issues being experienced by capital delivery personnel.

The first capital delivery project covered under the OCIP was valued at \$54 million. As of September 2013 there are approximately 28 capital delivery projects worth \$2.293 billion insured under this program. Depending upon the types of risks being incurred, the project may be covered by a blanket OCIP or a specific OCIP tailored to the project’s specific risk characteristics, i.e. tunneling or involving waterways.

Audit Services surveyed eight Canadian municipalities on their usage of OCIPs. Responses were received from four municipalities, none of which had performed a cost savings analysis on their OCIP program. Some had discontinued the program altogether. All four cited difficulties with developing an analysis from which cost savings could be quantified, and some questioned the reality of cost savings.

For five recent capital delivery projects put to tender (in 2012 and 2013), bidders were requested to submit a bid assuming the Region would be responsible for the cost of insurance for the project. For those same tenders, bidders were also requested to stipulate an amount the Region could add to the original bid assuming the bidder would be responsible for the insurance requirements. A comparison of all eligible bids submitted for these five recently awarded capital projects calculated an average savings of 1.0% of capital project cost, when comparing Region purchased insurance versus contractor purchased insurance.

A comparison of the premiums paid by the Region for five recently awarded capital projects against premiums in bid documents submitted by the awarded bidders noted a savings of 27.9% of premium costs if the insurance was obtained by the Region. Using this calculated percentage savings and detailed insurance premium cost information obtained from I&RM, Audit Services was able to extrapolate the savings over all capital delivery projects under the blanket and non-blanket OCIP programs at September 2013 to be approximately \$4.692 million, or .20% of contract value.

<i>Project coverage</i>	<i>Contract value of capital project</i>	<i>Region’s insurance premiums cost</i>	<i>Extrapolated contractor insurance premiums cost (27.9%)</i>	<i>Difference</i>	<i>Extrapolated savings as a % of contract values</i>
Blanket OCIP	\$175,268,346	\$661,233	\$917,105	\$255,872	.15%
Non Blanket OCIP	\$683,642,000	\$2,999,908	\$4,160,760	\$1,160,852	.17%
Duffin Creek	\$992,357,000	\$1,702,390	\$2,361,151	\$658,761	.06%
SE Collector	\$442,000,000	\$6,762,183	\$9,378,895	\$2,616,712	.59%
Totals	\$2,293,267,346			\$4,692,197	.20%

An OCIP program also creates other costs and benefits that are difficult to quantify:

<i>Costs</i>	<i>Benefits</i>
Increased level of risk being assumed by the Region by undertaking to purchase adequate insurance for projects, i.e. time sensitive projects, misjudging risk	More effective control over the claims process to help ensure any issues are reconciled on a timely basis and injured parties deal with the Region directly
Increased workload for Project Managers and other personnel administering claims, thereby reducing the time spent on other project priorities	Ability to control the level and type of insurance coverage for each project to reduce the risk of inadequate coverage
Difficulty in obtaining all potential cost savings from the contractor relating to not only premiums, but also claims administration	Better control over claims allowing for analysis and learnings that can be applied directly to future risk mitigation, and provide more timely information to management and elected officials
Potentially forgone liquidated damages for late delivery of capital projects if the contractor requires extra time from the Region to complete the project as a result of an OCIP claim	Contractors are still required to carry commercial and general liability insurance with a Region stipulated deductible per occurrence to help ensure claims can be collected back from the contractor

3.0 Objectives and Scope

The objectives of this engagement included:

- Determining if the OCIP program employed by the Region for eligible capital projects is resulting in net savings.

The audit objectives were accomplished through:

- Interviews with select Region staff associated with overseeing the OCIP program; and,
- A review of OCIP related documentation and processes that include: vendor bids, management reports, and claims.

4.0 Detailed Observations

4.1 Finance should report the use of an OCIP program to Regional Council

Observation

The formal adoption of the OCIP program for capital projects has not been reported to Regional Council. Under the current I&RM Policy, the Commissioner of Finance and Treasurer is required to report annually on “any other information that the Treasurer deems important or has been requested by Council to provide”.

In October 2006, Finance reported to Regional Council that an OCIP would be piloted for use in large capital projects. The adoption of the OCIP program as a mainstay, together with the anticipated benefits of increased risk protection and cost savings, were never formally reported back to Council.

The adoption of the OCIP program and its coverage of \$2.293 billion in capital projects, together with anticipated benefits and costs, is of a significant value that it should be reported formally to Regional Council.

Recommendation

The Commissioner of Finance and Treasurer should formally report the adoption of the OCIP program to Regional Council.

Management Response

As part of the update to the Insurance and Risk Management Policy discussed in Recommendation 4.4, details of the adoption of OCIP will be reported to Council during the second quarter of 2014.

4.2 Development of Service Level Agreements for capital projects under a separate OCIP (Non Blanket OCIP)

Observation

There are no service level agreements (SLAs) between Finance - I&RM and Project Managers managing a capital project under a separate OCIP.

Non Blanket capital projects contain certain unique elements: i.e. working close to bodies of water, tunneling, wells nearby, time sensitive delivery date.

A SLA specific to the project, would avoid confusion in responsibilities. When expectations are aligned, claims processing can be better managed, potential project delays avoided, and, consistent management reporting.

Recommendation

It is a best practise to have a SLA when an internal branch provides services to another internal branch. For a Non Blanket OCIP, Finance - I&RM should develop a specific SLA that describes their responsibilities and expectations, together with those of Project Managers.

For capital projects covered under the Blanket OCIP, one standard SLA can be used.

Each SLA should be reviewed and signed by each party. This would help reduce the risks noted above, and help ensure project completion without unnecessary time delays and unexpected insurance costs.

Management Response

A Working Group which includes key stakeholder representation from client groups has been established in order to address OCIP issues. Service Level Agreement templates for both Blanket and Non-Blanket OCIPs will be developed by this group for implementation starting in the second quarter of 2014.

4.3 Developing regular reporting for OCIP related projects to ensure consistent reporting from the Claims & Certificate Reporting (CCS) System

Observation

Insurance activity reporting relating to capital projects under OCIP is not generated on a regular, periodic basis. Ad hoc reports from CCS are available, however they may not be reliable for comparative purposes.

Reliable reporting helps to ensure that management makes decisions based on comparable and complete reports.

Recommendation

I&RM should develop regular OCIP reporting from CCS to help ensure complete and reliable information used for management decision making and program reporting.

Management Response

A standard report in CCS will be developed in order to show claims activity relating to OCIP capital projects. As this involves a programming enhancement to CCS by an outside vendor, it will be addressed as part of the next update to this software application expected in late 2014.

4.4 The current I&RM Policy should be updated to include the Region's use of OCIPs

Observation

The current I&RM Policy does not require regular periodic review and update. Last updated in November 2007, the policy does not include the use of OCIPs as a means to save on costs and mitigate risks associated with major capital projects.

Recommendation

Update the I&RM Policy to include reference to the use of OCIPs.

Require periodic updates of the I&RM Policy, i.e. every five years.

This will help to reduce the risk of outdated reporting requirements and management decision errors relating to insurance.

Management Response

The Insurance and Risk Management policy and its related procedures are reviewed whenever significant changes occur. The current policy is scheduled to be updated during the second quarter of 2014 and will reflect the corporation's use of OCIPs.

4.5 Amounts owed by contractors relating to OCIP claim costs should be deducted from payments to contractors together with interest penalty charges (for late payments)

Observation

OCIP claim costs at October 21, 2013 of approximately \$69,400, and outstanding approximately 218 days on average, have not been reimbursed back to the Region by contractors.

The claim costs include claim payments to injured parties, and any adjuster fees incurred in the processing of the claims. Contractors have disputed the adjuster fees claiming that they should not be responsible for the expense.

The Region has not charged interest penalties on invoiced amounts outstanding. This is contrary to the Collections of Accounts Policy that requires interest be charged at the rate of 1.25%, or 15% annually on all accounts of the Regional Corporation (except Municipalities) that remain unpaid for 30 days after the invoice date.

Recommendation

Finance should:

1. Automatically deduct amounts owed to the Region by a contractor from amounts owed to that contractor.
2. Charge interest penalties on invoiced amounts outstanding to date, and deduct the whole amount from the next payment to the respective contractors.

Management Response

As noted the delays in payments were the result of an ongoing dispute by the contractors over the amounts owed for claims and expenses paid on their behalf. Despite efforts by I&RM to address contractor concerns, the delays have continued and the option of automatically deducting invoiced amounts from payments owed to the contractors by the Region was the subject of ongoing discussions with Legal Services. Based on their advice the outstanding amounts owed will now be deducted starting in second quarter of 2014. The specific procedures to implement this will be developed by the Working Group.

4.6 I&RM should ensure data entered into CCS is accurate and complete, so as to allow for increased internal reporting, and potentially external reporting to other Region departments

Observation

CCS does not produce edit listings from which new information for claims can be verified to source documents. A random selection of 11 claims from a report produced by the CCS application for OCIP related claims for the period January 1, 2012 to September 30, 2013 revealed that three claims were mistakenly identified as OCIP when in fact they were non OCIP.

CCS currently provides limited reporting for I&RM purposes, however there is an OCIP improvement working group that is looking to provide information to project departments. New reports will be developed. Accurate information helps to ensure reports will be not be flawed and correct management decisions are made.

Recommendation

As part of the OCIP improvement project, I&RM should develop edit listings from CCS, or a process by which any information entered, changed or deleted is complete, accurate, authorized and timely.

Accurate information allows for reporting that can be developed for internal use by I&RM, and potentially external use by other departments where risk management is important to their work.

Management Response

An internal procedural change has been implemented that requires new claims files to be returned to the analysts for review and sign-off once opened. In addition the new CCS report identified as part of in Recommendation 4.3 will help ensure OCIP files are properly coded.

4.7 Reconciling invoiced insurance claims reimbursement from contractors to CCS

Observation

Invoices created by I&RM from closed claims data in CCS is not reconciled back to CCS to help ensure all closed claims have been invoiced.

An invoice is created from CCS data when a claim is closed and a contractor needs to be invoiced for the associated costs. CCS does not presently provide reporting from which invoices created can be reconciled to all claims closed within a certain period, i.e. monthly.

Periodic reconciliation will help to ensure that closed claims are not omitted from invoicing and reimbursed by the contractors.

Recommendation

I&RM should investigate the reporting capabilities of CCS to determine if reporting can be created that summarizes closed claims for a certain period, to be used to reconcile to invoices generated through PeopleSoft invoice requisitions.

Management Response

The new report as addressed in Recommendation 4.3 will be designed to include a reconciliation component.

Original signed by

Bill Hughes
Commissioner Finance and
Regional Treasurer

Original signed by

Edward Hankins
Director, Treasury Office

Original signed by

Paul Duggan
Director, Audit Services



***Outstanding Audit
Recommendations Follow up
Audit Report***

February 2014 Audit Committee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page No.
1.0 MANAGEMENT SUMMARY	2
2.0 INTRODUCTION.....	2
3.0 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE	3
4.0 DETAILED OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	4
4.1 DETAIL SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR OUTSTANDING AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWED UP	4

1.0 Management Summary

Audit Services has completed a follow up of outstanding audit recommendations at December 31, 2013. These recommendations are comprised of:

1. Audit recommendations that were noted as 'not yet completed' in our previous outstanding audit recommendations follow up audit report dated October 2013.
2. Any new audit report recommendations issued up to and including December 31, 2013.

There were 23 audit recommendations originally issued through the four audit reports currently on our list for follow up. Prior to this review, six audit recommendation, or 26% had been implemented. From the remaining 17 recommendations, eight have been implemented. At December 31, 2013, nine recommendations, or 39% of the original 23 recommendations issued have not yet been implemented.

For a detailed summary of audit reports followed up and recommendations issued, completed and outstanding, please refer to section 4.0. Additional detail is available upon request from the Director, Audit Services.

2.0 Introduction

As part of our 2013 Audit Plan, which accommodates various types of audit projects, consulting engagements, and follow up requests from Audit Committee and Management, the Audit Services Branch performed a follow up of outstanding audit recommendations. These recommendations included those noted as outstanding in our October 2013 audit recommendations follow up audit report, and all new recommendations issued in audit reports up to and including December 31, 2013.

The Audit Plan, approved by York Region's (the Region's) Audit Committee, is developed annually by the Audit Services Branch using a Risk Assessment Methodology that helps to define the different risks associated with the various processes here at the Region. It is one tool that Audit Services uses in assessing where best to allocate audit resources.

On a periodic basis, Audit Services updates the Regional Audit Committee and the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) on the status of issued audit recommendations. To provide this update, Audit Services contacts Commissioners and Directors to confirm the status of the issued recommendation(s) relating to their area. In some cases, the status is further validated directly by Audit Services through discussions and / or detailed testing. This is an integral part of our audit process that allows us to confirm that the opportunities for improvement outlined in the audit report(s) have been implemented.

Department heads were e-mailed requests containing:

1. A summary of outstanding audit recommendation(s) for their area.
2. A request to provide a status update and a confirmation of the original due date for implementation of the recommendation, or a new anticipated implementation date if necessary.

3. As requested by Audit Committee in November 2008, departments having an audit recommendation outstanding that has an original due date older than one year provide Audit Committee with a separate report as to why the recommendation has not been implemented. Management action plans that detail what is being done to implement the recommendation(s) are to be included.
4. Finally, an Executive Sign-off Form, to be signed by the Commissioner and Director responsible for the implementation of the recommendation(s), was also sent.

Audit reports issued after December 31, 2013 will be followed up in the future.

3.0 Objectives and Scope

The objective for this engagement was:

- To provide feedback to the York Region Audit Committee and CAO, as to the disposition of issued audit recommendations.

The audit scope to accomplish this objective was:

- All outstanding audit recommendations issued prior to December 31, 2013.

4.0 Detailed Observations and Recommendations

4.1 Detail Summary Statistics for Outstanding Audit Recommendations Followed Up

- Table A summarizes the outstanding audit recommendations followed up for this review.
- Table B is a detailed summary of outstanding audit recommendations which were followed up for this review.
- Table C summarizes the outstanding private audit recommendations followed up for this review. (*Private*)
- Table D is a summary of outstanding audit recommendations which were originally presented private and followed up for this review. (*Private*)

TABLE A - Summary of Outstanding Audit Recommendations Follow up as at December 31, 2013

Audit Report	Number of opportunities originally highlighted	Completed for 8/31/12	Completed for 12/31/13	Not yet complete	% Not yet complete	Date of Audit Report	Date Reported to Audit Committee
Finance – Tangible Capital Assets Management	4	2	2	0	0%	Jan-12	Jun-12
Finance – Procurement Card	6	4	1	1	17%	May-13	Jun-13
Finance – Petty Cash	3	0	0	3	100%	Jun-13	Oct-13
TCP – YRT Mobility Plus Contract Compliance	10	0	5	5	50%	Aug-13	Oct-13
Totals	23	6	8	9	39%		

TABLE B – Summary of Outstanding Audit Recommendations as at August 31, 2013

Audit Report	Recommendation	Management response	Original due date	Current due date
Finance				
Tangible Capital Assets (TCA) Management	4.1 A. Finance TCA update the TCA Policy to (a) assign periodic inventory counts to Operational areas and (b) require Operational areas to create formal procedures manuals.	Done.	None	NA
	B. Finance TCA lead a project to help ensure Operations areas develop and maintain formal procedures manuals.	Done. Procedure manuals for all operating departments are done.	Q4 2013	NA
	4.2 Finance TCA help to ensure: 1. C&HS and CS develop an inventory listing. 2. Operational areas develop timetables for periodic physical inventory counts. 3. Operational capital asset registries are reconciled to finance capital asset registry at least annually.	Done.	None	NA
	2. Operational areas develop timetables for periodic physical inventory counts.	Done.	Q4 2012	NA
	3. Operational capital asset registries are reconciled to finance capital asset registry at least annually.	Done. Plans to perform reconciliations have been developed.	Q2 2013	NA
	4.3 Protocols should be developed to allow for consistent and relevant data attributes to be input into the Finance TCA registry.	Done.	Q3 2013	NA
	4.4 1. Review process associated with capitalization of vehicles with Transportation – Roads – Fleet.	Done.	None	NA
	2. Examine other vehicle purchases from 2011, and possibly 2010.	Done.	None	NA

Audit Report	Recommendation	Management response	Original due date	Current due date
Procurement Card	4.1 Procedures should be established to enable the Corporate Administrator to perform random audits. Specific focus should be made on suspense account transactions.	Done. Procedures have been established. Random audits began in October 2013, and will continue commencing Q1 2014.	Q3 2013	NA
	4.2 Add a line to Procurement Card forms to require the authorizer to print their name.	Done	None	NA
	4.3 Ensure card holders sign for their card to ensure they understand and agree to Regional purchasing card policies.	Done	Q2 2013	NA
	4.4 Department administrators should be reminded that failure to comply with purchasing card policy and procedures could result in card revocation.	Done. Audit report was distributed to all attendees at the quarterly administrator meeting in June 2013.	Q2 2013	NA
	4.5 For employees who have not used their purchasing card in 6 months, Department Administrators should confirm to the Corporate Administrator that the card is still needed.	Done. The audit report was incorporated into the revised procedures – this exercise will be carried out every six months.	None	NA
	4.6 Management re-examine the current control environment for procurement cards to determine if more efficient processes can be developed as enhancements to PeopleSoft progress.	The reassessment of the Procurement Card process has been added to the Source to Settlement project, to be implemented over the next three to four years.	2017	2017
Petty Cash	4.1 Cash handling / petty cash policies and procedures should be developed by Finance to centralize controls over cash handling.	Management currently developing policies and procedures.	Q3 2014	Q3 2014

Audit Report	Recommendation	Management response	Original due date	Current due date
	4.2 Centralize documentation and processes to set up, increase, decrease, close, or change custodian petty cash accounts.	Policies and procedures on schedule for Q3 2014.	Q3 2014	Q3 2014
	4.3 Finance should perform surprise cash counts periodically.	Schedule for cash counts was created in Q4 2013. Cash counts to commence Q1 2014	Q4 2013	Q1 2014
YRT – Mobility Plus	4.1 Insurance certificates should be agreed to contract documents, or other related documentation.	Done. An enhanced, formal timeline process with an automated abeyance system has been instituted.	None	NA
	4.2 The application process manual should be reviewed and updated to reflect the current state; require a formal overall review and update on a periodic basis; and, require formal YRT Management sign-off as evidence of the update and review.	Manual to be updated with implementation of RouteMatch.	Q2 2014	Q2 2014
	4.3 YRT Mobility management contact Cares Accessible Transit and Mobility Transit to obtain the Emergency Operations Protocol documents.	Done. YRT has received the protocols from the vendors.	None	NA
	4.4 Changes to driver information (addition, deletion, changes) keyed into TIRS should be reviewed for accuracy and completeness by another individual. Management should also explore the feasibility in obtaining such functionality with the new RouteMatch application currently schedule for deployment.	To be completed with implementation of RouteMatch.	Q2 2014	Q2 2014

Audit Report	Recommendation	Management response	Original due date	Current due date
	<p>4.5 YRT Mobility management should discuss industry standards for late cancellations and no-shows with other similar transit services to determine a) how we are performing when dealing with this issue, and, b) what other incentives have been successfully used by other similar transit providers to reduce occurrences.</p>	<p>YRT will participate in the development of a Canadian Code of Practice for Specialized Service Standards with CUTA and other transit service providers. This includes developing no-shows and late cancellation guidelines.</p>	<p>Q4 2014</p>	<p>Q4 2014</p>
	<p>4.6 The Transview application is being replaced in the near future with a more robust system called RouteMatch. The requirement for edit listing should be one of the deliverables for this project.</p>	<p>An edit listing is currently not a deliverable for the new scheduling and management software (RouteMatch). Mobility Plus will review this potential upgrade. If possible, YRT's target date for implementation is Q2-2014.</p>	<p>Q2 2014</p>	<p>Q2 2014</p>

Audit Report	Recommendation	Management response	Original due date	Current due date
	<p>4.7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthcare professionals who have provided input on the application should be verified as members in good standing with their respective associations. • Paper application files should be kept complete with all correspondences with the applicant. • The addition of 'Not Applicable' check boxes for two questions on the application would help to ensure that the applicant has considered and responded to all questions. • Once an applicant becomes a registered user of Mobility Plus services, their information should not be deleted. If removal is deemed necessary, then an edit listing of the change to the database should be printed and approved by management and the riders file should be stored off of the database and available for retrieval, or made inactive on the current database. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthcare professionals: Nurse will randomly audit the health care professional's on-line registry for verification. • All acceptance letters for applicants between January 1, 2013 and July 31, 2013 are currently being attached to the passenger's file. • The additional check boxes will be added to the on-line application for download immediately and added to the hard copy application for the next printing. • Registered rider files will not be deleted unless authorized by a Supervisor or designate. Feasibility of tracking changes will be undertaken as part of the implementation of the new scheduling and management software (RouteMatch) in Q2-2014. 	<p>Q4 2013</p> <p>Q4 2013</p> <p>Q2 2014</p> <p>Q2 2014</p>	<p>Q1 2014</p> <p>Q1 2014</p> <p>Q2 2014</p> <p>Q2 2014</p>
	<p>4.8</p> <p>Mobility Plus management should enlist the help of Property Services to explore options to increase the level of security for those files.</p>	<p>Done. Cabinets are now locked.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>NA</p>

Audit Report	Recommendation	Management response	Original due date	Current due date
	<p>4.9 Current TransView data should be purged of inactive clients and those files kept off the active database. This would help allow for some additional report processing capacity.</p> <p>Transview registered client data be scrubbed prior to uploading into RouteMatch. Inactive client data should be secured and kept ready to reload if needed.</p>	<p>Done. Only registered riders who have travelled within the past 2 years will have their files transferred into the new scheduling and management software (RouteMatch).</p>	<p>Q4 2013</p>	<p>NA</p>
	<p>4.10 YRT Mobility Plus management perform a cost / benefit analysis on expanding the resources needed for the current appeals process versus outsourcing this process to a third party.</p> <p>YRT Mobility Plus should also examine why there has been a sudden increase in appeals.</p>	<p>Done.</p> <p>York Region nurse providing additional eight hours to assess clients.</p> <p>As recommended by Council Nov. 2013 – retaining Medisys Health Group for one year to conduct Mobility Plus appeals on behalf of York Region be brought to York Region Accessibility Advisory Committee in February 2014 and bring a report forward to the Committee of the Whole.</p>	<p>Q4 2013</p>	<p>NA</p>