

Audit Planning Memorandum

Follow-up 'L'

Background

We conduct audits with the goal of assessing the performance and compliance of state entities. Identifying areas for improvement is an essential part of these audits and our recommendations support that objective.

In the public sector, resources are limited and state entities only support recommendations that are practical and likely to lead to better outcomes such as increased effectiveness, efficiency or compliance. The degree to which entities implement recommendations is one element reflecting the value of our audit.

In framing our recommendations, we try to reach an agreement with clients and, through this collaboration, we expect that our recommendations will be actively implemented.

Since 2002, we have undertaken follow-up audits to provide Parliament with information about the extent to which state entities have acted on recommendations made in previous reports.

Follow up audit L will be number 12 since 2002. Parliament's Public Accounts Committee (PAC) also selectively follows up on some of our tabled reports (reports followed up by the PAC are not followed up by us).

Follow up L examines the implementation of recommendations made in four reports tabled between March and May 2015:

1. *Report of Auditor-General No. 8 of 2014–15 Security of information and communications technology (ICT) infrastructure.*
2. *Report of the Auditor-General No.9 of 2014–15 Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery: compliance with the National Standards for Australian Museums and Galleries.*
3. *Report of the Auditor-General No. 10 of 2014–15 Number of public primary schools.*
4. *Report of Auditor-General No. 11 of 2014–15 Road management in local government.*

Audit Objectives

The purpose of the audit is to:

- ascertain the extent to which the recommendations have been implemented
- determine reasons for non-implementation
- identify, assess and report on areas where recommendations resulted in improvements.

Audit Scope

The report will cover four audits tabled from March and May 2015:

Report of the Auditor-General	Auditees	Recommendations
<i>Security of ICT infrastructure</i> Tabled: 26 March 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Department of Treasury and Finance (Treasury)• Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment (DPIPWE)• Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC)• Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)• Department of Police and Emergency Management (DPEM), now Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management (DPFEM)	44 recommendations across all auditees. DPIPWE, DPAC, DHHS and DPEM, in general, accepted the recommendations and Treasury noted the recommendations.
<i>Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery: compliance with the National Standards for Australian Museums and Galleries</i> Tabled: 26 March 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery (TMAG)• Department of State Growth (State Growth)	11 recommendations. State Growth noted that the national standards are a set of ideals and that the government intends to review the governance arrangements at TMAG. TMAG noted the recommendations and stated it would take them into consideration.

Report of the Auditor-General	Auditees	Recommendations
<i>Number of public primary schools</i> Tabled: 26 May 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Education (DoE) 	<p>Seven recommendations.</p> <p>DoE agreed to take the recommendations into consideration.</p>
<i>Road management in local government.</i> Tabled: 26 May 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Highlands Council (CHC) • Devonport City Council (DCC) • Northern Midland Council (NMC) • Waratah-Wynyard Council (WWC) 	<p>15 recommendations across all auditees.</p> <p>CHC, NMC and WWC accepted the recommendations.</p> <p>DCC noted the recommendations with some concerns regarding our methodology.</p>

Audit criteria

Criteria	Consider points
1. Have the recommendations made in the original audits been implemented effectively?	<p>Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • self-assessed rate of implementation by entities • sufficiency of supporting evidence provided by entities and results of additional audit testing undertaken. Include evidence that the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ recommendations have or are in the process of being implemented ○ outcomes intended from the implementation of the recommendations are being monitored/reported ○ intended outcomes are being achieved • validity and reasonableness of explanations provided to substantiate why recommendations were not implemented, if applicable.