

**NATIONAL FRAUD INITIATIVE 2010/11**  
**CURRENT POSITION ON INVESTIGATION OF MATCHES**

Match Type	No. of records submitted	No. of Matches Returned	No. of Matches Processed	No. matches under investigation	Outcomes	Key Findings
Housing and Council Tax Benefits	Approx. 10,000 (Exact number not known as data provided by DWP).	1,132	773	48	<p>2 cases of fraud (one given administrative penalty and one official caution) - total overpayment £5,231. 1 case of official error (DWP) - overpayment of £2,861 to be written off.</p> <p>The matches 'under investigation' relate mainly to increased pensions warranting reassessment of entitlement and some expected overpayment but not treated as fraud.</p> <p>Typical reasons for match include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• change of circumstances around time of match (e.g. moved address);</li> <li>• claimants in employment or receiving former employment pension - found to be declared in vast majority of cases;</li> <li>• same or similar name but not same person;</li> <li>• incorrect NI number (error with other matching body in vast majority of cases).</li> </ul>	None.
Payroll	868	186	186	-	<p>No issues – typical reasons for match include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• casual and part time staff also in employment with other audited bodies ;</li> <li>• Members with employment by, or holding office at, other audited bodies;</li> <li>• low income employees on benefit with earnings declared;</li> <li>• special payments of salary or allowances to staff and Members made through creditors system (e.g. BACS failure, salary advance, etc.) - all found to be duly adjusted back on payroll system.</li> </ul>	None.

Match Type	No. of records submitted	No. of Matches Returned	No. of Matches Processed	No. matches under investigation	Outcomes	Key Findings
Housing Tenants	6,992	75	75	-	<p>No significant issues – typical reasons for match include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• change of tenancy around time of match (e.g. moved address);</li> <li>• joint tenant moving out without relinquishing right to tenancy (6 cases referred to Housing &amp; Property Services for action).</li> <li>• same or similar name but not same person;</li> <li>• incorrect NI number (at other matching body in vast majority of cases).</li> </ul>	None.
Right to Buy	39	9	9	-	<p>No issues – typical reasons for match include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RTB applied for but not proceeded with;</li> <li>• purchaser re-housed by Council after possession of RTB property by mortgage lender;</li> <li>• same or similar name but not same person.</li> </ul>	None.
Concessionary Travel Passes (to Deceased Persons)	25,207	86	86	-	All referred for check whether still in system and, if so, to be deleted. Number of records deleted unknown (instruction given to record those deleted during check disregarded or not passed on to officer undertaking the checks).	None.
Resident Parking Permits (to Deceased Persons)	2,675	4	4	-	Referred to Parking Services. In 2 cases, pass holder deceased after last renewal; in other 2 cases renewal form found signed by widow of holder (not considered fraudulent as they would have been entitled to permit in own name). All the cases have been flagged in the system to prevent automatic despatch of renewal form so that surviving member(s) of household will have to apply in own name.	None.

Match Type	No. of records submitted	No. of Matches Returned	No. of Matches Processed	No. matches under investigation	Outcomes	Key Findings
Insurance Claimants	Not known – data submitted by insurer	1	1	-	Claim recorded on both Warwick District Council and Warwickshire County Council systems. Confirmed claim repudiated by County after it was established that it was a District matter.	None.
Taxi Drivers (to UK Visas)	487	3	2	-	One case outstanding where licence holder advised application with Home Office for extension to right to remain in UK still pending. Update requested from UKBA and continuing to monitor.	None.
Council Tax Discount (2009/10)	Council Tax – 59,648 Electoral Roll – 100,266	788	788	-	71 cases where SPD withdrawn and discount totalling total of £20,766 being recouped (none of these related to Warwick District Council employees or Members).	None.
Trade Creditors (overpayment of VAT)	84,238	230	230	-	No issues – all but two of the matches related to invoices for bailiff fees where the VAT was adjusted to take account of fees deducted from recovered sums previously paid over to the Council. The two remaining items were a case of VAT adjustment on a previous interim payment and inclusion of a non-taxable credit item respectively.	None.

Match Type	No. of records submitted	No. of Matches Returned	No. of Matches Processed	No. matches under investigation	Outcomes	Key Findings
Trade Creditors (duplicates creditors/ payments)	Standing Data – 6,121  History Data – 84,238	1,034	1,034	-	<p>11 previously unrecovered duplicate payments of invoices found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 payments to former housing repair contractor - total of £7,679 (excl. VAT) recovered by deduction from final account.</li> <li>6 payments to internet service provider across different creditor references over two year period up to March 2009, total £163 (excl. VAT) – deemed uneconomical to pursue recovery.</li> <li>2 payments to energy supplier of £10.43 and £54.55 a year apart across different creditor references - deemed uneconomical to pursue recovery.</li> </ul> <p>The matches included a substantial number of duplicate housing repairs payments that occurred around the time that the MIS repairs system module was first implemented – all were shown to have been recovered by credit note.</p> <p>Apart from the above, other typical reasons for match include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'non-trade' creditors included in extraction (not possible to filter out all such creditors prior to submission);</li> <li>regular or repeated equal payments where non-unique entry made in supplier invoice number field.</li> <li>duplicates already recovered (by credit note or refund);</li> <li>the 'duplicate payment' is in fact a credit note (credit notes were included in the extraction for ease of identification in the matches).</li> </ul>	<p>The 8 cases of duplicate payment across different creditor references is a legacy of multiple creditors being set up for the same supplier since implementation of the Total system in 2006. This is better controlled now with more stringent checks so is more an historic issue and the NFI findings have never indicated a major risk of significant financial loss through overpayments to creditors in this way.</p> <p>There was a known problem with duplicate payment of housing repair invoices for a period after new system implementation in 2007, since rectified.</p> <p>The 3 duplicated repair contract payments identified to be recovered are seen as isolated occurrences originating from an aberration in the repairs system.</p>