

Fraud and corruption tracker

National Report 2020



**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, manipulation of data and grant fraud
- 15** Serious and organised crime
- 15** Sanctions
- 16** Cyber fraud
- 16** Whistleblowing
- 17** Counter fraud structure
- 18** Focus of counter fraud function
- 19** Joint working and data sharing
- 20** Fighting Fraud and Corruption Locally (FFCL)
- 21** Impact of COVID-19
- 22** Recommendations
- 23** Appendices

Foreword



As managers of public resources, every public sector organisation has a responsibility to fight fraud and corruption. Successful organisational efforts to prevent, identify and manage various types of financial crime not only strengthens the state of public finances, but also mitigates moral and reputational risks across the public sector. During times of unprecedented uncertainty, the importance of these principles cannot be overstated.



Rob Whiteman
Chief Executive, CIPFA

Each year, the CIPFA Fraud and Corruption Tracker (CFaCT) aims to provide a current national picture of public sector fraud and corrupt activity help local authorities identify and implement mitigating actions. The tracker's findings provide valuable insights that help counter fraud practitioners in local government better understand national trends and emerging risks. Our intention is that the tracker serves as a resource for both public sector organisations and citizens who are invested in, and engaged with, their local communities.

Although the information in this year's report does not capture the impact of the ongoing coronavirus pandemic, it does provide useful insight about the local government landscape in the period prior to the national response effort.

This publication forms part of CIPFA's commitment to support the public sector and promote the principles of good governance and strong public financial management. Not only do our findings offer insight on the fraudulent activities that occur across the UK's public sector organisations, but the survey also highlights the important role that counter-fraud protocols play in the fight against fraud and corruption.

Understanding ever-changing risks can help public sector professionals increase their individual awareness, collaborate more effectively with others in the sector and take tailored action to prevent illegal activity from growing in the public sphere.

The survey was supported by:



The CIPFA Counter Fraud Centre

The CIPFA Counter Fraud Centre (CCFC), launched in July 2014, was created to fill the gap in the UK counter fraud arena following the closure of the National Fraud Authority (NFA) and the Audit Commission, and the subsequent transfer of benefit investigations to the Single Fraud Investigation Service (SFIS), run by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP). It was 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 fraud and corruption. We provide a range of services and solutions that measurably impact the fight against fraud in the public sector, and are committed to helping organisations prevent, detect and recover financial loss; protecting their reputation and developing counter fraud skills.

Our annual CIPFA Fraud and Corruption Tracker (CFaCT) survey is the definitive survey of fraud and corruption activity in local government. It tracks the levels of fraud and corruption local authorities have detected, the number of investigations undertaken and the types of fraud encountered. Understanding where fraud losses are occurring – and the actions being taken to stem the flow – is essential to helping senior leaders across the public sector understand the value of counter fraud activity.



Acknowledgements

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

- LGA
- MHCLG
- NAO
- NCA
- SOLACE
- SLT
- 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 last set of government sanctioned estimates, fraud costs the public sector at least £40.3bn annually, with £7.3bn of this total being lost in local government.


Fraud is a prevalent cause of concern in the public sector and continues to pose financial threats to local authorities. CIPFA's partners, such as the LGA, the NAO and Home Office, work towards new ways of finding solutions to the challenges that the public sector faces.

The sixth annual CIPFA Fraud and Corruption Tracker (CFaCT) survey was conducted in August 2020, with the aim of creating a national picture of the types and volume of fraud detected and prevented in local authorities. The results were collated from local authorities in all regions in the UK, allowing CIPFA to estimate the total figures for fraud across England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

It should be noted that the response rate for the 2019/20 survey was significantly lower than previous years, which was to be expected, due to the impact of COVID-19 on local government resources. The figures mentioned in this report were captured in the time period before the pandemic and the data therefore represents what local authorities were experiencing before the COVID-19 outbreak.

Moreover, for each fraud breakdown, there was an additional option in this year's survey to record the 'overall number of cases identified' which may have included cases where fraud was not ultimately proven. The other option was to record the 'number of cases proven to be fraudulent' including cases where, following an investigation, action has taken place or a payment has been prevented and, on the balance of probabilities, fraud or corruption has

Response rate





occurred. To enable comparisons with previous years' data, for consistency and the volumes mentioned refer to the number of cases proven to be fraudulent.

This report highlights the following:

- the types of fraud identified in the 2019/20 CFaCT survey
- the monetary cost value of fraud in 2019/20
- 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 identified and prevented in 2019/20 is approximately £239.4m, which is an average value of £5,090 per fraud case. Last year, there was an estimated value of £253m with a lower average of £3,600 per case detected and prevented.




Councils reported that approximately 47,000 instances of fraud had been detected or prevented in 2019/20, which is lower than the approximation of 71,000 reported by CIPFA in 2018/19. Council tax fraud represents almost two thirds (65%) of these identified instances of fraud with an estimated value of £35.9m, followed by disabled parking concession (Blue Badge Scheme) and housing fraud which represent 17% and 11% of the total cases of UK public sector fraud, respectively.

This year, we also measured the impact of grant fraud (prior to the COVID-19 grant disbursement), which represents 0.3% of the total identified instances of UK public sector fraud and 15% of the total value (£36.6m).

The largest growing fraud area is housing tenancy (other), with an estimated £60.1m lost in 2019/20 compared to £47.7m in 2018/19. This is followed by council tax single person discount (SPD) which has an estimated increase of £9.6m to an estimated value of £29.0m for cases detected/prevented in 2018/19.

The two highest perceived fraud risk areas for 2019/20 are the same as last year: procurement and council tax SPD. This shows these are the areas that require strict controls and support. The perceived third, fourth and fifth highest fraud risk areas are business rates, adult social care and council tax reduction (CTR) respectively.

Survey results show that nationally, capacity, or sufficient counter fraud resource, was the main perceived issue that needs to be addressed to tackle the risk of fraud and corruption effectively. This was followed closely by effective fraud risk management and better data sharing – again, following the same trend as last year. It should be noted that multiple respondents also listed ‘increased awareness’, an option which was not originally considered in the survey. Results from respondents indicate that they expect to increase the number of counter fraud specialist staff by 5% in 2021.



Major fraud areas

For 2019/20, 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 continues to be the largest area of identified fraud in the last six years and is the top fraud risk area for district and unitary councils, 57% and 32% respectively. This is likely a result of the targeted effort by authorities to identify fraud that has a direct impact on their income. Data matching and analytic exercises continue to reap rewards and will continue to improve as authorities work smarter and use tools made available to them. The total number of council tax fraud cases identified by participating local authorities, which may not have ultimately proven to be fraudulent, was 24,105.

volume/low value area continues to be a leading trend each year, where there are many incidents of smaller value, requiring higher vigilance on a more frequent basis.

Since 2018/19, the estimated number of council tax cases proven to be fraudulent has decreased by 45%, while the estimated value has increased by £5.3m. This may be evidence that in proven cases offenders are less likely to reoffend. It may also be an indicator that fraud risk exercises continue to identify the high volume/low value frauds year on year, with more effort being focussed on the long-term offenders, or that more authorities are choosing to claw back fraudulent discounts from previous billing periods.

Since 2017/18, the cases pertaining to single person discount (SPD) have decreased yearly; there is a vast difference of 20,069 (46%) between the 2018/19 and 2019/20 volumes. Nonetheless, the money lost to SPD fraud has increased by £9.5m. The opposite is seen for council tax reduction (CTR) and other council tax-related fraud, where the values have decreased by £2.3m and £2.1m respectively.

The overall estimated value of council tax fraud has continued to increase, primarily due to the increase in the value of cases for SPD fraud detected in 2019/20.

Estimated council tax fraud

	2017/18		2018/19		2019/20	
	Volume	Value	Volume	Value	Volume	Value
SPD	46,278	£15.8m	44,051	£19.4m	23,982	£28.9m
CTR	8,759	£6.1m	8,973	£7.2m	3,845	£4.9m
Other	2,857	£4.5m	2,831	£4.0m	2,794	£1.9m
Total	57,894	£26.3m	55,855	£30.6m	30,622	£35.9m

Though the volume of cases proven to be fraudulent 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 £35.9m. This high



Disabled parking (Blue Badge)

The survey identified fraud from the misuse of the Blue Badges scheme was one of the steadily increasing fraud risk areas. The estimated number of cases proven to be fraudulent has increased by 938, and the national estimated average value per case increased from £661 to £811 in 2019/20.

This indicates that though 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.



Housing and tenancy fraud

In relation to housing fraud, councils record the income lost using different valuations, ranging 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 differences in approach can make it hard to formulate clear comparisons. On a national scale, the value of fraud detected or prevented will be looked at in two ways:

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

If the cases were regarding new build accommodations, there would be an average of £150,000 per fraud case, in comparison to £18,000 if they were pertaining to temporary accommodation. This can be further explored by looking at the comparison by tier.

Before 2019/20, there was a steady decline of around 20% a year in the number of housing and tenancy related frauds detected or prevented. However, this year there was an increase of 37% overall.

While illegally sublet properties and right to buy frauds continue to fall year on year, the volume of other housing fraud such as succession and application fraud has increased significantly. This

is predominantly down to the continued efforts to review housing tenancies, including proactive exercises and conducting appropriate due diligence on applications.

Estimated housing fraud

	2017/18		2018/19		2019/20	
	Volume	Value	Volume	Value	Volume	Value
Right to buy	1,518	£92.0m	652	£46.0m	584	£30.7m
Illegal sublet	1,051	£55.8m	826	£41.8m	605	£31.6m
Other *	2,164	£68.3m	2,154	£47.7m	3,802	£60.1m
Total	4,733	£216.1m	3,632	£135.6m	4,991	£122.4m

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



Business rates

Business rate fraud represents 1.0% of the total estimated number of cases proven to be fraudulent in 2019/20. This represents a marginal decrease from the previous year's figure of 2.0% and is reflected in the fact that the estimated loss decreased from £8.0m in 2018/19 to £6.2m this year.

Nonetheless, it was recorded as the third highest fraud risk area on a national scale, as well as fourth highest specific to districts.

Other types of fraud

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

- 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, manipulation of data and grant fraud.

Adult social care

Adult social care is viewed by survey respondents to be the fourth highest fraud risk area. Over the past year, the average value per adult social care fraud has decreased by £11k, following the trend seen in years prior to 2018/19.

Generally, the total volume and value of estimated fraud cases have decreased to 460 cases and £8.2m respectively, but the volume of personal budget frauds has increased by 30% in the past year. Nonetheless, the estimated value for personal budget frauds is £4.9m – lower than the estimated 2018/19 value.

Other fraud also showed a decline in the numbers of cases proven to be fraudulent.

Estimated adult social care fraud

	2017/18		2018/19		2019/20	
	Volume	Value	Volume	Value	Volume	Value
Personal budget	334	£3.3m	234	£9.6m*	306	£4.9m
Other	403	£3.4m	246	£4.1m	154	£3.3m
Total	737	£6.7m	480	£13.7m*	460	£8.2m
Average value per fraud		£9k		£29k*		£18k

* Please note that this figure is made up predominantly of a handful of authorities and though it is not comparable, it shows the scope of fraud possible in this area.



Insurance fraud

This year's survey found an estimated number of 349 insurance fraud cases with a value of £3.9m. Since last year, the estimated insurance fraud case value has more than halved. However, the figure for 2019/20 is very similar to the estimated value from 2017/18 of £3.5m.

A respondent who identified insurance fraud also reported one confirmed insider fraud case with a

combined value of £9.2k – a significant drop from last year's combined value of £43k.

Considerable work has been done in the area of insurance fraud, and insurance companies are working with local authorities to develop new ways to identify fraud and abuse within the system, which seems to be effective given the steady decline in volume and value of cases reported.



Procurement fraud

For the fourth year in a row, procurement fraud was perceived to be the highest fraud risk area. This year, there was an estimated number of 87 prevented procurement frauds, with 8% of cases reported as insider fraud. This is a continued decline from 125 estimated fraudulent cases with a value of

£20.3m in 2018/19, and 142 cases with a value of £5.2m in 2017/18. It is widely accepted that procurement fraud continues to be the hardest type of fraud to detect, can be very high in value and difficult to prove.

On 8 June 2020, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government published a review into risks of fraud and corruption in local government procurement.

It reported that councils in England spend around £55bn a year on goods, work and services. A survey conducted as part of the review showed 23% of respondents reported fraud and/or corruption in the procurement lifecycle during the 2017 to 2018 financial year.

Estimated procurement fraud

2017/18		2018/19		2019/20	
Volume	Value	Volume	Value	Volume	Value
142	£5.2m	125	£20.3m*	87	£1.5m

* 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.



Welfare assistance and no recourse to public funds

In 2019/20, the estimated number of fraud cases related to welfare assistance increased significantly to 307. Estimates for 2018/19 and 2017/18 approximated 24 and 109 cases respectively.

2019/20 saw the number of no recourse to public funds cases increase to an estimated figure of

193; the previous year's figure had declined to an estimated volume of 148, from a volume of 334 in 2017/18. This is mainly due to the reduction in the number of respondents who detected and prevented fraudulent activity in this area.



Economic and voluntary sector support and debt

There was only one economic and voluntary sector support fraud case reported by local authorities in this survey, with a value of £25,000. In the 2017/18 survey, there were 24 actual cases of fraud reported with an average estimated loss of £14,000 per case. These figures decreased in 2018/19, with six actual cases of fraud reported and an average value per fraud loss of £4,000.

The number of reported cases of debt has significantly dropped to just three, with a fraud loss of £82,600, in comparison with 53 reported in 2018/19 valued at over £495,000.



Payroll, expenses, recruitment and pension

The total value of fraud loss for all four areas in 2019/20 is an estimated £0.82m, a very significant decrease from 2018/19, where there was a total estimated loss of £9.42m. The inflated figure in

2018/19 is due to one incident of payroll fraud prevented by a local authority.

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. As a result, some organisations could be less likely to investigate or report investigations in these areas.

Payroll had the highest volume of fraud out of these four areas (payroll, expenses, recruitment and pension) for each year since 2016/17. In 2019/20, the area with the highest estimated average per case was pensions with £13,278, followed by recruitment fraud with an estimated average per case of £4,797.

Estimated fraud

Type	2017/18		2018/19		2019/20	
	Volume	Value	Volume	Value	Volume	Value
Payroll	167	£1.01m	168	£8.77m*	113	£0.30m
Expenses	34	£0.03m	32	£0.04m	69	£0.12m
Recruitment	52	£0.49m	33	£0.38m	16	£0.08m
Pension	164	£0.57m	153	£0.23m	24	£0.32m
Total	417	£2.10m	386	£9.42m*	222	£0.82m

* 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.



Mandate and grant fraud

In 2019/20, CIPFA estimates that there have been 344 cases of mandate fraud across the UK, which is a slight increase from the estimate of 322 in 2018/19.

This year, an extra section for grant specific fraud was added to the survey. Overall, there was an estimated number of 161 grant frauds, with a fraud loss value of £36.6m. The additional fraud type was

included in this year's survey to separate reported figures from expense fraud, so we have some specifically reported grant fraud to compare with the 2020/21 results, when COVID-19 grant fraud will be reported.

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 responses show that councils share a significant amount of data both internally and externally, with 73% sharing data with the Cabinet Office/National Fraud Initiative, 52% sharing data with the police and 51% sharing data with their peers (other similar organisations).

In addition, of the organisations that responded, 35% identified serious and organised crime within their organisation's risk register and 52% reported that their counter fraud and corruption plan includes serious and organised crime risks.

Sanctions

The following shows some of the key findings from sanctions that were being used in 2019/20:

- 452 prosecutions were completed in 2019/20 and of those, 10 involved insider fraud. All these insider fraud cases were found guilty.
- The number of cautions as a proportion of the total sanctions reduced from 13% in 2017/18 to 7% in 2018/19 but increased to 13% again in 2019/20.
- The percentage of other sanctions increased from 46% in 2017/18 to 55% in 2018/19. Over the past year, this proportion decreased to 46% again.



Cyber fraud

Results from the CFaCT survey show that 82% of respondents underwent a cyber/e-fraud risk assessment during or after 2019/20. More than three quarters (78%) state that the IT team/Senior Information Risk Owner (SIRO) is responsible for the management of cyber risk in their organisation, matching last year's figure.

One third (32%) of respondents stated that their organisation had been a victim of hacking/ Distributed Denial-of-Service (DDOS) attacks in the last month, an increase of 5% over the past year.

In response to the threat of cyber-crime against local government, the LGA has set up a cyber security programme and a stakeholder group, working together to address the issues of cyber-crime.

The LGA programme received three years of funding from the National Cyber Security Programme (NCSP) in 2018 to support councils in remaining safe and secure from cyber-attacks and to have the appropriate arrangements in place to deal effectively with a cyber-incident should it occur, ie both prevention and response.

Whistleblowing

This year, 64% of respondents reported that they annually reviewed their whistleblowing arrangements in line with the [ISO 37002 "Whistleblowing Management Systems" guidelines](#).

Of those questioned, 85% confirmed that staff and the public had access to a helpdesk and 66% said that the helpline conformed to the ISO 37002 guidelines.

Respondents reported a total of 486 whistleblowing cases logged, made in line with the ISO 37002 *Whistleblowing Management Systems* guidelines.

This is an average of six cases logged per authority, which equals the 2018/19 figure. The majority of cases logged by respondents were in metropolitan districts.

Counter fraud structure


Fraud teams across local government continue to detect and prevent a significant amount of fraud, although having sufficient counter fraud resources is the main perceived issue that needs to be addressed to tackle fraud. Councils are responding to this and expect the number of counter fraud specialist staff to grow by around 5% in the next year, with a small increase of 3% in 2022.

In addition to the reductions in resources, having a shared services structure has decreased this year to 12%, in comparison with 19% of respondents who reported having a shared services structure in 2018/19.

There has been a slight increase in the proportion of authorities that have a dedicated counter fraud team, from 40% in 2018/19 to 43% in 2019/20. 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.


In 2019/20, the proportion of authorities that have available in-house qualified financial investigators was 24%. In addition, the percentage of authorities that have a non-DWP qualified financial investigator increased from 23% in 2018/19 to 27% in 2019/20. However, the proportion of authorities that do not have a qualified financial investigator available to their organisation has increased slightly from 43% last year to 44% this year, showing the potential strain on resources.

Counter fraud structure breakdown



Focus of counter fraud function

A new section was added to this year's survey, where local authorities were asked to identify the main priority of their counter fraud function.



The greatest proportion of respondents (41%) reported that the most important priority was 'preventing fraud from occurring in the first place' and the second most important was 'investigating serious fraudsters' with 39%. In comparison, the area that was seen to have the least importance, with no authorities listing this as a priority, was 'gathering intelligence'.

The other options included were recovering stolen money, investigating low level fraudsters and raising fraud awareness.

Joint working and data sharing


85% of survey respondents stated that they share data internally, mainly with housing, council tax and revenue and benefits departments.

Eighty two per cent of local authorities share data externally – a decrease of 14% since 2018/19. This data is mainly shared with Cabinet Office/National Fraud Initiative (73%), the DWP (55%), police (52%) or other authorities/similar organisations (51%).


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

Of the CFaCT respondents, 54% say they work jointly with other similar organisations/peers, 52% work with the Cabinet Office/National Fraud Initiative, 48% with the DWP and 44% with the police. Further breakdown is shown in the charts to the right.

Share/exchange data with:




Work jointly with:



Fighting Fraud and Corruption Locally

The FFCL strategy 2016-2019, developed by local authorities and counter fraud experts, was the definitive guide for local authority leaders, chief executives, finance directors and all those with governance responsibilities for the period covered by this survey. The strategy has since been reviewed and replaced with the Fighting Fraud and Corruption Locally 2020 strategy. It provides a blueprint for a coordinated response to fraud and corruption perpetrated against local authorities with the support of those at the top.



This strategy is available for councils to use freely so that everyone can benefit from shared good practice, and is aimed specifically 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 the initiatives in the 2016-2019 strategy, the FFCL board included questions in the CFaCT survey and

the results are shown below. 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.

For the 2019/20 survey, a few additional questions were added to this section, with regards to resources, staff and training.

When asked if their organisation secured appropriate training for fraud practitioners in line with agreed professional standards, for all types of investigation, a significant proportion (81%) of local authorities said they did.

More than two thirds (71%) of authorities employ staff who are suitably qualified and trained to undertake counter fraud investigations.

Respondents were also asked to select what they perceived to be the most important strategies for countering fraud in the future. Local authorities reported that 'managing evolving risks' and 'ensuring staff are trained' are the most important strategies. The additional strategies listed in the questionnaire were increased funding, leadership, technology and working in partnerships.

Impact of COVID-19

It should be noted that the CFaCT survey covers the pre-pandemic period of 2019/20 and therefore the data in this report represents what local authorities were experiencing before the outbreak in 2020. However, a qualitative question was added to the 2019/20 survey regarding the observed impact of COVID-19 on any fraudulent behaviours in local government. Key themes emerging from responses were:

- Instances of potential frauds involving empty properties where fraudsters were claiming to occupy with the intention of claiming business grants.
These included applications from those that traditionally would not have considered committing any fraud offences now feeling financially pressured to do so, owing to the downturn in the economy.
- Adult social care services being exploited during a time where resources are limited and usually robust assessments such as home visits not being possible due to health risks.
- Parents and carers of children in receipt of free school meals being targeted by fraudsters who email with messages to harvest bank details with a promise to help with funding while the school is closed.
- The risk of fraudsters impersonating key personnel in both the purchase and supply chain in an attempt to commit mandate fraud has significantly increased with staff predominantly working from home. It has become more difficult to validate supplier details while pressures to process payments at speed have increased, therefore usually robust controls are weakened.
- The inability of councils to tackle usual areas of fraud due to resources being re-directed into the processing and review of business grants associated with COVID-19. This has restricted the ability to tackle fraud face-to-face, including visits and interviews due to public health concerns and uncertainty over the legality of conducting remote interviews under caution.

Recommendations

CIPFA recommends

- The cumulative value of fraud prevented/detected by local authorities continues to decline year-on-year. Local authorities must remain vigilant and determined in identifying and preventing fraud, raising the awareness of fraud risk across all areas of service delivery and all levels of the organisation.
- This year's findings show that a dedicated counter fraud team remains the preferred method of delivery amongst respondents, and although there has been a slight reduction in the number of shared services reported, it remains important for organisations to work collaboratively with their neighbours and business partners, share resources, skills and best practice to effectively detect and prevent fraud.
- There has been a 14% reduction since 2018/19 in the volume of local authorities share data externally and only 73% of authorities sharing data with the Cabinet Office/National Fraud Initiative. Public sector organisations should maximise opportunities to share data where these initiatives are made available and explore and invest in additional innovative use of data sharing and fraud prevention technology, reducing the risk of loss through fraud.
- This year the majority of authorities reported fraud prevention as their main priority with none listing intelligence gathering at any level. Authorities should reconsider the value of intelligence in connection with identifying fraud risk, informing and focusing their planned activity and helping protect the organisation, therefore further preventing fraud.
- The level of whistleblowing allegations received this year remained constant with 2018/19 and 85% of authorities confirmed that staff and the public had access to a helpdesk. CIPFA recommends active publicity campaigns across all levels of the organisation to ensure staff are aware of whistleblowing procedures and accessibility to supporting services.
- Cyber security continues to increase in importance relative to the increase in remote working and electronic service application. Where controls need to be strengthened authorities should seek assistance from the LGA's cyber security programme stakeholder group.
- The new Fighting Fraud and Corruption Locally 2020 strategy has been released and councils are encouraged to review their working practices against the FFCL checklist, strengthening controls where weakness is identified.

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 2019/20.

Types of fraud	Fraud cases	% of the total	Value	% of the total value	Average
Council tax frauds	30,622	65.4%	£35.9m	15.0%	£1,173
Disabled parking concession	7,889	16.8%	£6.4m	2.7%	£809
Housing frauds	4,991	10.7%	£122.4m	51.1%	£24,534
Business rates	476	1.0%	£6.2m	2.6%	£13,126
Other types of fraud	2,865	6.1%	£68.5m	28.6%	£23,890
Adult social care	460	1.0%	£8.2m	3.4%	£17,767
Insurance claim	349	0.7%	£3.9m	1.6%	£11,271
Mandate fraud	344	0.7%	£9.4m	3.9%	£27,227
Welfare assistance	307	0.7%	£0.2m	0.1%	£684
Schools frauds (excl. transport)	211	0.5%	£0.2m	0.1%	£1,174
No recourse to public funds	193	0.4%	£2.2m	0.9%	£11,132
Grant fraud	161	0.3%	£36.6m	15.3%	£226,997
Payroll	113	0.2%	£0.3m	0.1%	£2,629
Procurement	87	0.2%	£1.5m	0.6%	£16,696
Expenses	69	0.2%	£0.1m	0.1%	£1,743
Children's social care	40	0.1%	£0.4m	0.2%	£9,903
Pensions	24	0.1%	£0.3m	0.1%	£13,278
Recruitment	16	0.0%	£0.1m	0.0%	£4,797
Debt	11	0.0%	£0.3m	0.1%	£27,533
School transport	6	0.0%	£0.2m	0.1%	£32,750
Economic and voluntary sector support	4	0.0%	£0.1m	0.0%	£25,000
Investments	0	0.0%	na*	na*	na*
Manipulation of data	0	0.0%	na*	na*	na*

*The figures for investments and manipulation of data are not available as no responses were received and thus the amount is not representative of the national average. In addition, these figures are affected by few councils who had high value frauds not indicative of the national average.

Appendix 2: Methodology

This year's results are based on responses from 98 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 the measure 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, AFI 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 entitling holders of the permit to parking concessions. This scheme is locally administered and badges 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 a tenant claims to be the only adult resident to be eligible for a 25% discount when in fact other adults reside in the property.
- **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 fraud.

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 who 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.

cipfa.org

CIPFA \

77 Mansell Street, London E1 8AN
+44 (0)20 7543 5600

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy.
Registered with the Charity Commissioners of England and Wales No 231060.
Registered with the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator No SC037963.