

Public Audit and Post-Legislative Scrutiny Committee

National Fraud Initiative

Submission from Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh

1. What have been the benefits, financial and otherwise, of putting the National Fraud Initiative on a statutory footing? None - it causes considerable work with almost no tangible benefits that were not being provided already by the external/internal audit process already in place.
2. Could the legislation be strengthened in any way? Yes – by selecting only high risk organisations rather than a wholesale blanket covering of all public bodies – the Parliamentary Committee were informed of some of the costs – were the costs of organisations carrying out the matching post audit included, and was the fact that the same observations as last year and answered satisfactorily were simply repeated taken into account?
3. Should participation in the National Fraud Initiative be improved? Are there any bodies who do not participate in the National Fraud Initiative who should do so? Small bodies should be excluded – i.e. those with turnover of less than £20M.
4. Are there any other issues you would like to raise in connection to this particular part of the legislation? No