**Finance Process overview**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Summary Details** |
| **Process Name** | Investment Triggers |
| **Process Owner(s)** | Kathryn Edwards, Ryan Price |
| **Process Objective** | Ensure investment allocations are valid, accurately calculated and recorded in the ledger. |
| **Process Scope** | The process includes the process to create investment allocations percentage rates and upload of the rates into FDM, investment data import from source systems into FDM, automated processing/calculations of investments allocations within FDM and posting of the investments adjustments from FDM to Agresso.  The investment reporting is excluded from this process as it is covered separately. |

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

Below is a list of findings or recommendations identified in the premium process:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Summary Details** | **Classification**  *(design gap, control gap, process improvement)* |
| 1 | There is no review or approval process over the calculated investment allocation percentages before upload to FDM. See suggested control.  Investment allocation rules/percentages should be approved by way of sign off by senior management before they are updated to FDM.  This includes the review of the data that has been used to calculate the investment allocation rules/percentages (i.e. Wizi data, business plan information etc.) and the calculated investment allocation percentages. | Control gap |
| 2 | Investment data load from source systems/input files to FDM is significantly manual via the FDM control sheet and prone to human error. Finance should consider making this process automated. | Process improvement |
| 3 | The posting of investment allocation journals from FDM to Agresso is significantly manual via posting engine sheet and prone to human errors. Finance should consider making this process automated. | Process improvement |
| 4 | The process for business upload of investment allocation percentages into FDM need some work. This may need some FDM development. Current percentages were updated by FDM development team as it was easier for them rather than business | Process improvement |

**Future Development Requirements**

Below is a list of findings or recommendations identified

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Summary Details** |
| 1 | Automation of investment data load from source systems/input files to FDM. |
| 2 | Automation of the posting of investment allocation journals from FDM to Agresso. |
| 3 | Develop a process or mechanism to enable business to upload investment allocation percentages into FDM. |

**Risk Register Controls**

Below is a list of controls identified for the risk register

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **POAP Major Process Objective (s)** | **Risk Register Control** | **Status/Comment** |
| Ensure investment allocations are valid, accurately calculated and recorded in the ledger. | Investment allocation rules/percentages are approved by way of signed off by senior management before they are updated to FDM.  This includes the review of the data that has been used to calculate the investment allocation rules/percentages (i.e. Wizi data, business plan information etc.) and the calculated investment allocation percentages. | New Proposed control. |
| Ensure investment allocations are valid, accurately calculated and recorded in the ledger. | - Analytical reviews of investments, including current and historical investments trends  - Monthly analysis of investment amounts against budget and prior period  - Management review of significant investment variations from expectations. | New Proposed control. Some of analytical reviews are in place but the control is not captured in the risk register. |