

ISUS/WORKING NEIGHBOURHOODS	
1	ISUS records were subject to audit by A4E. Wirralbiz corrected errors within the files which were due to be audited after they had been completed-and therefore with no benefit to the ISUS client-and before making them available to A4E.
2	A WirralBiz employee (A2) was instructed by Linda Turnbull of Wirralbiz to re-date Wirralbiz records such that they did not refer to the date when the review actually took place.
3	At the time when A2 undertook his reviews concerning ISUS grant recipients (post receipt of ISUS money), some of the businesses he reviewed had no turnover and/or the proprietors were not working the minimum 30 hours a week on their business. The ISUS grant should, therefore, have been clawed back.
4	Some ISUS recipients , a sample of 47 records had 8 such instances,were not eligible for ISUS money because they had been in business for 18 months or more at the time of application.
5	Records "evidencing" that reviews had taken place for ISUS recipients falsely represented that the reviews had taken place or that they not had taken place on the date stated.
6	Records to support Wirralbiz invoicing to WBC referred to activities which had not taken place (eg legal advice provided to ISUS 1 and reviews not undertaken by A2).
7	Wirralbiz sold-passed over-an ISUS database to a related party to provide feed-corn clients for wirralbiz's Thinklocal and Mailbox enterprises, and to generate business for a mobile phone company.
8	Wirralbiz invoiced WBC for activities under both the ISUS and Working Neighbourhoods programmes which had not taken place.
9	A Wirralbiz employee/sub-contractor [REDACTED] had a conflict of interest when preparing a business plan for [REDACTED], as he was also a director of [REDACTED]. Michael Rayworth (a director of Wirralbiz) had a similar conflict of interest as he was a director/shareholder in One Culture.
10	Businesses owned by/associated with Wirralbiz employees and sub-contractors received ISUS money and should not have done because of a conflict of interest.
11	WirralBiz' sales invoice number 14326 for either £11,500 or £13,500 referred to professional development costs. It is alleged that this invoice referred to costs incurred by [REDACTED] (a sub-contractor to WirralBiz) for the preparation of a tender for ISUS, towards the close of "Working Neighbourhoods", as there is no reason to pay for professional development when the contract is due to expire.

STAFFING/COMPETENCE	
1	WirralBiz staff were not qualified/competent to provide the services provided by Wirralbiz to BIG and ISUS recipients, which was paid for by WBC (eg legal advice provided by [REDACTED] tax returns prepared by someone without accounting/tax qualifications and reviews being undertaken by receptionists/secretaries)
2	Tax returns were completed by Wirralbiz on behalf of BIG/ISUS recipients, paid for by WBC and contained errors.
3	Legal/accounting advice provided by Wirralbiz was deficient (eg to become incorporated, use/purchase Quickbooks software).
4	Wirralbiz staff/sub-contractors had criminal convictions and should not, therefore, have provided the services to ISUS/BIG/Working Neighbourhoods which were paid for by WBC.
5	In the absence of any formal audit during the life of Working Neighbourhoods wirralbiz did not train its staff to improve their competence. During ISUS and after a critical report from A4e on this matter, wirralbiz promised to train and conduct staff meetings BUT NEVER DID.
6	Staff sent to work on delicate council projects such as wirralbiz+, social enterprises, Asset Transfer and BIG fund were chosen ad hoc and in furtherance of patronage rather than for competence.

	OTHERS
1	WBC and Wirralbiz clients both paid for Quickbooks software/training (ie services and software were invoiced twice rather than once).
2	WBC paid for 24 laptops and storage facilities to enable Wirralbiz to promote Quickbooks and WBC paid for corresponding lectures, representing poor value for money as many lectures had only a handful of attendees
3	WBC paid for "market research" costs incurred by Wirralbiz in c. 2007. The research had not taken place or was not sufficient to merit the quantum of the payment made by WBC and in fact paid for the salaries of Wirralbiz staff to work on activities for which WBC had not paid (Think Local and Mailbox).
4	Wirralbiz Plus costs were paid for by WBC, but fell outside of contractual arrangements between WBC and Wirralbiz.
5	In c. 2007, WBC paid twice for business plans for the Community Enterprises program which had had to be re-written by A1.
6	Wirralbiz provided WBC with a set of accounts in c. August 2011 in order to support an application for ERDF funded work ("making businesses work") or a SFEDI centre. The accounts were manipulated in order to exclude a loss making part of Wirralbiz's business and, thereby give a false impression of Wirralbiz's financial position.
7	AFE's audit work identified potentially forged signatures from BIG/ISUS recipients, but these issues were not addressed by WBC.
8	Design, web and leaflet services were provided to clients of ISUS/Working Neighbourhoods to be paid out of the grants received
9	The directors ran a flat organization so that without staff meetings correct advice could not be transmitted across the organization, The directors themselves in total one-to-one control of all staff were not in any way competent enough to provide a bedrock of quality. This latter policy is suggested to have been deliberate to conceal the super-profits attained by a divide and rule policy.
10	The directors chose staff that could be suborned or patronised the better to facilitate the charging of super -profits to the public purse, Staff were bribed by advances ad hoc and by being given work whether they were competent or not, or by being paid off the payroll for review work or BIG fund work.

BULLYING, PATRONAGE AND SUPER-PROFIT	
1	A connection exists between bullying, patronage and super-profits specifically in an organization that proved its own inefficiency with its thinklocal, quickbooks and mailbox schemes
2	Profits of this firm from working neighbourhoods and ISUS before payment of directors were from 2007 ever in excess of \$250K and in 2009 were nearly \$500K, yet from its own schemes losses in some years exceeded \$100K.
3	The three individuals [REDACTED] and who stood up against the corrupt processes sponsored by the directors were harassed, compelled to leave and openly insulted by other staff with connivance of the directors.
4	[REDACTED] in addition was physically threatened on two occasions by subcontractors of wirralbiz with no action taken against them in spite of overwhelming evidence
5	Industrial tribunal to be held 3rd-4th April 2013 over two days [REDACTED] had to satisfy the law in preliminary hearings that there was a strong case to be answered on the grounds
6	In addition to harassment, patronage of unsuitable candidates was exercised to show the benefits of toeing the line and closing ones eyes to malfeasance
7	The loss to the tax-payer excluding the impact of poor value for money, can perhaps be estimated at between \$1m to \$2m over the six years wirralbiz dealt with the council. Taking improper grants awarded and using A4e audit figures of 25% we can deduce 25% of \$6m, being \$1.5m. Adding errors on BIG Fund, duplication of community enterprise work would add some \$250K to that figure.
8	Looking at point 7 in a different light one could ask what profits ought an inefficient firm make from its contracts with WBC? Perhaps \$100,000 would be the upper end; therefore in just three years 2007-2009 one might say \$300k whereas the directors took \$870k, indicating a loss to public of circa \$600K. Whether \$600K for three years, \$1m for six years or, from example 7 above, \$1.7m, the losses are large let alone the poor value for money and loss of reputation to the WBC.