

### **AUT Audits – Common Findings**

Date: 19 May 2025

Author: MedCo Audit Committee



#### Summary

In 2024, MedCo commenced a programme of auditing that included, Solicitor firms registered as Authorised Users (AUTs) on its service.

The purpose of the auditing is to evaluate an AUTs processes, systems and operations to determine compliance and understanding with key elements as detailed in the AUT User Agreement, MedCo Rules and Policy documents as well as general use of the MedCo system.

Auditing of AUT's will continue throughout the remainder of 2025 and may carry over into 2026.

To help AUTs prepare for auditing, and to serve as a reminder of the obligations and requirements, MedCo have identified common findings that have arisen from audits completed to date and these are set out below.



#### **Common findings:**

#### 1. Duplicate Searches (applicable to 81% of AUTs audited)

AUTs are generating duplicate searches on MedCo for the same claimant on the same accident date. In many instances, they fail to document the reasons for conducting these duplicate searches and were not able to demonstrate the investigation of the underlying causes.

Source: AUT User Agreement: Section 3.2.1(e) and Schedule 2, Database Rule 2. MedCo Rule 64.

#### 2. Conflict of Interest (applicable to 75% of AUTs audited)

The AUTs failed to demonstrate established controls for identifying and addressing potential conflicts of interest between DME and Claimant in line with the Civil Procedure Rules.

AUTs should inquire with the DME and claimant at the instruction stage to ascertain, to the best of their knowledge, that neither party has given or received treatment.

Source: Refer to - AUT User Agreement, Schedule 2, Database Rule 5

## 3. Training on MedCo Use (applicable to 75% of AUTs audited)

There was a lack of a structured or consistent training framework, or formal procedures to ensure understanding of key elements such as duplicated searches, use of alternative postcodes, search data, conflicts of interest, and agreeing terms.

Source: AUT User Agreement, Schedule 2, Database Rule 7

# 4. Contract Terms with Medical Experts (DMES) / MROs (applicable to 56% of AUTs audited)

AUTs did not directly negotiate and establish payment terms with DMEs/MROs. There were also examples of contingent terms (such as payment on 'successful' case outcome) or write offs in place.



It was also observed that DMEs were not being paid on a timely basis. It was evident that AUTs did not always establish terms with DMEs/ MROs at the beginning of their relationship, ensuring suitable and equitable payment terms.

There were examples where AUTs did not appear to have a sufficient number of agreements in place.

Source: AUT User Agreement Schedule 2, Database Rule 9. MedCo Rules 70, 71 & 72. MedCo Ethics Policy.

### 5. User Access Controls for MedCo Database (applicable to 56% of AUTs audited)

Some AUTs had multiple User accounts (which were often not being used, either due to employees having left the business or not being involved in the department).

There were also accounts being shared by employees, some with higher levels of permission in place than were required.

AUTs should only be allowing access to individuals who are currently employed by the AUT and authorised to do so.

Source: AUT User Agreement: Section 4.4(c), 4.4(d) and Schedule 2, Database Rule 2 and Schedule 3.

## 6. Issuing of instruction / cancellation letters (applicable to 44% of AUTs audited)

AUTs have not complied with the requirements to dispatch instruction & cancellation letters within the required timescales.

AUTs should ensure instruction and cancellation letters are sent to the selected party within 5 days of the selection being made on MedCo.

Source: AUT User Agreement Schedule 2, Database Rule 8