

Central Bedfordshire Council

Year ending 31 March 2016

Audit Plan

March 2016

Ernst & Young LLP



EY

Building a better
working world

Audit Committee
Central Bedfordshire Council

March 2016

Dear Committee Members

Audit Plan

We are pleased to attach our Audit Plan which sets out how we intend to carry out our responsibilities as auditor. Its purpose is to provide the Audit Committee with a basis to review our proposed audit approach and scope for the 2015/16 audit in accordance with the requirements of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014, the National Audit Office's 2015 Code of Audit Practice, the Statement of Responsibilities issued by Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA) Ltd, auditing standards and other professional requirements. It is also to ensure that our audit is aligned with the Committee's service expectations.

This plan summarises our initial assessment of the key risks driving the development of an effective audit for the Council, and outlines our planned audit strategy in response to those risks.

We welcome the opportunity to discuss this Audit Plan with you on 4 April 2016 and to understand whether there are other matters which you consider may influence our audit.

Yours faithfully



Neil Harris
Executive Director
For and behalf of Ernst & Young LLP
Enc

Contents

1. Overview	1
2. Financial statement risks	2
3. Value for money risks	5
4. Our audit process and strategy	7
5. Independence	13
Appendix A Fees	16
Appendix B UK required communications with those charged with governance	17

In April 2015 Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA) issued “Statement of responsibilities of auditors and audited bodies 2015-16”. It is available from the Chief Executive of each audited body and via the [PSAA website](http://www.psaa.co.uk) (www.psaa.co.uk)

The Statement of responsibilities serves as the formal terms of engagement between appointed auditors and audited bodies. It summarises where the different responsibilities of auditors and audited bodies begin and end, and what is to be expected of the audited body in certain areas.

The ‘Terms of Appointment from 1 April 2015’ issued by PSAA sets out additional requirements that auditors must comply with, over and above those set out in the National Audit Office Code of Audit Practice (the Code) and statute, and covers matters of practice and procedure which are of a recurring nature.

This Audit Plan is prepared in the context of the Statement of responsibilities. It is addressed to the Audit Committee, and is prepared for the sole use of the audited body. We, as appointed auditor, take no responsibility to any third party.

Our Complaints Procedure – If at any time you would like to discuss with us how our service to you could be improved, or if you are dissatisfied with the service you are receiving, you may take the issue up with your usual partner or director contact. If you prefer an alternative route, please contact Steve Varley, our Managing Partner, 1 More London Place, London SE1 2AF. We undertake to look into any complaint carefully and promptly and to do all we can to explain the position to you. Should you remain dissatisfied with any aspect of our service, you may of course take matters up with our professional institute. We can provide further information on how you may contact our professional institute.

1. Overview

This Audit Plan covers the work that we plan to perform to provide you with:

- ▶ Our audit opinion on whether the financial statements of Central Bedfordshire Council give a true and fair view of the financial position as at 31 March 2016 and of the income and expenditure for the year then ended;
- ▶ Our conclusion on the Council arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness; and
- ▶ Any additional specific sector requirements.

We will also review and report to the National Audit Office (NAO), to the extent and in the form required by them, on the Council's Whole of Government Accounts return.

Our audit will also include the mandatory procedures that we are required to perform in accordance with applicable laws and auditing standards.

When planning the audit we take into account several key inputs:

- ▶ Strategic, operational and financial risks relevant to the financial statements;
- ▶ Developments in financial reporting and auditing standards;
- ▶ The quality of systems and processes;
- ▶ Changes in the business and regulatory environment; and,
- ▶ Management's views on all of the above.

By considering these inputs, our audit is focused on the areas that matter and our feedback is more likely to be relevant to the Council.

We will provide an update to the Audit Committee on the results of our work in these areas in our report to those charged with governance scheduled for delivery in September 2016.

2. Financial statement risks

We outline below our current assessment of the financial statement risks facing the Council, identified through our transition and initial planning activities.

At our meeting, we will seek to validate these with you.

Significant risks (including fraud risks)	Our audit approach
Property, plant and equipment	
<p>Property, Plant and Equipment (PPE) represent the largest asset values on the Council's balance sheet.</p> <p>Land and buildings are initially measured at cost and then revalued to fair value. Revaluations are performed with sufficient regularity to ensure that carrying amounts are not materially different from those that would be determined at the end of the reporting period.</p> <p>Revaluations are carried out by the Council's in-house valuers. Council dwellings are valued by an external expert valuer. Valuations are based on a number of complex assumptions.</p> <p>Annually assets are assessed to identify whether there is any indication of impairment.</p> <p>ISAs (UK and Ireland) 500 and 540 require us to undertake procedures on the use of external experts and assumptions underlying fair value estimates.</p>	<p>We will obtain an understanding of and evaluate key controls over the valuation of PPE.</p> <p>Where asset valuations are undertaken in-year we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ agree the source data used by your valuer to supporting records; ▶ assess the work of your valuer; and ▶ agree the outputs to your fixed asset register and statements. <p>Where the Council proposes significant changes to valuation bases we will evaluate the rationale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Where assets are not revalued in-year, we will review the Council's impairment assessment and consideration of whether the carrying value of these assets remain appropriate.
Risk of fraud in revenue recognition	
<p>Under ISA 240, auditors are required to consider the risk that revenue may be misstated due to improper recognition.</p> <p>In the public sector, this requirement is modified by Practice Note 10, issued by the Financial Reporting Council, which states that auditors should also consider the risk that material misstatements may occur by the manipulation of expenditure recognition.</p>	<p>We will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Review and test revenue and expenditure recognition policies ▶ Review and discuss with management any accounting estimates on revenue or expenditure recognition for evidence of bias ▶ Develop a testing strategy to test material revenue and expenditure streams ▶ Review and test revenue cut-off at the period end date
Risk of management override	
<p>As identified in ISA (UK and Ireland) 240, management is in a unique position to perpetrate fraud because of its ability to manipulate accounting records directly or indirectly and prepare fraudulent financial statements by overriding controls that otherwise appear to be operating effectively. We identify and respond to this fraud risk on every audit engagement.</p>	<p>Our approach will focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Testing the appropriateness of journal entries recorded in the general ledger and other adjustments made in the preparation of the financial statements ▶ Reviewing accounting estimates for evidence of management bias, and ▶ Evaluating the business rationale for significant unusual transactions

Private Finance Initiative

The Council recognises on its Balance Sheet a PFI liability for the provision of new buildings, the refurbishment of existing building and associated facilities management at two schools which have both since converted to Academy status. This represents a large element of the balance sheet and is a significant balance at £16m.

The PFI liability is recognised at the same time as the PFI assets are recognised. It is measured initially at the same amount as the fair value of the PFI assets and is subsequently measured as a finance lease liability in accordance with IAS 17.

The accounting entries are based on a complex range of assumptions via a PFI accounting model.

We will

- ▶ Obtain an understanding of and evaluate key controls over the valuation of the PFI liability.
- ▶ Ensure PFI model has been brought forward correctly from the previous year, consider engaging relevant experts to review the model against an EY model to ensure the client model is still working as expected.
- ▶ Ensure the PFI accounting model has been updated for any service or other agreed variations.
- ▶ Agree outputs of the model to the accounts, including balances and disclosures for Assets, Liabilities, and Expenditure.

Better Care Fund

The Better Care Fund (BCF) is a major policy initiative between local authorities, CCGs and NHS providers with a primary aim of driving closer integration and improving outcomes for patients, service users and carers. The intention is that partners use the BCF to jointly commission health and social care services at a local level

From 1 April 2015 BCF has been set up as a pooled budget between the Council and the local Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The pool has total funding of £18 million in 2015/16.

Local BCF arrangements may be complex and varied, involving a number of different commissioning, governance and accounting arrangements that raise risks of misunderstanding and inconsistencies between the partners. There are also structural, cultural and regulatory differences between local government and the NHS, and it is important that these are understood and considered by all of the partners in the operation of the BCF.

Our approach will focus on:

- ▶ Examining relevant S75 agreements entered into by the Council
- ▶ Reviewing proposed accounting treatments for the Better Care Fund and the disclosures made under relevant accounting standards. As part of this, we will consider what relevant activities are to be undertaken and whether participants have control, either jointly or solely, over the arrangement.
- ▶ Performing testing to gain assurance that the Council has appropriately accounted for its share of the BCF.

We will keep our approach under review, pending any further guidance from CIPFA, the National Audit Office and PSAA.

2.1 Responsibilities in respect of fraud and error

We would like to take this opportunity to remind you that management has the primary responsibility to prevent and detect fraud. It is important that management, with the oversight of those charged with governance, has a culture of ethical behaviour and a strong control environment that both deters and prevents fraud.

Our responsibility is to plan and perform audits to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole are free of material misstatements whether caused by error or fraud. As auditors, we approach each engagement with a questioning mind that accepts the possibility that a material misstatement due to fraud could occur, and design the appropriate procedures to consider such risk.

Based on the requirements of auditing standards our approach will focus on:

- ▶ Identifying fraud risks during the planning stages;

- ▶ Enquiry of management about risks of fraud and the controls to address those risks;
- ▶ Understanding the oversight given by those charged with governance of management's processes over fraud;
- ▶ Consideration of the effectiveness of management's controls designed to address the risk of fraud;
- ▶ Determining an appropriate strategy to address any identified risks of fraud, and,
- ▶ Performing mandatory procedures regardless of specifically identified risks.

3. Value for money risks

We are required to consider whether the Council has put in place 'proper arrangements' to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness on its use of resources.

For 2015/16, this is based on the overall evaluation criterion:

"In all significant respects, the audited body had proper arrangements to ensure it took properly informed decisions and deployed resources to achieve planned and sustainable outcomes for taxpayers and local people"

Proper arrangements are defined by statutory guidance issued by the National Audit Office. They comprise your arrangements to:

- Take informed decisions;
- Deploy resources in a sustainable manner; and
- Work with partners and other third parties.

In considering your proper arrangements, we will draw on the requirements of the CIPFA/SOLACE framework for local government to ensure that our assessment is made against a framework that you are already required to have in place and to report on through documents such as your annual governance statement.

We are only required to determine whether there are any risks that we consider significant, which the Code of Audit Practice which defines as:

"A matter is significant if, in the auditor's professional view, it is reasonable to conclude that the matter would be of interest to the audited body or the wider public"

Our risk assessment supports the planning of sufficient work to enable us to deliver a safe conclusion on arrangements to secure value for money and enables us to determine the nature and extent of further work that may be required. If we do not identify any significant risks there is no requirement to carry out further work.

Our risk assessment has therefore considered both the potential financial impact of the issues we have identified, and also the likelihood that the issue will be of interest to local taxpayers, the Government and other stakeholders. This has resulted in the following significant VFM risks which we view as relevant to our value for money conclusion.

Significant value for money risks

Our audit approach

Financial position

Councils are funded by grants from central government and locally raised revenue from council tax and business rates or from fees, charges, or other revenue generating activities. Since 2010-11 funding for Councils from central government has reduced by 37 per cent in real terms, and further reductions for the period 2016-17 to 2019-20 are likely.

Central Bedfordshire Council has identified it requires efficiency savings of £15.3million in 2016/17 and £30million over the following three years to 2019/20. Per the medium term financial plan taken to the Executive on 9 February 2016, the Council has already identified many of schemes to deliver these efficiencies – all of those to meet the £15.3million 2016/17 requirement and £18.8million of the £30million required for the subsequent three years.

Our approach will focus on:

- ▶ Financial reporting including achievement of financial targets.
- ▶ Delivery of the Council's 2015/16 savings plans and linkages to delivery of longer-term transformational change;
- ▶ The Council's 2016/17 financial plan; and
- ▶ The Council's longer-term financial strategy in the light of the local and wider financial pressures in the local economy.

Other matters

In January 2016, the National Audit Office passed on to us a public interest disclosure from a whistleblower concerning the approach the Council has taken during the 2015-2016 financial year to the procurement of its legal services. Several concerns were raised from the whistleblower which we have drawn to the attention of the Council's Chief Executive and Chair of Audit Committee. We have received written responses and supporting documentation from the Council's Chief Executive to each of the concerns raised by the whistleblower including following our subsequent enquiries and discussions. At the time of drafting this Audit Plan, we are now concluding our work in this matter.

- ▶ We will report to the Council, those charged with governance and the whistleblower, via the National Audit Office, on the outcome of our work. In concluding our work, we will determine whether we are minded to challenge any aspect of the Council's procurement of legal services and any additional action we propose to take during the course of our 2015-2016 audit.

4. Our audit process and strategy

4.1 Objective and scope of our audit

Under the Code of Audit Practice our principal objectives are to review and report on the Council's:

- ▶ Financial statements
- ▶ Arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources to the extent required by the relevant legislation and the requirements of the Code.

We issue an audit report that covers:

1. Financial statement audit

Our objective is to form an opinion on the financial statements under International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland).

We report to you by exception in respect of your governance statement and other accompanying material as required, in accordance with relevant guidance prepared by the NAO on behalf of the Comptroller and Auditor General.

Alongside our audit report, we also:

- ▶ Review and report to the NAO on the Whole of Government Accounts return to the extent and in the form they require;
- ▶ Examine and report on the consistency of any consolidation schedules or returns with the Council's audited financial statements for the relevant reporting period;

2. Arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness (value for money)

We are required to consider whether the Council has put in place 'proper arrangements' to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness on its use of resources.

4.2 Audit process overview

We are now starting our audit work to review internal controls over financial reporting used throughout the Council, with the intention of using a controls-based audit approach where we expect this to be robust and efficient. Where we believe that reliance on controls will not be possible due to any ineffective design or operation of the controls, we will provide feedback on areas for improvement compared to what we see as leading practice, and will instead perform additional substantive procedures to support our audit opinion.

Liaising with Internal Audit

A key part of understanding and monitoring of the control environment is our ongoing liaison with Internal Audit. We will discuss and review Internal Audit's annual plans and reports to inform where specific reviews can assist us in our controls and Value for Money Conclusion work.

Analytics

We will use our analytics tools to enable us to capture whole populations of your financial data, in particular journal entries. These tools:

- ▶ Help identify specific exceptions and anomalies which can then be subject to more traditional substantive audit tests
- ▶ Give greater likelihood of identifying errors than random sampling techniques.

Internal audit

We will review internal audit plans and the results of their work. We will reflect the findings from these reports, together with reports from any other work completed in the year, in our detailed audit plan, where we raise issues that could have an impact on the year-end financial statements

Use of specialists

When auditing key judgements, we are often required to rely on the input and advice provided by specialists who have qualifications and expertise not possessed by the core audit team. The areas where either EY or third party specialists provide input for the current year based on our initial planning activities are:

Area	Specialists
Pensions	EY Pensions team/ Third party specialists
Valuations	EY Valuations team/ / Third party specialists

In accordance with Auditing Standards, we will evaluate each specialist's professional competence and objectivity, considering their qualifications, experience and available resources, together with the independence of the individuals performing the work.

We also consider the work performed by the specialist in light of our knowledge of the Council environment and processes and our assessment of audit risk in the particular area. For example, we would typically perform the following procedures:

- ▶ Analyse source data and make inquiries as to the procedures used by the expert to establish whether the source data is relevant and reliable;
- ▶ Assess the reasonableness of the assumptions and methods used;
- ▶ Consider the appropriateness of the timing of when the specialist carried out the work; and

- ▶ Assess whether the substance of the specialist's findings are properly reflected in the financial statements.

4.3 Mandatory audit procedures required by auditing standards and the Code

As well as the financial statement risks (section two) and value for money risks (section three), we must perform other procedures as required by auditing, ethical and independence standards, the Code and other regulations. We outline below the procedures we will undertake during the course of our audit.

Procedures required by standards

- ▶ Addressing the risk of fraud and error;
- ▶ Significant disclosures included in the financial statements;
- ▶ Entity-wide controls;
- ▶ Reading other information contained in the financial statements and reporting whether it is inconsistent with our understanding and the financial statements;
- ▶ Auditor independence.

Procedures required by the Code

- ▶ Reviewing, and reporting on as appropriate, other information published with the financial statements, including the Annual Governance Statement
- ▶ Reviewing and reporting on the Whole of Government Accounts return, in line with the instructions issued by the NAO
- ▶ Examining and reporting on the consistency of any consolidation schedules or returns with the Council's audited financial statements for the relevant reporting period.

Finally, we are also required to discharge our statutory duties and responsibilities as established by the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014.

4.4 Materiality

For the purposes of determining whether the financial statements are free from material error, we define materiality as the magnitude of an omission or misstatement that, individually or in aggregate, could reasonably be expected to influence the users of the financial statements. Our evaluation requires professional judgement and so takes into account qualitative as well as quantitative considerations implied in the definition.

We have determined that overall materiality for the financial statements of the Council is £9,78million based on 2% of gross revenue expenditure. We will communicate uncorrected audit misstatements greater than £489,403 to you.

The amount we consider material at the end of the audit may differ from our initial determination. At this stage, however, it is not feasible to anticipate all the circumstances that might ultimately influence our judgement. At the end of the audit we will form our final opinion

by reference to all matters that could be significant to users of the financial statements, including the total effect of any audit misstatements, and our evaluation of materiality at that date.

4.5 Fees

The duty to prescribe fees is a statutory function delegated to Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA) by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. PSAA has published a scale fee for all relevant bodies. This is defined as the fee required by auditors to meet statutory responsibilities under the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 in accordance with the NAO Code. The indicative fee scale for the audit of Central Bedfordshire Council is £139,466. Our work to review concerns raised by a whistleblower on the Council's procurement of legal services is likely to represent additional work outside of the scope of our 2015-2016 audit and scale fee. We are conscious that the cost of our work in this area ultimately falls on Council Tax payers. For this reason, we will be risk based and proportionate in our work. Should we seek a fee variation for the additional audit work we have needed to undertake to respond to the concerns raised, we will discuss the basis of this with Council's management, report to the Audit Committee and seek approval from PSAA.

4.6 Your audit team

The engagement team is led by Neil Harris, who has significant experience of local government audits. Neil is supported by Carol Ryan who is responsible for the day-to-day direction of audit work and is the key point of contact for the Chief Finance Officer.

4.7 Timetable of communication, deliverables and insights

We have set out below a timetable showing the key stages of the audit, including the value for money work and the Whole of Government Accounts. The timetable includes the deliverables we have agreed to provide to the Council through the Audit Committee's cycle in 2015/16. These dates are determined to ensure our alignment with PSAA's rolling calendar of deadlines.

From time to time matters may arise that require immediate communication with the Audit Committee and we will discuss them with the Chair as appropriate.

Following the conclusion of our audit we will prepare an Annual Audit Letter to communicate the key issues arising from our work to the Council and external stakeholders, including members of the public.

Audit phase	Timetable	Audit Committee timetable	Deliverables
High level planning	January 2016	March 2016	Audit Fee Letter Audit Plan
Risk assessment and setting of scopes	February 2016	4 April 2016	Audit Plan
Testing routine processes and controls	February 2016	27 May 2016	Progress Report (We will only provide a report if we have significant matters to raise with the Audit Committee, and by exception).

Year-end audit	August/September 2016	September 2016	Report to those charged with governance via the Audit Results Report
Completion of audit	September 2016	September 2016	Report to those charged with governance via the Audit Results Report Audit report (including our opinion on the financial statements and overall value for money conclusion). Audit completion certificate Reporting to the NAO on the Whole of Government Accounts return.
Conclusion of reporting	October 2016	January 2017	Annual Audit Letter

In addition to the above formal reporting and deliverables we will seek to provide practical business insights and updates on regulatory matters.

5. Certification work

5.1 Housing benefits

Certification work involves executing prescribed tests which are designed to give reasonable assurance that the Council's housing benefits claim is fairly stated and in accordance with specified terms and conditions. Certification work is not an audit.

The work necessary is determined by the Department of Works and Pensions.

Based on previous experience we expect to carry out extended testing, known as 40+ testing, on up to thirteen areas of the claim.

Where possible we integrate our benefits certification work with our opinion and other work. We also aim to rely on the work of internal audit and benefits staff.

We will report to the Audit Committee the results of our benefits certification work

Public Sector Audit Appointments has set an indicative fee for benefits certification work for each body. The indicative fee is based on actual benefits certification fees for 2013/14.

The indicative fee is based on the expectation that audited bodies are able to provide the auditor with complete and materially accurate claims, with supporting working papers, within agreed timeframes.

6. Independence

6.1 Introduction

The APB Ethical Standards and ISA (UK and Ireland) 260 'Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance', requires us to communicate with you on a timely basis on all significant facts and matters that bear on our independence and objectivity. The Ethical Standards, as revised in December 2010, require that we do this formally both at the planning stage and at the conclusion of the audit, as well as during the audit if appropriate. The aim of these communications is to ensure full and fair disclosure by us to those charged with your governance on matters in which you have an interest.

Required communications	
Planning stage	Final stage
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The principal threats, if any, to objectivity and independence identified by EY including consideration of all relationships between you, your affiliates and directors and us; ▶ The safeguards adopted and the reasons why they are considered to be effective, including any Engagement Quality Review; ▶ The overall assessment of threats and safeguards; ▶ Information about the general policies and process within EY to maintain objectivity and independence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A written disclosure of relationships (including the provision of non-audit services) that bear on our objectivity and independence, the threats to our independence that these create, any safeguards that we have put in place and why they address such threats, together with any other information necessary to enable our objectivity and independence to be assessed; ▶ Details of non-audit services provided and the fees charged in relation thereto; ▶ Written confirmation that we are independent; ▶ Details of any inconsistencies between APB Ethical Standards, the PSAA Terms of Appointment and your policy for the supply of non-audit services by EY and any apparent breach of that policy; and ▶ An opportunity to discuss auditor independence issues.

During the course of the audit we must also communicate with you whenever any significant judgements are made about threats to objectivity and independence and the appropriateness of our safeguards, for example when accepting an engagement to provide non-audit services.

We also provide information on any contingent fee arrangements, the amounts of any future contracted services, and details of any written proposal to provide non-audit services;

We ensure that the total amount of fees that EY and our network firms have charged to you and your affiliates for the provision of services during the reporting period are disclosed, analysed in appropriate categories.

6.2 Relationships, services and related threats and safeguards

We highlight the following significant facts and matters that may be reasonably considered to bear upon our objectivity and independence, including any principal threats. However we have adopted the safeguards below to mitigate these threats along with the reasons why they are considered to be effective.

Self-interest threats

A self-interest threat arises when EY has financial or other interests in your entity. Examples include where we have an investment in your entity; where we receive significant fees in respect of non-audit services; where we need to recover long outstanding fees; or where we enter into a business relationship with the Council.

At the time of writing, there are no long outstanding fees.

We believe that it is appropriate for us to undertake permissible non-audit services, and we will comply with the policies that the Council has approved and that are in compliance with PSAA Terms of Appointment. For example, we undertook an assessment, against ethical standards to ensure we could carry out reasonable assurance work on the Teachers' Pension and Pooling of Housing Capital Receipts returns in 2014/15. The fee was £17,000.

At the time of writing, the current ratio of non-audit fees to audit fees is approximately 1:8.

No additional safeguards are required

A self-interest threat may also arise if members of our audit engagement team have objectives or are rewarded in relation to sales of non-audit services to the Council. We confirm that no member of our audit engagement team, including those from other service lines, is in this position, in compliance with Ethical Standard 4.

There are no other self-interest threats at the date of this report.

Self-review threats

Self-review threats arise when the results of a non-audit service performed by EY or others within the EY network are reflected in the amounts included or disclosed in the financial statements.

There are no other self-review threats at the date of this report.

Management threats

Partners and employees of EY are prohibited from taking decisions on behalf of management of your entity. Management threats may also arise during the provision of a non-audit service where management is required to make judgements or decisions based on that work.

There are no management threats at the date of this report.

Other threats

Other threats, such as advocacy, familiarity or intimidation, may arise.

There are no other threats at the date of this report.

Overall Assessment

Overall we consider that the adopted safeguards appropriately mitigate the principal threats identified, and we therefore confirm that EY is independent and the objectivity and independence of Neil Harris, the audit engagement Executive Director and the audit engagement team have not been compromised.

6.3 Other required communications

EY has policies and procedures that instil professional values as part of firm culture and ensure that the highest standards of objectivity, independence and integrity are maintained.

Details of the key policies and processes within EY for maintaining objectivity and independence can be found in our annual Transparency Report, which the firm is required to publish by law. The most recent version of this report is for the year ended June 2015 and can be found here:

<http://www.ey.com/UK/en/About-us/EY-UK-Transparency-Report-2015>

Appendix A Fees

A breakdown of our agreed fee is shown below.

	Planned Fee 2015/16 £	Scale fee 2015/16 £
Opinion Audit and VFM Conclusion	139,466	139,466
Total Audit Fee – Code work	139,466	139,466
Certification of claims and returns ¹	26,910	26,910

All fees exclude VAT.

The agreed fee presented above is based on the following assumptions:

- ▶ Officers meeting the agreed timetable of deliverables;
- ▶ The operating effectiveness of the internal controls for the key processes outlined in section 4.2 above;
- ▶ We can rely on the work of internal audit as planned;
- ▶ Our accounts opinion and value for money conclusion being unqualified;
- ▶ Appropriate quality of documentation is provided by the Council; and
- ▶ The Council has an effective control environment.

If any of the above assumptions prove to be unfounded, we will seek a variation to the agreed fee. This will be discussed with the Council in advance.

Fees for the auditor's consideration of correspondence from the public and formal objections will be charged in addition to the scale fee. Our work to review concerns raised by a whistleblower on the Council's procurement of legal services is likely to represent additional work outside of the scope of our 2015-2016 audit and scale fee. We are conscious that the cost of our work in this area ultimately falls on Council Tax payers. For this reason, we will be risk based and proportionate in our work. Should we seek a fee variation for the additional audit work we have needed to undertake to respond to the concerns raised, we will discuss the basis of this with Council's management, report to the Audit Committee and seek approval from PSAA.

¹ Our fee for the certification of grant claims is based on the indicative scale fee set by the PSAA.

Appendix B UK required communications with those charged with governance

There are certain communications that we must provide to the Audit Committee. These are detailed here:

Required communication	Reference
Planning and audit approach Communication of the planned scope and timing of the audit including any limitations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Audit Plan
Significant findings from the audit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Our view about the significant qualitative aspects of accounting practices including accounting policies, accounting estimates and financial statement disclosures ▶ Significant difficulties, if any, encountered during the audit ▶ Significant matters, if any, arising from the audit that were discussed with management ▶ Written representations that we are seeking ▶ Expected modifications to the audit report ▶ Other matters if any, significant to the oversight of the financial reporting process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Report to those charged with governance
Misstatements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Uncorrected misstatements and their effect on our audit opinion ▶ The effect of uncorrected misstatements related to prior periods ▶ A request that any uncorrected misstatement be corrected ▶ In writing, corrected misstatements that are significant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Report to those charged with governance
Fraud <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Enquiries of the Audit Committee to determine whether they have knowledge of any actual, suspected or alleged fraud affecting the entity ▶ Any fraud that we have identified or information we have obtained that indicates that a fraud may exist ▶ A discussion of any other matters related to fraud 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Report to those charged with governance
Related parties Significant matters arising during the audit in connection with the entity's related parties including, when applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Non-disclosure by management ▶ Inappropriate authorisation and approval of transactions ▶ Disagreement over disclosures ▶ Non-compliance with laws and regulations ▶ Difficulty in identifying the party that ultimately controls the entity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Report to those charged with governance
External confirmations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Management's refusal for us to request confirmations ▶ Inability to obtain relevant and reliable audit evidence from other procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Report to those charged with governance
Consideration of laws and regulations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Audit findings regarding non-compliance where the non-compliance is material and believed to be intentional. This communication is subject to compliance with legislation on tipping off ▶ Enquiry of the Audit Committee into possible instances of non-compliance with laws and regulations that may have a material effect on the financial statements and that the Audit Committee may be aware of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Report to those charged with governance

Required communication	Reference
<p>Independence</p> <p>Communication of all significant facts and matters that bear on EY's objectivity and independence</p> <p>Communication of key elements of the audit engagement director's consideration of independence and objectivity such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The principal threats ▶ Safeguards adopted and their effectiveness ▶ An overall assessment of threats and safeguards ▶ Information about the general policies and process within the firm to maintain objectivity and independence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Audit Plan ▶ Report to those charged with governance
<p>Going concern</p> <p>Events or conditions identified that may cast significant doubt on the entity's ability to continue as a going concern, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Whether the events or conditions constitute a material uncertainty ▶ Whether the use of the going concern assumption is appropriate in the preparation and presentation of the financial statements ▶ The adequacy of related disclosures in the financial statements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Report to those charged with governance
<p>Significant deficiencies in internal controls identified during the audit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Report to those charged with governance
<p>Fee Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Breakdown of fee information at the agreement of the initial audit plan ▶ Breakdown of fee information at the completion of the audit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Audit Plan ▶ Report to those charged with governance ▶ Annual Audit Letter if considered necessary
<p>Certification work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Summary of certification work undertaken 	<p>Annual Report to those charged with governance summarising grant certification, and Annual Audit Letter if considered necessary</p>

EY | Assurance | Tax | Transactions | Advisory

Ernst & Young LLP

© Ernst & Young LLP. Published in the UK.
All Rights Reserved.

The UK firm Ernst & Young LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC300001 and is a member firm of Ernst & Young Global Limited.

Ernst & Young LLP, 1 More London Place, London, SE1 2AF.

ey.com