



# External Audit Plan

*Year ending 31 March 2020*

Coventry City Council

27 January 2020



# Contents



## Your key Grant Thornton team members are:

**Mark Stocks**

**Key Audit Partner**

T: 0121 232 5437  
E: mark.c.stocks@uk.gt.com

**Avtar Sohal**

**Senior Manager**

T: 0121 232 5420  
E: avtar.s.sohal@uk.gt.com

**Zak Francis**

**In-Charge**

T: 0121 232 5164  
E: zak.francis@uk.gt.com

## Section

1. Introduction & headlines	3
2. Key matters impacting our audit	4
3. Group audit scope and risk assessment	5
4. Significant risks identified	7
5. Other risks identified	10
6. Other matters	11
7. Materiality	12
8. Value for Money arrangements	13
9. Audit logistics & team	14
10. Audit fees	15
11. Independence & non-audit services	17

## Appendix

A. Audit quality – national context	19
-------------------------------------	----

The contents of this report relate only to the matters which have come to our attention, which we believe need to be reported to you as part of our audit planning process. It is not a comprehensive record of all the relevant matters, which may be subject to change, and in particular we cannot be held responsible to you for reporting all of the risks which may affect the Authority or all weaknesses in your internal controls. This report has been prepared solely for your benefit and should not be quoted in whole or in part without our prior written consent. We do not accept any responsibility for any loss occasioned to any third party acting, or refraining from acting on the basis of the content of this report, as this report was not prepared for, nor intended for, any other purpose.

Grant Thornton UK LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales: No.OC307742. Registered office: 30 Finsbury Square, London, EC2A 1AG. A list of members is available from our registered office. Grant Thornton UK LLP is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority. Grant Thornton UK LLP is a member firm of Grant Thornton International Ltd (GTIL). GTIL and the member firms are not a worldwide partnership. Services are delivered by the member firms. GTIL and its member firms are not agents of, and do not obligate, one another and are not liable for one another's acts or omissions.

# 1. Introduction & headlines

## Purpose

This document provides an overview of the planned scope and timing of the statutory audit of Coventry City Council ('the Authority') for those charged with governance.

## Respective responsibilities

The National Audit Office ('the NAO') has issued a document entitled Code of Audit Practice ('the Code'). This summarises where the responsibilities of auditors begin and end and what is expected from the audited body. Our respective responsibilities are also set out in the Terms of Appointment and Statement of Responsibilities issued by Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA), the body responsible for appointing us as auditor of Coventry. We draw your attention to both of these documents on the [PSAA website](#).

## Scope of our audit

The scope of our audit is set in accordance with the Code and International Standards on Auditing (ISAs) (UK). We are responsible for forming and expressing an opinion on the:

- Authority and group's financial statements that have been prepared by management with the oversight of those charged with governance (the Audit and Procurement committee); and
- Value for Money arrangements in place at the Authority for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in your use of resources.

The audit of the financial statements does not relieve management or the Audit and Procurement Committee of your responsibilities. It is the responsibility of the Authority to ensure that proper arrangements are in place for the conduct of its business, and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for. We have considered how the Authority is fulfilling these responsibilities.

Our audit approach is based on a thorough understanding of the Authority's business and is risk based.

<b>Group Accounts</b>	The Council is required to prepare group financial statements that consolidate the financial information of Coventry and Solihull Waste Disposal Company Limited, Friargate LLP, Coventry North Regeneration Limited, North Coventry Holdings Limited and Coombe Abbey Park Limited. We will assess whether activity in the UK Battery Industrialisation Centre Ltd warrants consolidation in the group accounts.
<b>Significant risks</b>	<p>Those risks requiring special audit consideration and procedures to address the likelihood of a material financial statement error have been identified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management Override of Control</li> <li>• Valuation of land and buildings and Investment Property</li> <li>• Valuation of net pension fund liability.</li> </ul> <p>We will communicate significant findings on these areas as well as any other significant matters arising from the audit to you in our Audit Findings (ISA 260) Report.</p>
<b>Materiality</b>	We have determined planning materiality to be £11.4m for the Group (PY £14.0m) and £11.3m for the Council, which equates to 1.5% of your prior year gross expenditure for the year. We are obliged to report uncorrected omissions or misstatements other than those which are 'clearly trivial' to those charged with governance. Clearly trivial has been set at £0.565m (PY £0.690m).
<b>Value for Money arrangements</b>	<p>Our risk assessment regarding your arrangements to secure value for money have identified the following VFM significant risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium Term Financial Sustainability</li> <li>• Delivering the Capital Programme</li> </ul>
<b>Audit logistics</b>	<p>Our interim visit will take place in January/February and our final visit will take place in June and July. Our key deliverables are this Audit Plan and our Audit Findings Report. Our audit approach is detailed in Appendix A.</p> <p>Our fee for the audit will be £168,414[ (PY: £150,056) for the Authority, subject to the Authority meeting our requirements set out on page 15.</p>
<b>Independence</b>	We have complied with the Financial Reporting Council's Ethical Standard and we as a firm, and each covered person, confirm that we are independent and are able to express an objective opinion on the financial statements..

## 2. Key matters impacting our audit

### Factors

#### The wider economy and political uncertainty

Local Government funding continues to be stretched with increasing cost pressures and demand from residents. The Council is currently within the final year of a four-year funding settlement from Government. A major upheaval in the funding arrangements for all councils that had been signalled for the period from 2020/21 onwards had been postponed until 2021/22 at the earliest. Based on 2019/20 approved budget, the financial gap for the four years following was £16.7m for 2020/21 rising to £34.4m by 2023/24.

At a national level, the government continues its negotiation with the EU over Brexit, and future arrangements remain clouded in uncertainty (update as appropriate). The Council will need to ensure that it is prepared for all outcomes, including in terms of any impact on contracts, on service delivery and on its support for local people and businesses.

#### Financial reporting and audit –raising the bar

The Financial Reporting Council (FRC) has set out its expectation of improved financial reporting from organisations and the need for auditors to demonstrate increased scepticism and challenge, and to undertake more robust testing as detailed in Appendix 1.

Our work in 2018/19 has highlighted areas where local government financial reporting, in particular, property, plant and equipment and pensions, needs to be improved, with a corresponding increase in audit procedures. We have also identified an increase in the complexity of local government financial transactions which require greater audit scrutiny.

#### Group Boundary

The Council has various companies in which it retains an interest. It has the following subsidiaries Coombe Abbey Park Ltd, North Coventry Holding and Coventry North Regeneration and the following joint ventures Coventry and Solihull Waste Disposal Company (CSWDC) and Friargate JV Project Ltd.

The UK Battery Industrialisation Centre Ltd was incorporated on 27th February 2018 and the Council is currently the sole shareholder with 1 share which has a nominal value of £1. Activity within the company was minimal in 2018/19 and was held at nil value in the Financial Statements as at 31 March 2019

The Council continues to look at ways in which it can work with partners to deliver services for its residents and ensure that it is appropriately considering commercialization opportunities.

### Our response

We will consider your arrangements for managing and reporting your financial resources as part of our work in reaching our Value for Money conclusion.

We will consider whether your financial position leads to material uncertainty about the going concern of the Council and will review related disclosures in the financial statements.

As a firm, we are absolutely committed to meeting the expectations of the FRC with regard to audit quality and local government financial reporting. Our proposed work and fee, as set further in our Audit Plan, has been agreed with the Director of Finance and is subject to PSAA agreement.

We have deemed Coventry and Solihull Waste Disposal Company Limited, Friargate JV Project Ltd and Coombe Abbey Park Ltd to be individually significant to the group financial statements, based on 2018/19 activity.

We will assess whether in developments in activity in the UK Battery Industrialisation Centre will require consolidation in the Group financial statements for 2019/20.

We will maintain a watching brief and continue to liaise with the finance team to ensure that if further changes to the group boundary are identified that the consolidation is extended to include further entities as necessary

### 3. Group audit scope and risk assessment

In accordance with ISA (UK) 600, as group auditor we are required to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence regarding the financial information of the components and the consolidation process to express an opinion on whether the group financial statements are prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework.

Component	Individually Significant?	Audit Scope	Risks identified	Planned audit approach
<b>Coventry City</b>	Yes	Audit of the financial information of the component using component materiality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See pages 6 to 9</li> </ul>	Full scope UK statutory audit performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP
<b>Coventry and Solihull Waste Disposal Company</b>	No	Audit of one or more classes of transactions, account balances or disclosures relating to significant risks of the group financial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Valuation of Investment</li> <li>Consolidation of Income and Expenditure</li> </ul>	<p>Full scope UK statutory audit performed by Ernst and Young LLP.</p> <p>The nature, time and extent of our involvement in the work of the auditor of the company will begin with a discussion on risks, guidance on designing procedures, participation in meetings, followed by the review of relevant aspects of the company audit documentation and meeting with appropriate members of management.</p> <p>We have changed our approach from last year to take into account the lower materiality levels compared to the prior year and to ensure we have adequate assurances over the material balances.</p>
<b>Coombe Abbey Park Limited</b>	No	Audit of one or more classes of transactions, account balances or disclosures relating to significant risks of the group financial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Valuation of Investment</li> </ul>	Grant Thornton UK LLP to undertake specific procedures on the valuation of the Investment by engaging our Experts.
<b>Friargate LLP</b>	No	Audit of one or more classes of transactions, account balances or disclosures relating to significant risks of the group financial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Valuation of Investment</li> </ul>	Grant Thornton UK LLP to undertake specific procedures on the valuation of the Investment by engaging our Experts.

### 3. Group audit scope and risk assessment (continued)

Component	Individually Significant?	Audit Scope	Risks identified	Planned audit approach
<b>Coventry North Regeneration Limited</b>	No	Analytical Procedures at Group Level	None	Analytical review performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP.
<b>North Coventry Holdings Limited</b>	No	Analytical Procedures at Group Level	None	Analytical review performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP.
<b>UK Battery Industrialisation Centre Ltd</b>	No	Analytical Procedures at Group Level	None	Analytical review performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP.

## 4. Significant risks identified

Significant risks are defined by ISAs (UK) as risks that, in the judgement of the auditor, require special audit consideration. In identifying risks, audit teams consider the nature of the risk, the potential magnitude of misstatement, and its likelihood. Significant risks are those risks that have a higher risk of material misstatement.

Risk	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
<b>The revenue cycle includes fraudulent transactions</b> <b>(Group and Council)</b>	<p>Under ISA (UK) 240 there is a rebuttable presumed risk that revenue may be misstated due to the improper recognition of revenue.</p> <p>This presumption can be rebutted if the auditor concludes that there is no risk of material misstatement due to fraud relating to revenue recognition.</p> <p>Having considered the risk factors set out in ISA240 and the nature of the revenue streams at the Authority, we have determined that the risk of fraud arising from revenue recognition can be rebutted, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there is little incentive to manipulate revenue recognition</li> <li>• opportunities to manipulate revenue recognition are very limited</li> <li>• the culture and ethical frameworks of local authorities, including Coventry City Council, mean that all forms of fraud are seen as unacceptable</li> </ul>	<p>Therefore we do not consider this to be a significant risk for Coventry City Council and the Group</p>
<b>Management over-ride of controls</b> <b>(Group and Council)</b>	<p>Under ISA (UK) 240 there is a non-rebuttable presumed risk that the risk of management over-ride of controls is present in all entities.</p> <p>We therefore identified management override of control, in particular journals, management estimates and transactions outside the course of business as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement.</p>	<p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• evaluate the design effectiveness of management controls over journals</li> <li>• analyse the journals listing and determine the criteria for selecting high risk unusual journals</li> <li>• test unusual journals recorded during the year and after the draft accounts stage for appropriateness and corroboration</li> <li>• gain an understanding of the accounting estimates and critical judgements applied made by management and consider their reasonableness with regard to corroborative evidence</li> <li>• evaluate the rationale for any changes in accounting policies, estimates or significant unusual transactions.</li> </ul>

# Significant risks identified – PPE

Risk	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
<b>Valuation of land and buildings (Council)</b>	<p>The Council revalues its land and buildings on a rolling five-yearly basis. This valuation represents a significant estimate by management in the financial statements due to the size of the numbers involved (GBV £853m) and the sensitivity of this estimate to changes in key assumptions. Additionally, management will need to ensure the carrying value in the Authority and group financial statements is not materially different from the current value or the fair value (for surplus assets) at the financial statements date, where a rolling programme is used.</p> <p>We therefore identified valuation of land and buildings, particularly revaluations and impairments, as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement, and a key audit matter.</p>	<p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• evaluate management's processes and assumptions for the calculation of the estimate, the instructions issued to valuation experts and the scope of their work</li> <li>• evaluate the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the valuation expert</li> <li>• Correspond with the valuer to confirm the basis on which the valuation was carried out</li> <li>• challenge the information and assumptions used by the valuer to assess completeness and consistency with our understanding/</li> <li>• engage our own valuer to assess the instructions to the Authority's valuer, the Authority's valuer's report and the assumptions that underpin the valuation.</li> <li>• test revaluations made during the year to see if they had been input correctly into the Council and group asset register</li> <li>• evaluating the assumptions made by management for those assets not revalued during the year and how management has satisfied themselves that these are not materially different to current value at year end.</li> </ul>
<b>Valuation of Investment Properties (Council)</b>	<p>The Council hold a range of investment properties which comprise of commercial, office units, agriculture, residential and other assets.</p> <p>The assets are included in the balance sheet are at fair value (£176m), and the Council revalues over 80% of its assets each year. The remaining assets not valued are subject to review to ensure that there has been no material changes. The Council to be compliant with the LG Code should value 100% of assets.</p> <p>For Investment Property, valuations decrease are recognised in Surplus or Deficit on the Provision of Services.</p> <p>We therefore identified valuation of Investment Properties, particularly revaluations and impairments, as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement, and a key audit matter.</p>	<p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• evaluate management's processes and assumptions for the calculation of the estimate, the instructions issued to valuation experts and the scope of their work</li> <li>• evaluate the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the valuation expert</li> <li>• Correspond with the valuer to confirm the basis on which the valuation was carried out</li> <li>• challenge the information and assumptions used by the valuer to assess completeness and consistency with our understanding/</li> <li>• engage our own valuer to assess the instructions to the Authority's valuer, the Authority's valuer's report and the assumptions that underpin the valuation.</li> <li>• test revaluations made during the year to see if they had been input correctly into the Council and group asset register</li> <li>• evaluating the assumptions made by management for those assets not revalued during the year and how management has satisfied themselves that these are not materially different to current value at year end.</li> </ul>



# Significant risks identified - Pensions

Risk	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
<b>Valuation of the pension fund net liability (Council)</b>	<p>The Authority's pension fund net liability, as reflected in its balance sheet as the net defined benefit liability, represents a significant estimate in the financial statements and group accounts.</p> <p>The pension fund net liability is considered a significant estimate due to the size of the numbers involved (£554 million in the Authority's balance sheet) and the sensitivity of the estimate to changes in key assumptions.</p> <p>We therefore identified valuation of the Authority's pension fund net liability as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement, and a key audit matter.</p>	<p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• update our understanding of the processes and controls put in place by management to ensure that the Authority's pension fund net liability is not materially misstated and evaluate the design of the associated controls;</li> <li>• evaluate the instructions issued by management to their management expert (an actuary) for this estimate and the scope of the actuary's work;</li> <li>• assess the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the actuary who carried out the Authority's pension fund valuation;</li> <li>• assess the accuracy and completeness of the information provided by the Authority to the actuary to estimate the liability;</li> <li>• test the consistency of the pension fund asset and liability and disclosures in the notes to the core financial statements with the actuarial report from the actuary;</li> <li>• undertake procedures to confirm the reasonableness of the actuarial assumptions made by reviewing the report of the consulting actuary (as auditor's expert) and performing any additional procedures suggested within the report; and</li> <li>• obtain assurances from the auditor of West Midlands Pension Fund as to the controls surrounding the validity and accuracy of membership data; contributions data and benefits data sent to the actuary by the pension fund and the fund assets valuation in the pension fund financial statements.</li> </ul>

We will communicate significant findings on these areas as well as any other significant matters arising from the audit to you in our Audit Findings Report in July 2020.

## 5. Other risks identified

Risk	Reason for risk identification
<b>International Financial Reporting Standard (IFRS) 16 Leases – (issued but not adopted) (Council)</b>	<p>The public sector will implement this standard from 1 April 2020. It will replace IAS 17 Leases, and the three interpretations that supported its application (IFRIC 4, Determining whether an Arrangement contains a Lease, SIC-15, Operating Leases – Incentives, and SIC-27 Evaluating the Substance of Transactions Involving the Legal Form of a Lease). Under the new standard the current distinction between operating and finance leases is removed for lessees and, subject to certain exceptions, lessees will recognise all leases on their balance sheet as a right of use asset and a liability to make the lease payments.</p> <p>In accordance with IAS 8 and paragraph 3.3.4.3 of the Code disclosures of the expected impact of IFRS 16 should be included in the Authority's 2019/20 financial statements. The Code adapts IFRS 16 and requires that the subsequent measurement of the right of use asset where the underlying asset is an item of property, plant and equipment is measured in accordance with section 4.1 of the Code.</p> <p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate the processes the Authority has adopted to assess the impact of IFRS16 on its 2020/21 financial statements and whether the estimated impact on assets, liabilities and reserves has been disclosed in the 2019/20 financial statements.</li> <li>• Assess the completeness of the disclosures made by the Authority in its 2019/20 financial statements with reference to The Code and CIPFA/LASAAC <a href="#">Local Authority Leasing Briefings</a>.</li> </ul>

We will communicate significant findings on these areas as well as any other significant matters arising from the audit to you in our Audit Findings Report in July 2020.

## 6. Other matters

### Other work

In addition to our responsibilities under the Code of Practice, we have a number of other audit responsibilities, as follows:

- We read your Narrative Report and Annual Governance Statement to check that they are consistent with the financial statements on which we give an opinion and consistent with our knowledge of the Authority
- We carry out work to satisfy ourselves that disclosures made in your Annual Governance Statement are in line with the guidance issued by CIPFA
- We carry out work on your consolidation schedules for the Whole of Government Accounts process in accordance with NAO group audit instructions
- We consider our other duties under the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 (the Act) and the Code, as and when required, including:
  - Giving electors the opportunity to raise questions about your 2019/20 financial statements, consider and decide upon any objections received in relation to the 2019/20 financial statements
  - Issue of a report in the public interest or written recommendations to the Authority under section 24 of the Act, copied to the Secretary of State
  - Application to the court for a declaration that an item of account is contrary to law under Section 28 or for a judicial review under Section 31 of the Act or
  - Issuing an advisory notice under Section 29 of the Act.
- We certify completion of our audit.

### Other material balances and transactions

Under International Standards on Auditing, "irrespective of the assessed risks of material misstatement, the auditor shall design and perform substantive procedures for each material class of transactions, account balance and disclosure". All other material balances and transaction streams will therefore be audited. However, the procedures will not be as extensive as the procedures adopted for the risks identified in this report.

### Going concern

As auditors, we are required to "obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence about the appropriateness of management's use of the going concern assumption in the preparation and presentation of the financial statements and to conclude whether there is a material uncertainty about the group's ability to continue as a going concern" (ISA (UK) 570). We will review management's assessment of the going concern assumption and material uncertainties, and evaluate the disclosures in the financial statements.

## 7. Materiality

### The concept of materiality

The concept of materiality is fundamental to the preparation of the financial statements and the audit process and applies not only to the monetary misstatements but also to disclosure requirements and adherence to acceptable accounting practice and applicable law.

Misstatements, including omissions, are considered to be material if they, individually or in the aggregate, could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements.

### Materiality for planning purposes

We have determined financial statement materiality based on a proportion of the gross expenditure of the group and Council for the financial year. In the prior year we used the same benchmark. Materiality at the planning stage of our audit is £11.4m (PY £14m) for the group and £11.3m (PY £13.8m) for the Council, which equates to 1.5% of your prior year gross expenditure for the year. The reduction in materiality compared to the previous year reflects the higher profile of local audit following external reviews such as those led by Sir John Kingman and Sir Tony Redman. We design our procedures to detect errors in specific accounts at a lower level of precision which we have determined to be £100k for Senior Officer remuneration.

We reconsider planning materiality if, during the course of our audit engagement, we become aware of facts and circumstances that would have caused us to make a different determination of planning materiality.

### Matters we will report to the Audit and Procurement Committee

Whilst our audit procedures are designed to identify misstatements which are material to our opinion on the financial statements as a whole, we nevertheless report to the Audit Committee any unadjusted misstatements of lesser amounts to the extent that these are identified by our audit work. Under ISA 260 (UK) 'Communication with those charged with governance', we are obliged to report uncorrected omissions or misstatements other than those which are 'clearly trivial' to those charged with governance. ISA 260 (UK) defines 'clearly trivial' as matters that are clearly inconsequential, whether taken individually or in aggregate and whether judged by any quantitative or qualitative criteria. In the context of the group and Council, we propose that an individual difference could normally be considered to be clearly trivial if it is less than £0.565m (PY £0.690m).

If management have corrected material misstatements identified during the course of the audit, we will consider whether those corrections should be communicated to the Audit and Procurement Committee to assist it in fulfilling its governance responsibilities.

### Prior year gross expenditure

£752m Group

£743m Council

### Materiality

£11.4m


group financial  
statements materiality  
(PY: £14.0m)

£11.3m

Authority financial  
statements materiality  
(PY: £13.8m)

£0.xm

Misstatements reported  
to the Audit and  
Procurement Committee  
(PY: £0.565m)



■ Prior year gross expenditure

■ Materiality

## 8. Value for Money arrangements


### Background to our VFM approach

The NAO issued its guidance for auditors on Value for Money work in November 2017. The guidance states that for Local Government bodies, auditors are required to give a conclusion on whether the Authority has proper arrangements in place to secure value for money.

The guidance identifies one single criterion for auditors to evaluate:

*"In all significant respects, the audited body takes properly informed decisions and deploys resources to achieve planned and sustainable outcomes for taxpayers and local people."*

This is supported by three sub-criteria, as set out below:



### Significant VFM risks

Those risks requiring audit consideration and procedures to address the likelihood that proper arrangements are not in place at the Authority to deliver value for money.



#### Medium Term Financial Sustainability

The Council is currently forecasting a balanced budget for 2019/20. Based on the 2019/20 approved budget the Council has identified budget shortfalls of £16.7m from 2020/21 rising to £34.4m in 2023/24. The Council acknowledges that the uncertainty with Local Government funding from 2020/21 onwards poses further difficulties in its work to deliver a balanced position.

In response to this risk we will assess whether the Council;

- has arrangements in place to plan its finances effectively to support the sustainable delivery of strategic priorities and maintain statutory functions whilst addressing these budget shortfalls



#### Delivering the Capital Programme

The 2019/20 capital expenditure outturn has been revised from £195.4m the original programme reported to Cabinet to £218.7m for the year. This includes major scheme expenditure including investment in the A46 Link Road, Coventry Station Master Plan, Whitley South Infrastructure and the National Battery Plant. There is a risk for any large capital programme that there is slippage in delivery and increased costs.

In response to this risk we will assess whether the Council

- has arrangements in place to monitoring its performance against its capital programme and whether any delays or slippages will have an impact on the Councils capital strategy and objectives.

## 9. Audit logistics & team



### Mark Stocks, Key Audit Partner

As your engagement lead, Mark will have the ultimate responsibility for the delivery of your audit service. He will lead our relationship with the Authority and take overall responsibility for delivering a high quality audit, which meets the highest professional standards while adding value.



### Avtar Sohal, Senior Manager

As the engagement manager, Avtar is responsible for overseeing the delivery of our service and managing the audit process. He will work with officers and our on-site team to ensure the smooth planning and delivery of the audit. He will oversee the on-site team and discuss any issues with you during the audit process as well as any questions you may have throughout the year.



### Zak Francis, Audit Incharge

Zak will lead the on-site audit team and is responsible for the performance of the audit fieldwork and day-to-day liaison with the finance team. He will ensure that your audit is delivered effectively, efficiently and supportively, keeping the finance team abreast of any issues arising as and when they occur.

### Client responsibilities

Where clients do not deliver to the timetable agreed, we need to ensure that this does not impact on audit quality or absorb a disproportionate amount of time, thereby disadvantaging other clients. Where the elapsed time to complete an audit exceeds that agreed due to a client not meeting its obligations we will not be able to maintain a team on site. Similarly, where additional resources are needed to complete the audit due to a client not meeting their obligations we are not able to guarantee the delivery of the audit to the agreed timescales. In addition, delayed audits will incur additional audit fees.

### Our requirements

To minimise the risk of a delayed audit, you need to ensure that you:

- produce draft financial statements of good quality by the deadline you have agreed with us, including all notes, the narrative report and the Annual Governance Statement
- ensure that good quality working papers are available at the start of the audit, in accordance with the working paper requirements schedule that we have shared with you
- ensure that the agreed data reports are available to us at the start of the audit and are reconciled to the values in the accounts, in order to facilitate our selection of samples
- ensure that all appropriate staff are available on site throughout (or as otherwise agreed) the planned period of the audit
- respond promptly and adequately to audit queries.

# 10. Audit fees

## Planned audit fees 2019/20

Across all sectors and firms, the FRC has set out its expectation of improved financial reporting from organisations and the need for auditors to demonstrate increased scepticism and challenge and to undertake additional and more robust testing. Within the public sector, where the FRC has recently assumed responsibility for the inspection of local government audit, the regulator requires that all audits achieve a 2A (few improvements needed) rating.

Our work across the sector in 2018/19 has highlighted areas where local government financial reporting, in particular, property, plant and equipment and pensions, needs to be improved. We have also identified an increase in the complexity of local government financial transactions. Combined with the FRC requirement that 100% of audits achieve a 2A rating this means that additional audit work is required. We have set out below the expected impact on our audit fee. The table overleaf provides more details about the areas where we will be undertaking further testing.

As a firm, we are absolutely committed to meeting the expectations of the FRC with regard to audit quality and local government financial reporting. Our proposed work and fee for 2019/20 at the planning stage, as set out below and with further analysis overleaf, has been agreed with the Director of Finance and is subject to PSAA agreement.

	Actual Fee 2017/18	Actual Fee 2018/19	Proposed fee 2019/20
<b>Council Audit</b>	£173,460	£150,056	£168,414
<b>Total audit fees (excluding VAT)</b>	<b>£173,460</b>	<b>£150,056</b>	<b>£168,414</b>

## Assumptions:

In setting the above fees, we have assumed that the Authority will:

- prepare a good quality set of accounts, supported by comprehensive and well presented working papers which are ready at the start of the audit
- provide appropriate analysis, support and evidence to support all critical judgements and significant judgements made during the course of preparing the financial statements
- provide early notice of proposed complex or unusual transactions which could have a material impact on the financial statements.

## Relevant professional standards:

In preparing our fee estimate, we have had regard to all relevant professional standards, including paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 of the FRC's [Ethical Standard](#) which stipulate that the Engagement Lead (Key Audit Partner) must set a fee sufficient to enable the resourcing of the audit with staff of appropriate skills, time and abilities to deliver an audit to the required professional standard.

# Audit fee variations – Further analysis

## Planned audit fees

The table below shows the planned variations to the original scale fee for 2019/20 based on our best estimate at the audit planning stage. Further issues identified during the course of the audit may incur additional fees. In agreement with PSAA (where applicable) we will be seeking approval to secure these additional fees for the remainder of the contract via a formal rebasing of your scale fee to reflect the increased level of audit work required to enable us to discharge our responsibilities. Should any further issues arise during the course of the audit that necessitate further audit work additional fees will be incurred, subject to PSAA approval.

Audit area	£	Rationale for fee variation
<b>Scale fee</b>	£133,564	
<b>Enhanced regularity requirements in respect of public interest entity audits</b>	£4,000	As the Council holds listed debt, it meets the FRC definition of a Public Interest Entity. Certain additional Ethical and Quality standards apply, including the need for us to produce an Enhanced Audit Report.
<b>Raising the bar</b>	£8,000	The Financial Reporting Council (FRC) has highlighted that the quality of work by all audit firms needs to improve across local audit. This will require additional supervision and leadership, as well as additional challenge and scepticism in areas such as journals, estimates, financial resilience and information provided by the entity. As outlined earlier in the Plan, we have also reduced the materiality level, reflecting the higher profile of local audit. This will entail increased scoping and sampling.
<b>Pensions – valuation of net pension liabilities under International Auditing Standard (IAS) 19</b>	£3,500	We have increased the granularity, depth and scope of coverage, with increased levels of sampling, additional levels of challenge and explanation sought, and heightened levels of documentation and reporting.
<b>PPE Valuation – work of experts</b>	£9,350	The FRC has also determined that auditors need to improve the quality of audit challenge on PPE valuations across the sector. We have therefore engaged our own audit expert – Wilks Head and Eve and increased the volume and scope of our audit work to ensure an adequate level of audit scrutiny and challenge over the assumptions that underpin PPE valuations. The increase includes an estimate for the fee payable to the auditor's expert which we estimate to be in the region of £5000.
<b>New standards/ developments – IFRS 16</b>	£2,500	IFRS16 requires a leased asset, previously accounted for as an operating lease off balance sheet, to be recognised as a 'right of use' asset with a corresponding liability on the balance sheet from 1 April 2020. There is a requirement, under IAS8, to disclose the expected impact of this change in accounting treatment in the 2019/20 financial statements.
<b>Specialist Valuation of Coombe Abbey Park Ltd</b>	£2,500	The Council has a complex portfolio of Long-Term Investments which are carried at Fair Value. We are therefore required to engage our expert valuation teams to confirm that the valuation of the Long-Term Investments the Council holds are not materially misstated. We have included an additional fee for the expert valuation of Coombe Abbey Park Ltd
<b>Working with Component Auditors</b>	£5,000	As part of the Group Audit we will have to work with component auditors to get assurance required to deliver the audit opinion. This will involve us instructing, co-ordinating, reviewing and concluding on the audit work completed.
<b>Revised scale fee (to be approved by PSAA)</b>	<b>£168,414</b>	



# 11. Independence & non-audit services

## Auditor independence

Ethical Standards and ISA (UK) 260 require us to give you timely disclosure of all significant facts and matters that may bear upon the integrity, objectivity and independence of the firm or covered persons relating to our independence. We encourage you to contact us to discuss these or any other independence issues with us. We will also discuss with you if we make additional significant judgements surrounding independence matters.

We confirm that there are no significant facts or matters that impact on our independence as auditors that we are required or wish to draw to your attention. We have complied with the Financial Reporting Council's Ethical Standard and we as a firm, and each covered person, confirm that we are independent and are able to express an objective opinion on the financial statements.

We confirm that we have implemented policies and procedures to meet the requirements of the Financial Reporting Council's Ethical Standard and we as a firm, and each covered person, confirm that we are independent and are able to express an objective opinion on the financial statements. Further, we have complied with the requirements of the National Audit Office's Auditor Guidance Note 01 issued in December 2017 and PSAA's Terms of Appointment which set out supplementary guidance on ethical requirements for auditors of local public bodies.

## Other services provided by Grant Thornton

For the purposes of our audit we have made enquiries of all Grant Thornton UK LLP teams providing services to the Authority. The following other services were identified.

Audit Relate Service	£	Threats	Safeguards
Certification of Housing Benefits Subsidy claim	16,000	Self-Interest (because this is a recurring fee)	The level of this recurring fee taken on its own is not considered a significant threat to independence as the fee for this work is expected to be low £16,000 (£14,020 prior year) in comparison to the total scale fee for the audit of £133,564 and in particular relative to Grant Thornton UK LLP's turnover overall. Further, it is a fixed fee and there is no contingent element to it. These factors all mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level.
Certification of 2018/19 Teachers Pension Return	4,200 (indicative)	Self-Interest (because this is a recurring fee)	The level of this recurring fee taken on its own is not considered a significant threat to independence as the fee for this work is £4,200 in comparison to the total scale fee for the audit of £133,564 and in particular relative to Grant Thornton UK LLP's turnover overall. Further, it is a fixed fee and there is no contingent element to it. These factors all mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level.
Certification of Innovate UK grant claims in relation to Battery Industrialisation Centre (from April 2019 for 18 months)	23,700	Self-Interest (because this is a recurring fee)	The level of this recurring fee taken on its own is not considered a significant threat to independence as the fee for this work is £23,700 for 18 months in comparison to the total annual audit fee for the audit of £133,564 and in particular relative to Grant Thornton UK LLP's turnover overall. Further, it is a fixed fee and there is no contingent element to it. These factors all mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level.

The amounts detailed are fees agreed to-date for audit related services to be undertaken by Grant Thornton UK LLP in the current financial year. These services are consistent with the group's policy on the allotment of non-audit work to your auditors. All services have been approved by the Audit and Procurement Committee. Any changes and full details of all fees charged for audit related services by Grant Thornton UK LLP and by Grant Thornton International Limited network member Firms will be included in our Audit Findings report at the conclusion of the audit.

None of the services provided are subject to contingent fees.

The firm is committed to improving our audit quality – please see our transparency report - <https://www.grantthornton.ie/about/transparency-report/>

---

# Appendices

## A. Audit Quality – national context

# Appendix A: Audit Quality – national context

## What has the FRC said about Audit Quality?

The Financial Reporting Council (FRC) publishes an annual Quality Inspection of our firm, alongside our competitors. The Annual Quality Review (AQR) monitors the quality of UK Public Interest Entity audits to promote continuous improvement in audit quality.

All of the major audit firms are subject to an annual review process in which the FRC inspects a small sample of audits performed from each of the firms to see if they fully conform to required standards.

The most recent report, published in July 2019, shows that the results of commercial audits taken across all the firms have worsened this year. The FRC has identified the need for auditors to:

- improve the extent and rigour of challenge of management in areas of judgement
- improve the consistency of audit teams' application of professional scepticism
- strengthen the effectiveness of the audit of revenue
- improve the audit of going concern
- improve the audit of the completeness and evaluation of prior year adjustments.

The FRC has also set all firms the target of achieving a grading of '2a' (limited improvements required) or better on all FTSE 350 audits. We have set ourselves the same target for public sector audits from 2019/20.

## Other sector wide reviews

Alongside the FRC, other key stakeholders including the Department for Business, energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) have expressed concern about the quality of audit work and the need for improvement. A number of key reviews into the profession have been undertaken or are in progress. These include the review by Sir John Kingman of the Financial Reporting Council (Dec 2018), the review by the Competition and Markets authority of competition within the audit market, the ongoing review by Sir Donald Brydon of external audit, and specifically for public services, the Review by Sir Tony Redmond of local authority financial reporting and external audit. As a firm, we are contributing to all these reviews and keen to be at the forefront of developments and improvements in public audit.

## What are we doing to address FRC findings?

In response to the FRC's findings, the firm is responding vigorously and with purpose. As part of our Audit Investment Programme (AIP), we are establishing a new Quality Board, commissioning an independent review of our audit function, and strengthening our senior leadership at the highest levels of the firm, for example through the appointment of Fiona Baldwin as Head of Audit. We are confident these investments will make a real difference.

We have also undertaken a root cause analysis and put in place processes to address the issues raised by the FRC. We have already implemented new training material that will reinforce the need for our engagement teams to challenge management and demonstrate how they have applied professional scepticism as part of the audit. Further guidance on auditing areas such as revenue has also been disseminated to all audit teams and we will continue to evolve our training and review processes on an ongoing basis.

## What will be different in this audit?

We will continue working collaboratively with you to deliver the audit to the agreed timetable whilst improving our audit quality. In achieving this you may see, for example, an increased expectation for management to develop properly articulated papers for any new accounting standard, or unusual or complex transactions. In addition, you should expect engagement teams to exercise even greater challenge management in areas that are complex, significant or highly judgmental which may be the case for accounting estimates, going concern, related parties and similar areas. As a result you may find the audit process even more challenging than previous audits. These changes will give the audit committee – which has overall responsibility for governance - and senior management greater confidence that we have delivered a high quality audit and that the financial statements are not materially misstated. Even greater challenge of management will also enable us to provide greater insights into the quality of your finance function and internal control environment and provide those charged with governance confidence that a material misstatement due to fraud will have been detected.

We will still plan for a smooth audit and ensure this is completed to the timetable agreed. However, there may be instances where we may require additional time for both the audit work to be completed to the standard required and to ensure management have appropriate time to consider any matters raised. This may require us to agree with you a delay in signing the announcement and financial statements. To minimise this risk, we will keep you informed of progress and risks to the timetable as the audit progresses.

We are absolutely committed to delivering audit of the highest quality and we should be happy to provide further detail about our improvement plans should you require it.



© 2019 Grant Thornton UK LLP. All rights reserved.

'Grant Thornton' refers to the brand under which the Grant Thornton member firms provide assurance, tax and advisory services to their clients and/or refers to one or more member firms, as the context requires.

Grant Thornton UK LLP is a member firm of Grant Thornton International Ltd (GTIL). GTIL and the member firms are not a worldwide partnership. GTIL and each member firm is a separate legal entity. Services are delivered by the member firms. GTIL does not provide services to clients. GTIL and its member firms are not agents of, and do not obligate, one another and are not liable for one another's acts or omissions.