## Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee



Title of Report:	Ernst and Young -				
	<b>Presentation of External Audit</b>				
	Plan and Fees 2015/2016 and 2016/2017 Indicative Fees				
Report No:	PAS/SE/16/012				
Report to and date/s:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	25 May 2016			
Portfolio holder:	Ian Houlder Outgoing Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance Tel: 01284 810074 Email: ian.houlder@stedsbc.gov.uk				
Lead officer:	Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance Tel: 01638 719245 Email: rachael.mann@westsuffolk.gov.uk				
Purpose of report:	To provide members with a basis to review:				
	<ul> <li>Ernst and Young's proposed approach and scope for the 2015/2016 audit along with the planned fees to complete the work as set out in the Audit Plan, attached at Appendix A; and</li> <li>The indicative fees for the 2016/2017 audit as set out in the letter attached at Appendix B.</li> </ul>				
Recommendation:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee:				
	Members are asked to <u>note</u> the External Audit Plan and Fees for 2015/2016, along with the indicative fees for 2016/2017.				

Key Decision:		•	cision and, if so, ur	nder which	
(Check the appropriate	definition		Dagisian 🗆		
box and delete all those		Yes, it is a Key Decision - □			
that <u>do not</u> apply.)	No, it is	No, it is not a Key Decision - ⊠			
con Per the		s report has been prepared in sultation with the Resources and formance team, Leadership Team and Portfolio Holder for Resources and formance.			
<b>Alternative option</b>	n(s):	• N/A			
Implications:					
Are there any finar	<b>icial</b> implicat	ions?	Yes ⊠ No □		
If yes, please give details		<ul> <li>The report includes the planned 2015/2016 audit fee of £43,767 and certification of claims fee of £30,822.</li> <li>The report also includes an indicative audit fee for 2016/17 of £43,767. The indicative certification of claims fee has yet to be confirmed.</li> </ul>			
Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? If yes, please give details		ons?	Yes □ No ⊠		
Are there any <b>ICT</b> i		Τf	Yes □ No ⊠		
yes, please give det	•	11	• NO 🗵		
Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? If yes, please give details  Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? If yes, please give details		Yes ⊠ No □  • External audit is a statutory function.  Yes □ No ⊠			
, , ,					
Risk/opportunity	assessmen	t:	(potential hazards or corporate, service or p		
Risk area	Inherent lev risk (before controls)		Controls	Residual risk (after controls)	
The accessment of	Low/Medium/ I	High*	Accommont of land	Low/Medium/ High*	
The assessment of the key strategic or operational risks and the financial statement risks facing the Council may not be correct	Medium		Assessment of key strategic or operational risks and the financial statement risks facing the Council have been identified through External Audits knowledge of the entity's operations and discussion with members and officers.	Low	
Ward(s) affected:			N/A		

Background papers: (all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)	None
Documents attached:	Appendix A – Ernst and Young Audit Plan 2015/2016  Appendix B – Ernst and Young Annual Audit and Certification Fees 2016/2017

## 1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)

- 1.1 The Council's appointed external auditors, Ernst and Young ("EY"), are required to provide an audit plan which covers the work they plan to perform in order to provide the Council with:
  - An audit opinion on whether the financial statements of St Edmundsbury Borough 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;
     and
  - A statutory conclusion on the Council's arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness. The Audit Plan (attached) is based on EY's risk-based approach to audit planning.
- 1.2 When planning the audit EY 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.
  - Management's views on all of the above.
- 1.3 Sections 2 and 3 of **Appendix A**, summarise EY's assessment of the key risks which drive the development of an effective audit for the Council, and outlines their planned audit strategy in response to those risks. Officers will be working with EY over the coming months to ensure that these risks are managed and where possible to come to an agreement over their treatment prior to the issuing of the Annual Governance Report, and Audit Opinion (due to be issued by EY by September 2016).
- 1.4 EY also review and report to the National Audit Office ('NAO'), to the extent and in the form required by them, on our Whole of Government Accounts return.
- 1.5 The planned fee for carrying out this work for 2015/2016 is set out on page 11 of **Appendix A** and the indicative fee for 2016/17 is contained in **Appendix B**. The fees are summarised below:

	Planned fee 2015/2016 £	Indicative fee 2016/2017 £
Total Code audit fee	43,767	43,767
Certification of claims and returns	30,822	TBC

1.6 The Code audit fee for 2016/2017 is an indicative fee only, set by the PSAA (Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd) for each audited body. It will be reviewed and updated as necessary following completion of the 2015/16 audit. The PSAA have yet to confirm the indicative certification fee for 2016/17.