

St Edmundsbury Borough Council

Year ending 31 March 2015

Audit Plan

26 March 2015



Building a better
working world

DELIBERATELY LEFT BLANK FOR PRINTING PURPOSES

Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee
St Edmundsbury Borough Council
West Suffolk House
Western Way
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk
IP33 3YU

26 March 2015

Dear Councillors

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 Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee with a basis to review our proposed audit approach and scope for the 2014/15 audit in accordance with the requirements of the Audit Commission Act 1998, the Code of Audit Practice, Standing Guidance, 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 plan with you at the next Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee as well as to understand whether there are other matters which you consider may influence our audit.

Yours faithfully



Neil Harris
For and behalf of Ernst & Young LLP
Enc

DELIBERATELY LEFT BLANK FOR PRINTING PURPOSES

Contents

1. Overview	2
3. Financial statement risks	4
4. Economy, efficiency and effectiveness	7
5. Our audit process and strategy	8
6. Independence	12
Appendix A Fees	15
Appendix B UK required communications with those charged with governance	17

In March 2010 the Audit Commission issued a revised version of the 'Statement of responsibilities of auditors and audited bodies' (Statement of responsibilities). It is available from the Chief Executive of each audited body and via the [Audit Commission's website](#).

The Statement of responsibilities serves as the formal terms of engagement between the Audit Commission's 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 Standing Guidance serves as our terms of appointment as auditors appointed by the Audit Commission. The Standing Guidance sets out additional requirements that auditors must comply with, over and above those set out in the Code of Audit Practice 2010 (the Code) and statute, and covers matters of practice and procedure which are of a recurring nature.

This Audit Results Report is prepared in the context of the Statement of responsibilities. It is addressed to the Members of the audited body, and is prepared for their sole use. 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

Context for the audit

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

- ▶ our 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 2015 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.

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.

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

In parts three and four of this report we provide more detail on the areas which we believe present significant risk to the financial statements audit, and outline our plans to address these risks. Our proposed audit process and strategy are summarised below and set out in more detail in section five.

We will provide an update to the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee on the results of our work in these areas in our report to those charged with governance scheduled for delivery in September 2015.

2. The Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014

The Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 (the 2014 Act) closes the Audit Commission and repeals the Audit Commission Act 1998.

The 2014 Act requires the Comptroller and Auditor General to prepare a Code of Audit Practice. This must be laid before Parliament and approved before 1 April 2015.

Although this new Code will apply from 1 April 2015, transitional provisions within the 2014 Act provide for the Audit Commission's 2010 Code to continue to apply to audit work in respect of the 2014/15 financial year. This plan is therefore prepared on the basis of the continued application of the 2010 Code of Audit Practice throughout the 2014/15 audit.

3. Financial statement risks

We outline below our assessment of the financial statement risks facing the Council, identified through our knowledge of the Council's operations and discussion with Members and officers.

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

Significant risks (including fraud risks)	Our audit approach
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>For local authorities the potential for the incorrect classification of revenue spend as capital is a particular area where there is a risk of management override.</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; ▶ evaluating the business rationale for significant unusual transactions; and ▶ reviewing capital expenditure on property, plant and equipment to ensure it meets the relevant accounting requirements to be capitalised.
Other financial statement risks	
Business rates appeals provision	
<p>Individual councils now need to provide for rating appeals. This includes not only claims from 1 April 2014 but claims that relate to earlier periods. As appeals are made to the Valuation Office, Councils may not be aware of the level of claims. Council's may also find it difficult to obtain sufficient information to establish a reliable estimate.</p>	<p>Our approach will focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ reviewing the Council's provision for business rate appeals to ensure it has been calculated on a reasonable basis in line with IAS37. As part of this we will ensure the provision is supported by appropriate evidence and that the level of estimation uncertainty is adequately disclosed in the accounts.
Group accounting standards	
<p>The 2014/15 CIPFA Code of Practice introduces new accounting practices in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ the specification of new control criteria under IFRS 10 (Consolidated financial statements); ▶ new classification requirements for joint arrangements under IFRS 11 (Joint arrangements); and ▶ the requirements of the new disclosures standard IFRS 12 (Disclosures of interests in other entities). 	<p>Our approach will focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ evaluating management controls in place to ensure all group assessment considerations have been made; and ▶ reviewing the reasonableness of the group assessment against the requirements of the Code and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS).

There is a risk that associated group boundary changes may go undetected, and that the required disclosures are not made in accordance with the new standards.

Other issues identified from walkthrough testing undertaken to date

Our audit approach

Cash and bank

As at the end of January 2015 bank reconciliations had only been completed to August 2014. Regular bank reconciliations are an important control to identify any anomalies or differences requiring further investigation or action.

Our approach will focus on:

- ▶ the review and testing of the year end bank reconciliations, ensuring that any reconciling items can be adequately supported.

Payroll

Our walkthrough identified an amendment (bank account change) that had not been reviewed by a second officer.

Our approach will focus on:

- ▶ undertaking predictive analytical review procedures and running our payroll analytics tool to confirm the reasonableness of pay data.

We will provide an update to the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee on the results of our work in these areas in our report to those charged with governance scheduled for delivery in September 2015.

Respective responsibilities in relation to 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 fraud risks.

We will consider the results of the National Fraud Initiative and may refer to it in our reporting to you.

4. Economy, efficiency and effectiveness

Our approach to the value for money (VFM) conclusion for St Edmundsbury Borough Council for 2014/15 is based on criteria specified by the Audit Commission relating to whether there are proper arrangements in place at the Council for securing:

- ▶ financial resilience, and
- ▶ economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources.

The Audit Commission VFM guidance for 2014/15 requires that auditors consider and assess the significant risks of giving a wrong conclusion and carry out as much work as is appropriate to enable them to give a safe conclusion on arrangements to secure VFM.

Our assessment of what is a significant risk is a matter of professional judgement, and is based on consideration of both quantitative and qualitative aspects of the subject matter in question.

We have undertaken a high-level summary of our risk assessment and have not identified any significant risks. We have identified the following area that we will focus on as part of our assessment.

Area of focus	Arrangements for securing:	Our audit approach
Pressures from economic downturn		
<p>To date the Council has responded well to the financial pressure resulting from the continuing economic downturn.</p> <p>However, with the Council forecasting a cumulative budget gap of £3.4m by 2017/18, there remains significant financial pressure on the Council's budget and MTFS during the current and forthcoming financial years.</p>	<p>Financial resilience</p>	<p>Our approach will continue to focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ the adequacy of the Council's budget setting process; ▶ the robustness of any assumptions; ▶ the effective use of scenario planning to assist the budget setting process; ▶ the effectiveness of in year monitoring against the budget; ▶ the Council's approach to prioritising resources.

We will keep our risk assessment under review throughout our audit and communicate to the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee any revisions to the specific risks identified here and any additional local risk-based work we may need to undertake as a result.

5. Our audit process and strategy

5.1 Objective and scope of our audit

Under the Audit Commission's Code of Audit Practice ('the Code') 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 a two-part audit report covering both of these objectives.

i) Financial statement audit

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

We will also review and report to the NAO on the Whole of Government Accounts return to the extent and in the form they require.

ii) Arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness

The Code sets out our responsibility to satisfy ourselves that the Council has proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources. In arriving at our conclusion, we will rely as far as possible on the reported results of the work of other statutory inspectorates on corporate or service performance.

In examining the Council's corporate performance management and financial management arrangements, we consider the following criteria and areas of focus specified by the Audit Commission:

- ▶ arrangements for securing financial resilience – whether the Council has robust systems and processes to manage financial risks and opportunities effectively, and to secure a stable financial position that enables it to continue to operate for the foreseeable future.
- ▶ arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness - whether the Council is prioritising its resources within tighter budgets, for example by achieving cost reductions and by improving efficiency and productivity.

5.2 Audit process overview

Our intention is to carry out a fully substantive audit in 2014/15 as we believe this to be the most efficient audit approach. Although we are therefore not intending to rely on individual system controls in 2014/15, the overarching control arrangements form part of our assessment of your overall control environment and will form part of the evidence for your Annual Governance Statement. We will review the work completed by internal audit as part of this element of our work.

Processes

We are not planning to rely on testing of key controls and will take a fully substantive approach to the audit as we believe this is the most efficient approach.

Analytics

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

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

We will report the findings from our process and analytics work, including any significant weaknesses or inefficiencies identified and recommendations for improvement, to management and the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee.

Internal audit

As in prior years, 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 issues are raised that could impact on the year-end financial statements

Use of experts

In producing the financial statements, management will place reliance on the work undertaken by a small number of experts, including a professional valuer in relation to the valuation of property plant and equipment, and an actuary in relation to the Council's liability to the local government pension scheme administered by Suffolk County Council. We anticipate being able to undertake sufficient procedures such that we will be able to place reliance on the work undertaken by management's experts.

We also anticipate relying on the work of the experts commissioned by the Audit Commission in respect of land and property values, and the work undertaken by the pension scheme actuary appointed by Suffolk County Council.

We will utilise specialist EY resource, as necessary, to help us to form a view on judgments made in the financial statements. Our plan currently includes the involvement of specialists in pensions and valuations.

Mandatory procedures required by auditing standards

As well as the financial statement risks outlined in 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; and
- ▶ 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; and
- ▶ reviewing and examining, where appropriate, evidence relevant to the Council's corporate performance management and financial management arrangements, and its reporting on these arrangements.

5.3 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 Council's financial statements is £1.3m based on 2% of gross operating expenditure.

We will communicate uncorrected audit misstatements greater than £66k 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.

5.4 Fees

The Audit Commission has published a scale fee for all authorities. This is defined as the fee required by auditors to meet statutory responsibilities under the Audit Commission Act in accordance with the Code of Audit Practice 2010. The indicative fee scale for the audit of St Edmundsbury Borough Council is £58,356. Further information is provided in Appendix A.

5.5 Your audit team

The engagement team is led by Neil Harris, who has significant experience on St Edmundsbury Borough Council. Neil Harris is supported by Melanie Richardson who is responsible for the day-to-day direction of audit work, and who is the key point of contact for the Head of Resources and Performance. Mary Springer will supervise the on-site audit team, is the key point of contact for the finance team and is responsible for raising and discussing emerging issues with officers.

5.6 Timetable of communication, deliverables and insights

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

From time to time matters may arise that require immediate communication with the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee and we will discuss them with the Chairman 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	Committee timetable	Deliverables
High level planning	December		
Risk assessment and setting of scopes	January - February		
Testing routine processes and controls	February - April	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	Audit Plan
Year end audit including WGA	July - September	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	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	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	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.

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 Audit Commission’s Standing Guidance 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 the Audit Commission's Standing Guidance.

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.

The Audit Commission's standing guidance for auditors requires confirmation, before the start of the sixth year of an individual auditor's work on an engagement, that there are no independence issues that would preclude an extension for an additional period of up to no more than two years. This is Neil Harris's seventh year on the St Edmundsbury Borough Council audit. We agreed with the Audit Commission in 2013/14 that there were no independence issues that would preclude an extension for a further year.

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, your audit engagement 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 27 June 2014 and can be found here:

<http://www.ey.com/UK/en/About-us/EY-UK-Transparency-Report-2014>

Appendix A Fees

A breakdown of our agreed fee is shown below.

	Planned Fee 2014/15	Out-turn 2013/14	Published scale fee 2013/14	Explanation
	£	£	£	
Opinion Audit and VFM Conclusion	58,356	60,356	57,456	In 2013/14 there was an additional fee of £2,000 in respect of additional audit work undertaken in respect of the financial statements audit. A further £900 was charged in respect of NNDR opinion assurance previously gained through grant claim procedures.
Total Audit Fee – Code work	58,356	60,356	57,456	
Certification of claims and returns *	27,610	41,096	46,700	The 2013/14 fee for certification of housing benefit subsidy claims was reduced from the indicative fee by a further 12% to reflect the removal of council tax benefit from the scheme.

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 5.2 above;
- ▶ we can rely on the work of internal audit as planned;
- ▶ the Audit Commission making no significant changes to the use of resources criteria on which our conclusion will be based;
- ▶ our accounts opinion and use of resources 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 fee for the certification of grant claims is based on the indicative scale fee set by the Audit Commission.

Appendix B UK required communications with those charged with governance

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

Required communication	Reference
<p>Planning and audit approach</p> <p>Communication of the planned scope and timing of the audit including any limitations.</p>	<p>▶ Audit Plan</p>
<p>Significant findings from the audit</p> <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 	<p>▶ Report to those charged with governance</p>
<p>Misstatements</p> <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 	<p>▶ Report to those charged with governance</p>
<p>Fraud</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ enquiries of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny 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 	<p>▶ Report to those charged with governance</p>
<p>Related parties</p> <p>Significant matters arising during the audit in connection with the entity's related parties including, when applicable:</p> <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 	<p>▶ Report to those charged with governance</p>
<p>External confirmations</p> <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 	<p>▶ Report to those charged with governance</p>

<p>Consideration of laws and regulations</p> <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 Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee into possible instances of non-compliance with laws and regulations that may have a material effect on the financial statements and that the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee may be aware of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Report to those charged with governance
<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Annual Report to those charged with governance summarising grant certification, and Annual Audit Letter if considered necessary

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