Internal

Grant Thornton

DRAFT

This version of the report is a draft. Its contents and subject matter remain under review and its contents may change and be expanded as part of the finalisation of the report.
This draft has been created from the template dated DD MMM YYYY

External Audit Plan

Year ending 31 March 2020

Folkestone and Hythe District Council

February 2020

Contents

DRAFT

Your key Grant Thornton team members are:

Paul Dossett
Engagement Lead
T: 020 7728 3180
E: paul.Dossett@uk.gt.com

Ezgi Aslan
Audit In-charge
T: 020 7184 4309
E: ezgi.aslan@uk.gt.com

Section	Page
1. Introduction & headlines	3
2. Key matters impacting our audit	4
3. Group audit scope and risk assessment	5
4. Significant risks identified	6
5. Other Risks Identified	9
6. Other matters	10
7. Materiality	11
8. Value for Money arrangements	12
9. Audit logistics & team	13
10. Audit fees	14
11. Independence & non-audit services	16

Appendix	
A. Audit quality – national context	18

1. Introduction & headlines

DRAFT

Purpose

This document provides an overview of the planned scope and timing of the statutory audit of Folkestone and Hythe District 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 [insert name of organisation. 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 Governance 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 Governance 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.

Group Accounts	The Authority is required to prepare group financial statements that consolidate the financial information of Oportunitas Limited.
Significant risks	Those risks requiring special audit consideration and procedures to address the likelihood of a material financial statement error have been identified as: • Management override of controls • Valuation of land and buildings • Valuation of net pension fund liability • Level 3 financial assets and liabilities 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.
Materiality	We have determined planning materiality to be £1.7m for the Authority, which equates to 2% of your prior 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 £85k (PY £85k).
Value for Money arrangements	Our risk assessment regarding your arrangements to secure value for money have identified the following VFM significant risks: • Delivering the full potential on capital plans • Medium Term Financial Resilience • East Kent Housing
Audit logistics	Our interim visit will take place in February / March 2020 and our final visit will take place in June and July 2020. Our key deliverables are this Audit Plan and our Audit Findings Report. Our audit approach is detailed in Appendix A. Our fee for the audit will be £54,053 (PY: £51,753) for the Authority, subject to the Authority meeting our requirements set out on page 13
Independence	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

DRAFT

Factors

The wider economy and political uncertainty

Local Government funding continues to be stretched with increasing cost pressures and demand from residents. For Folkestone and Hythe District Council, you set a balanced budget for the 2019/20 financial period. You have increased share of council tax by 1.92% as part of your Medium Term Financial Strategy, well below the 2.99% threshold that would require a referendum. At quarter 2, you were showing an underspend on the budget of £599k.

At a national level, the government continues its negotiation with the EU over Brexit, and future arrangements remain clouded in uncertainty. The Authority 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.

Implementation of IFRS 16 – Leases

The implementation of IFRS 16 is delayed in the public sector until 1 April 2020. There will therefore be disclosure requirements that apply in 2019/20 for standards issued but not yet adopted.

The current distinction between operating and finance leases is removed for lessees and all leases will be recognised on the balance sheet of lessees as a right of use asset and a liability to make the lease payments, subject to the adaptations for short term leases and exceptions for leases of low value assets.

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 group 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 will assess the adequacy of your disclosure about the financial impact of implementing IFRS 16 – Leases from 1 April 2020 and test a sample of lease obligations to determine whether they have been accounted for appropriately under the new requirements.

3. Group audit scope and risk assessment

DRAFT

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
Folkestone and Hythe District Council	Yes		See pages 6 to 8	Full scope UK statutory audit performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP
Oportunitas Limited	Yes	Audit of one or more classes of transactions, account balances or disclosures relating to significant risks of the group	Valuation of Investment Properties	Full scope UK statutory audit performed by Begbies Chartered Accountants. Specific scope procedures on valuation of investment properties to be performed by Begbies Chartered Accountants. The nature, time and extent of our involvement in the work of Begbies Chartered Accountants will begin with a discussion on risks, guidance on designing procedures, participation in meetings, followed by the review of relevant aspects of the Begbies Chartered Accountants audit documentation and meeting with appropriate members of management.
Oportunitas Limited	No		None	Analytical review performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Audit scope

- Audit of the financial information of the component using component materiality
- Audit of one more classes of transactions, account balances or disclosures relating to significant risks of material misstatement of the group financial statements
- Review of component's financial information
- Specified audit procedures relating to significant risks of material misstatement of the group financial statements
- Analytical procedures at group level

4. Significant risks identified

DRAFT

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	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
The revenue cycle includes fraudulent transactions	**Authority only**	Under ISA (UK) 240 there is a rebuttable presumed risk that revenue may be misstated due to the improper recognition of revenue. This presumption can be rebutted if the auditor concludes that there is no risk of material misstatement due to fraud relating to revenue recognition. 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: • there is little incentive to manipulate revenue recognition • opportunities to manipulate revenue recognition are very limited • the culture and ethical frameworks of local authorities, including Folkestone and Hythe District Council mean that all forms of fraud are seen as unacceptable	Therefore we do not consider this to be a significant risk for Folkestone and Hythe District Council.
Management over-ride of controls	**Group and Authority**	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. The Authority faces external scrutiny of its spending and this could potentially place management under undue pressure in terms of how they report performance. 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.	We will: • evaluate the design effectiveness of management controls over journals • analyse the journals listing and determine the criteria for selecting high risk unusual journals • test unusual journals recorded during the year and after the draft accounts stage for appropriateness and corroboration • gain an understanding of the accounting estimates and critical judgements applied made by management and consider their reasonableness with regard to corroborative evidence • evaluate the rationale for any changes in accounting policies, estimates or significant unusual transactions.

4. Significant risks identified (continued)

DRAFT

Risk	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Valuation of land and buildings	**Authority**	The Authority 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 (£214m) and the sensitivity of this estimate to changes in key assumptions. Additionally, management will need to ensure the carrying value in the Authority financial statements is not materially different from the current value or the fair value (for investment properties) at the financial statements date, where a rolling programme is used. 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.	We will: • evaluate management's processes and assumptions for the calculation of the estimate, the instructions issued to valuation experts and the scope of their work • evaluate the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the valuation expert • write to the valuer to confirm the basis on which the valuation was carried out • challenge the information and assumptions used by the valuer to assess completeness and consistency with our understanding, the Authority’s valuer’s report and the assumptions that underpin the valuation. We will place special focus on the Council’s new purchases related to the Otterpool Project • test revaluations made during the year to see if they had been input correctly into the Authority's asset register • 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
Valuation of the pension fund net liability	**Authority**	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. The pension fund net liability is considered a significant estimate due to the size of the numbers involved (£64,881k in the Authority’s balance sheet) and the sensitivity of the estimate to changes in key assumptions. 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.	We will: • 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; • evaluate the instructions issued by management to their management expert (an actuary) for this estimate and the scope of the actuary’s work; • assess the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the actuary who carried out the Authority’s pension fund valuation; • assess the accuracy and completeness of the information provided by the Authority to the actuary to estimate the liability; • 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; • 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 • obtain assurances from the auditor of Kent County Council 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.

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.

4. Significant risks identified (continued)

DRAFT

Risk	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Level 3 financial assets and liabilities	**Authority only**	The Council has reviewed the fair value of the finance assets as part of the IFRS 9 assessment in preparing the draft accounts and concluded that the soft loans for private sector housing improvement purposes and the equity investment in Oportunitas Limited are Level 3. Fair value hierarchy level 3 financial assets are hard to value as they have unobservable inputs for the assets or liability. By their very nature, level 3 assets require a particularly high degree of judgement.	We will: • gain an understanding of the council's process for valuing hard to value financial assets and evaluate the design of the associated controls • review the nature and basis of estimated values and consider what assurance management has over the year end valuation provided for the loans to companies and shares in unlisted companies • consider the competence, expertise and objectivity of any management experts used • challenged management about the disclosure of the level 3 financial assets.

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

DRAFT

Risk	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
International Financial Reporting Standard (IFRS) 16 Leases – (issued but not adopted)	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. 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.	We will: • 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. • Assess the completeness of the disclosures made by the Authority in its 2019/20 financial statements with reference to The Code and CIPFA/LASAAC Local Authority Leasing Briefings.

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

DRAFT

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 and any other information published alongside your financial statements 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

DRAFT

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 Authority for the financial year. In the prior year we used the same benchmark. Materiality at the planning stage of our audit is £1.75m (PY £1.65m) for the group and £1.7m (PY £1.6m) for the Authority, which equates to 2% of your prior year gross expenditure for the year. We design our procedures to detect errors in specific accounts at a lower level of precision which we have determined to be £100k for audit fees, related party transactions, senior management remuneration disclosures and exit packages which are material by nature.

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 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 and Governance 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 Authority, we propose that an individual difference could normally be considered to be clearly trivial if it is less than £80k (PY £85k).

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 Governance Committee to assist it in fulfilling its governance responsibilities.



8. Value for Money arrangements

DRAFT

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 Resilience

The Council will need to manage it's financial position and savings targets closely during the medium term period to avoid a negative impact on the long term financial stability of the Council. You have savings plans in place including:

- Service redesign and reviews around the future operating model
- Generation of additional revenues through capital investment and Oportunitas

We will review your Medium Term Financial Plan, including the robustness of assumptions. We will review arrangements in place for monitoring savings plans and revenue generating schemes.

Moreover, the United Kingdom has now exited the European Union as at 31 January 2020. This will result in national and local financial implications.

We will also consider the financial impact of ongoing discussions in respect of East Kent Housing.

We will review your arrangements and plan to mitigate any financial risks on Brexit. Our review will focus on areas such as workforce planning, supply chain analysis, regulatory impact and impacts on finances including investments.

Delivering the full potential on capital plans

The development of the Otterpool Park Garden Town, alongside smaller scale capital plans, has the potential to make a long term positive contribution to the finances of the Council as well as a long term impact on the area.

We will review the ongoing governance arrangements and decision making processes around the capital investment plans during 2019/20. We will review the business case process for major projects

9. Audit logistics & team

DRAFT

Planning and risk assessment

Interim audit
February 2020

Audit and Governance Committee
March 2020

Audit plan and Interim Progress Report

Year end audit
June and July 2020

Audit and Governance Committee
July 2020

Audit Findings Report

Audit opinion

Audit and Governance Committee
October 2020

Annual Audit Letter

Paul Dossett, Key Audit Partner

Responsible for overall quality control; accounts opinions; final authorisation of reports; liaison with the Audit Committee.

TBC, Audit Manager

Responsible for overall audit management, quality assurance of audit work and output and liaison with the Audit Committee. Andy will be the escalation contact for complex or unusual queries and will review the work performed by the on-site audit team

Ezgi Aslan, Audit Incharge

Ezgi will lead the onsite team and will be the day to day contact for the audit. Ezgi will monitor the deliverables, manage the query log with your finance team and highlight any significant issues and adjustments to senior management. Ezgi will undertake the more technical aspects of the audit, coach the junior members of the team and review the team work.

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

DRAFT

Planned audit fees 2019/20

During 2017, PSAA awarded contracts for audit for a five year period beginning on 1 April 2018. 2019/20 is the second year of that contract. The scale fee set by PSAA at the beginning of the contract was £46,553. Since that time, there have been a number of developments within the accounting profession.

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 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
Council Audit	£60,458	£51,753	£54,053
Total audit fees (excluding VAT)	**£60,458**	**£51,753**	**£54,053**

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

DRAFT

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.

Audit area	£	Rationale for fee variation
Scale fee	46,553	
Pensions – valuation of net pension liabilities under International Auditing Standard (IAS) 19	1,750	The Financial Reporting Council (FRC) has highlighted that the quality of work by all audit firms in respect of IAS 19 needs to improve across local government audits. Accordingly, we plan to increase the level of scope and coverage of our work in respect of IAS 19 this year to reflect the expectations of the FRC and ensure we issue a safe audit opinion. Specifically, 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.
Increased challenge and depth of work	2,500	Historically, the FRC's definition for 2b was 'acceptable but with improvements required' and, as such, both the Audit Commission and PSAA considered a '2b' to represent an acceptance level of audit quality for contract delivery purposes. The FRC has now set a 100% target for all audits (including local audits) to achieve a '2a'. Its threshold for achieving a '2a' is challenging and failure to achieve this level is reputationally damaging for individual engagement leads and their firm. Non-achievement of the standard can result in enforcement action, including fines and disqualification, by the FRC. Inevitably, we need to increase the managerial oversight to manage this risk. In addition, you should expect the audit team to exercise even greater challenge of management in areas that are complex, significant or highly judgmental. We will be required to undertake additional work around use of specialists, information provided by the entity (IPE), journals, management review of controls, revenue, accounting estimates, financial resilience and going concern and related parties and similar areas.
New standards/ developments	1,500	We will be required to do work around IFRS16. 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
PPE Valuation – work of experts	1,750	As above, the FRC has also determined that auditors need to improve the quality of audit challenge on PPE valuations across the sector. We have 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.
Revised scale fee (to be approved by PSAA)	**54,053**	

11. Independence & non-audit services

DRAFT

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.

Service	£	Threats	Safeguards
Audit related:			
Certification of Housing Benefits claim	TBC	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 agreed fee for this work in 2018/19 was £TBC in comparison to the total fee for the audit of £50,853 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 Housing capital receipts grant	2,500	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 £2,500 in comparison to the total fee for the audit of £50,853 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 and non-audit services to be undertaken by Grant Thornton UK LLP in the current financial year. These services are consistent with the group policy on the allotment of non-audit work to your auditors. All services have been approved by the Audit and Risk Committee. Any changes and full details of all fees charged for audit related and non-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

DRAFT

A. Audit Quality – national context

Appendix A: Audit Quality – national context

DRAFT

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. Specifically for Grant Thornton the FRC identified the need for us 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' (minor improvements required) or better on all large commercial 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. Whilst we recognise we have work to do, 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 ensuring the issues identified by the FRC are addressed and 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 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 more challenging than previous audits. These changes will give the audit committee and the board greater confidence that we have delivered a high quality audit and that the financial statements are not materially misstated. Challenging 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 highest quality 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.

DRAFT