



LEE VALLEY REGIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

AUDIT COMMITTEE

16 JUNE 2016 AT 10:30

Agenda Item No:

7

Report No:

AUD/67/16

EXTERNAL AUDIT 2015/16 - AUDIT PLAN

Presented by the Director of Finance & Resources

SUMMARY

As part of the 2015/16 audit the Authority's external auditors (Ernst & Young) undertake an interim audit and produce a plan to cover the end of year audit 2015/16. The full plan is attached at Appendix A to this report.

The auditor's intention is to undertake a fully substantive audit which will review and report on the financial statements as well as arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources. As in previous years it will include a review of the work of the internal auditors, including audit plans and reports, together with reports from any other work completed in the year. The plan also covers other mandatory audit procedures required by auditing standards as well as the financial statements and value for money risks.

Materiality is assessed as £965,000 based on 2% of the Authority's gross revenue expenditure and the auditor will communicate uncorrected audit misstatements greater than £48,000 to this Committee.

The plan also highlights any potential risks for producing the financial statements and sets out the auditor's process, strategy and timetable.

The Plan sets out the fee for 2015/16 (£18,619) and this is the same as 2014/15.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Members Note:
- (1) the External Auditors' Audit Plan for 2015/16 attached at Appendix A to this report; and
 - (2) the proposed annual audit fee for 2015/16 as set out in page 12 of Appendix A to this report.

BACKGROUND

- 1 The role of external audit is to provide an annual independent assessment of how the Authority is discharging its responsibility for the stewardship of public money. The Auditors' conclusions are reported in their Annual Audit Letter later

in the year following the Final Accounts Audit in the summer. This Plan summarises their work to date and highlights risks which may arise during the course of the annual audit.

- 2 Preceding this, preliminary audit work is carried out to assess the Authority's arrangements for ensuring the proper conduct of its financial affairs. The auditor has provided for this within their plan to the Audit Committee attached at Appendix A to this report.

AUDIT PLAN 2015/16

- 3 The Audit Plan for 2015/16 was circulated by e-mail to Members on 26 April 2016. A full copy is attached at Appendix A to this report. The Auditors have confirmed that their interim work has progressed well but it is still subject to final review. A further update will be given at the Committee.
- 4 To date there are no weaknesses highlighted by the Auditor in this Plan.
- 5 The proposed fee for 2015/16 is £18,619 which is the same as the 2014/15 fee. However, the proposed fee may not cover for the specific audit risks identified in section 2 (page 2) of the plan which highlights potential risks that may impact upon the completion of the annual audit.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6 There are no environmental implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 7 There are no equality implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 8 The fee to be charged by the External Auditor in 2015/16 is £18,619 and is the same as that set for 2014/15.
- 9 This fee estimate does not include for any additional costs resulting from the specific audit risks identified in section 2 (page 2) of the plan. Officers believe the existing budget for the External Audit should be sufficient unless a material additional risk arises and therefore impacts upon the standard fee. Members will be kept apprised of this during 2016/17 and any potential variation will be reported to Executive Committee as part of the regular revenue budget monitoring.

HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 10 There are no human resource implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 11 There are no legal implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 12 There are no risk management implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report although the audit plan does highlight financial statement risks that potentially could impact on the Audit and subsequently impact on the final fee.
-

Author: Simon Sheldon, 01992 709859, ssheldon@leevalleypark.org.uk

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE REPORTS

Audit Committee	AUD/65/16	Accounting Policies & Accounts Closedown Timetable 2015/16	25 February 2016
Audit Committee	AUD/64/15	External Auditor's Audit Results Report – 2014/15 Accounts	24 September 2015

APPENDIX ATTACHED

Appendix A	Audit Commission's Audit Plan 2015/16
------------	---------------------------------------

This page is blank


Lee Valley Regional Park Authority

Year ending 31 March 2016

Audit Plan

April 2016

Ernst & Young LLP



Building a better
working world



Ernst & Young LLP
400 Capability Green
Luton
Bedfordshire LU1 3LU

Tel: + 44 1582 643 000
Fax: + 44 1582 643 001
ey.com

Audit Committee
Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
Myddelton House, Bulls Cross
Enfield,
Middlesex EN2 9HG

25 April 2016

Ref: LVRPA / DH / 2015-16 Audit Plan

Direct line: 07974 006715

Email: dhanson@uk.ey.com

Dear Members

2015/16 Audit Plan

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

This plan summarises our initial assessment of the key risks driving the development of an effective audit for the Authority and outlines our planned audit strategy in response to those risks. We welcome the opportunity to discuss this Audit Plan with you on 16 June 2016 and to understand whether there are other matters which you consider may influence our audit.

Yours faithfully

Debbie Hanson
Executive Director
For and behalf of Ernst & Young LLP
Enc

Contents

1. Overview	1
2. Financial statement risks	2
3. Value for money risks	4
4. Our audit process and strategy	6
5. Independence	101
Appendix A Fees	124
Appendix B UK required communications with those charged with governance	135

In April 2015 Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA) issued 'Statement of responsibilities of auditors and audited bodies 2015-16'. It is available from the Chief Executive of each audited body and via the PSAA website (www.psa.co.uk)

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

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

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

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

1. Overview

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

- ▶ Our audit opinion on whether the financial statements of Lee Valley Regional Park Authority give a true and fair view of the financial position as at 31 March 2016 and of its income and expenditure for the year then ended; and
- ▶ Our conclusion on the Authority'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 Authority's Whole of Government Accounts return.

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

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

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

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

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

2. Financial statement risks

We outline below our current assessment of the financial statement risks facing the Authority, identified through our knowledge of the Authority's operations and discussion with those charged with governance and officers.

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

Significant risks (including fraud risks)	Our audit approach
<p>Risk of fraud in revenue recognition</p> <p>Under ISA240 there is a presumed risk that revenue may be misstated due to improper recognition of revenue.</p> <p>In the public sector, this requirement is modified by Practice Note 10, issued by the Financial Reporting Council, which states that auditors should also consider the risk that material misstatements may occur by the manipulation of expenditure recognition.</p> <p>For the Authority, the potential for the incorrect classification of revenue spend as capital is a particular area where there is a risk of revenue recognition. We will undertake specific testing to address this risk.</p>	<p>We will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Review and test revenue and expenditure recognition policies. ▶ Review and discuss with management any accounting estimates on revenue or expenditure recognition for evidence of bias. ▶ Develop a testing strategy to test material revenue and expenditure streams. ▶ Review and test revenue cut-off at the period end date. ▶ Test capital expenditure on property, plant and equipment to ensure it meets the definition of capital expenditure as set out in the Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the United Kingdom (the Accounting Code).
<p>Risk of management override</p> <p>As identified in ISA (UK and Ireland) 240, management is in a unique position to perpetrate fraud because of its ability to manipulate accounting records directly or indirectly and prepare fraudulent financial statements by overriding controls that otherwise appear to be operating effectively. We identify and respond to this fraud risk on every audit engagement.</p>	<p>Our approach will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Test the appropriateness of journal entries recorded in the general ledger and other adjustments made in the preparation of the financial statements. ▶ Review accounting estimates for evidence of management bias. ▶ Evaluate the business rationale for significant unusual transactions.
Other financial statement risks	
<p>Valuation of property, plant & equipment, biological equipment, and investment property</p> <p>The Authority undertakes an annual exercise to revalue property plant and equipment, investment property, and biological assets. The valuation of these assets represents a significant accounting estimate, and the accounting entries arising from changes in value will have a significant impact on the Authority's financial statements.</p>	<p>Our approach will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Test management's arrangements for assessing the work of its valuation experts, including the key assumptions underpinning valuations. ▶ Utilise the work of our own valuation experts to validate the work of the valuation experts engaged by the Authority. ▶ Test the reliability of the information provided by the Authority to its valuer. ▶ Test the accounting treatment applied to changes in valuation. ▶ Test how management has satisfied itself that the valuation of those assets not subject to formal revaluation at 31 March 2016 are materially correct.
<p>Group accounting standards</p> <p>From 1 April 2015, Lee Valley Leisure Trust Limited, a charity set up as an Industrial and Provident Society, was established to run the main leisure facilities owned by the Authority. Management has previously assessed the nature of the arrangement against the Code and</p>	<p>Our approach will focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Reviewing management's assessment of the accounting treatment adopted with regard to Lee Valley Leisure Trust Limited.

relevant International Financial Reporting Standards and determined that the arrangement does not give rise to a need to prepare group accounts. We will undertake specific work to consider management's assessment of any factors that change the nature of the arrangement, and which would change the accounting treatment adopted in previous years.

- ▶ Consider the adequacy of the disclosures made within the financial statements in respect of the Authority's relationship with Lee Valley Leisure Trust Limited.

2.1 Responsibilities in respect of fraud and error

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

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

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

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

3. Value for money risks

We are required to consider whether the Authority has put in place 'proper arrangements' to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness on its use of resources. For 2015/16 this is based on the overall evaluation criterion:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our risk assessment considers both the potential financial impact of the issues we have identified, and also the likelihood that the issue will be of interest to local taxpayers, the Government and other stakeholders. Our work to date, which is still in progress, has not identified any risks which we view as relevant to our value for money conclusion. We update our risk assessment throughout our audit, and will update you on any changes to that assessment.

4. Our audit process and strategy

4.1 Objective and scope of our audit

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

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

We issue an audit report that covers:

1. Financial statement audit

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

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

Alongside our audit report, we also review and report to the NAO on the Whole of Government Accounts return to the extent and in the form they require;

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

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

4.2 Audit process overview

Processes

Our intention is to undertake a fully substantive audit. We believe this to be the most efficient approach to gaining assurance over the Authority's financial statements. Although we are not intending to rely on the control processes established within individual systems, the overarching control arrangements established by the Authority 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.

Analytics

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

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

Internal audit

- ▶ 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 planning, where they identify issues that could impact on the Authority's year-end financial statements.

Use of specialists

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

Area	Specialists
Asset valuations	Management's expert (Montagu Evans and Kite Consultancy); EY valuation team
Pension fund liability	Management's expert (pension fund actuary); EY pension team.
Fair value of short and long-term borrowing	Management's expert (Public Works Loan Board).

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

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

- ▶ Analyse source data and make inquiries as to the procedures used by the expert to establish whether the source data is relevant and reliable;
- ▶ Assess the reasonableness of the assumptions and methods used;
- ▶ Consider the appropriateness of the timing of when the specialist carried out the work; and
- ▶ Assess whether the substance of the specialist's findings are properly reflected in the financial statements.

4.3 Mandatory audit procedures required by auditing standards and the Code

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

Procedures required by standards

- ▶ Addressing the risk of fraud and error;
- ▶ Significant disclosures included in the financial statements;
- ▶ Entity-wide controls;

- ▶ Reading other information contained in the financial statements and reporting whether it is inconsistent with our understanding and the financial statements;
- ▶ Auditor independence.

Procedures required by the Code

- ▶ Reviewing, and reporting on as appropriate, other information published with the financial statements, including the Annual Governance Statement.
- ▶ Reviewing and reporting on the Whole of Government Accounts return, in line with the instructions issued by the NAO

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

4.4 Materiality

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

We have determined that overall materiality for our audit of the Authority's financial statements is £965,000. We have based our calculation of materiality on 2% of the Authority's gross revenue expenditure. We will communicate uncorrected audit misstatements greater than £48,000 to you.

The amount we consider material at the end of the audit may differ from our initial determination. At this stage, however, it is not feasible to anticipate all the circumstances that might ultimately influence our judgement. At the end of the audit we will form our final opinion by reference to all matters that could be significant to users of the financial statements, including the total effect of any audit misstatements, and our evaluation of materiality at that date.

4.5 Fees

The duty to prescribe fees is a statutory function delegated to Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA) by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. PSAA has published a scale fee for all relevant bodies. This is defined as the fee required by auditors to meet statutory responsibilities under the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 in accordance with the NAO Code. The indicative scale fee for the audit of Lee Valley Regional Park Authority is £18,619 (2014/15 £18,619).

Our audit process and strategy

4.6 Your audit team

The individuals within your EY engagement team have been selected from our dedicated Government and Public Sector audit team. The core members of your audit team are:

Team Member	Responsibilities and experience
Engagement Lead:	
Debbie Hanson Telephone: 07974 006715 Email: dhanson@uk.ey.com	Responsible for delivering of the audit in line with the Code, including the Audit Planning Report, ISA (UK&I) 260 Report to Those Charged with Governance, and the Annual Audit Letter, quality of outputs and significant of opinions and conclusion. Debbie has extensive experience of auditing within the local government sector, and currently leads the audit of a number of unitary and district council audits across the east of England. Debbie has led the audit of Lee Valley Regional Park since 2014/15.
Engagement Manager:	
Stephen Bladen Telephone: 01582 643087 Email: sbladen@uk.ey.com	Responsible for responsible for the day-to-day direction of audit work and is the key point of contact for the CCG's finance team. Stephen has extensive experience of auditing within the local government sector, including unitary and district councils

4.7 Timetable of communication, deliverables and insights

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

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

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

Our audit process and strategy

Audit phase	Timetable	Audit Committee timetable	Deliverables
High level planning	April 2015		Audit Fee Letter
Risk assessment and setting of scopes	February - March 2016	June 2016	Audit Plan
Testing routine processes	February - March 2016	June 2016	Audit Plan
Year-end audit	August - September 2016		
Completion of audit	September 2016	September 2016	Report to those charged with governance via the Audit Results Report Audit report (including our opinion on the financial statements and overall value for money conclusion). Audit completion certificate Reporting to the NAO on the Whole of Government Accounts return.
Conclusion of reporting	October 2016	February 2017	Annual Audit Letter

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

5. Independence

5.1 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 in appropriate categories.

5.2 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 Authority.

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 Authority has approved and that are in compliance with the PSAA Terms of Appointment.

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 Authority. We confirm that no member of our audit engagement team, including those from other service lines, is in this position, in compliance with Ethical Standard 4.

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

Self-review threats

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

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

Management threats

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

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

Other threats

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

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

Overall Assessment

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

5.3 Other required communications

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

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

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

Fees

Appendix A Fees

A breakdown of our agreed fee is shown below.

	Planned Fee 2015/16 £	Scale Fee 2015/16 £	Outturn fee 2014/15 £
Opinion Audit and VFM Conclusion	18,619	18,619	18,619
Total Audit Fee - Code work	18,619	18,619	18,619

All fees exclude VAT.

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

- ▶ Officers meeting the agreed timetable of deliverables;
- ▶ Our accounts opinion and value for money conclusion being unqualified;
- ▶ Appropriate quality of documentation is provided by the Authority; and
- ▶ The Authority has an effective control environment.

Should any of the above assumptions prove to be unfounded, we will seek a variation to the agreed fee. We will discuss this in the first instance with the Director of Finance and Resources and, if necessary, prepare a report outlining the reasons for the fee change for discussion with the Audit Committee.

Fees for the auditor's consideration of correspondence from the public and formal objections will be charged in addition to the scale fee.

Appendix B UK required communications with those charged with governance

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

Required communication	Reference
<p>Planning and audit approach Communication of the planned scope and timing of the audit including any limitations.</p>	▶ Audit Plan
<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 	▶ Report to those charged with governance
<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 	▶ Report to those charged with governance
<p>Fraud</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Enquiries of the Audit Committee to determine whether they have knowledge of any actual, suspected or alleged fraud affecting the entity ▶ Any fraud that we have identified or information we have obtained that indicates that a fraud may exist ▶ A discussion of any other matters related to fraud 	▶ Report to those charged with governance
<p>Related parties 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 	▶ Report to those charged with governance
<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 	▶ Report to those charged with governance
<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 Audit Committee into possible instances of non-compliance with laws and regulations that may have a material effect on the financial statements and that the Audit Committee may be aware of 	▶ Report to those charged with governance

UK required communications with those charged with governance

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

EY | Assurance | Tax | Transactions | Advisory

Ernst & Young LLP

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

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

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

ey.com