

# Audit Plan

Year end 31 March 2014

Bracknell Forest Council

March 2014

Ernst & Young LLP



Governance and Audit Committee  
Bracknell Forest Council  
Easthampstead House  
Town Square  
Bracknell  
Berkshire  
RG12 1AQ

1 April 2014

Dear Members of the Governance and Audit Committee

## **Audit Plan**

We are pleased to attach our Audit Plan which sets out how we intend to carry out our responsibilities as auditor. The purpose of this report is to provide the Governance and Audit Committee with a basis to review our proposed audit approach and scope for the 2013-14 audit, in accordance with the requirements of the Audit Commission Act 1998, the Code of Audit Practice, the Standing Guidance, auditing standards and other professional requirements. It also helps ensure that our audit is aligned with the Committee's service expectations.

This report summarises our assessment of the key risks which drive the development of an effective audit for Bracknell Forest Council, and outlines our planned audit strategy in response to those risks.

We welcome the opportunity to discuss this report with you on 1 April 2014 as well as understand whether there are other matters which you consider may influence our audit.

Yours faithfully



Helen Thompson  
Director  
For and behalf of Ernst & Young LLP  
Enc

## Contents

<b>1. Overview .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Financial Statement Risks .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Economy, Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4. Our audit process and strategy.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5. Independence.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendix A Fees.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix B UK required communications with those charged with governance. ....</b>	<b>17</b>

# 1. Overview

## Context for the audit

This audit plan covers the work that we plan to perform in order to provide you with:

- ▶ our audit opinion on whether the financial statements of Bracknell Forest Council give a true and fair view of the financial position as at 31 March 2014 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 your 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.
- ▶ Management's views on all of the above.

By considering these inputs, our audit is focused on the areas that matter. And by focusing on the areas that matter, 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 2 and 3 of this report we provide more detail on the areas which we believe present significant risk to our audit, and outline our plans to address these risks.

## Our process and strategy

### Financial Statement Audit

- ▶ When considering the results of our audit work, we consider them in the context of their materiality to the statements as a whole.
- ▶ Where possible and more efficient we will seek to rely on the controls in your systems, therefore reducing the year-end testing required.
- ▶ To the fullest extent permissible by auditing standards, we will seek to place reliance on the work of internal audit.

### Arrangements for securing Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness

- ▶ We adopt an integrated audit approach such that our work on the financial statement audit feeds into our consideration of the arrangements in place for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

## 2. Financial Statement Risks

We outline below our assessment of the financial statement risks facing Bracknell Forest 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
<b>Risk of management override</b>	
<p>We identify and respond to this fraud risk on every audit engagement.</p> <p>As identified in ISA (UK &amp; Ireland) 240, management is in a unique position to perpetrate fraud because of their ability to directly or indirectly manipulate accounting records and prepare fraudulent financial statements by overriding controls that otherwise appear to be operating effectively.</p>	<p>Our approach will focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ testing the appropriateness of journal entries recorded in the general ledger and other adjustments made in the preparation of the financial statements;</li> <li>▶ reviewing accounting estimates for evidence of management bias; and</li> <li>▶ evaluating the business rationale for significant unusual transactions.</li> </ul>

**Significant risks (including fraud risks)****Our audit approach****National Non-Domestic Rates (NNDR) ratetable value appeals provision**

The Business Rates Retention Scheme came into force on 1 April 2013. Under the scheme a proportion of the business rates collected by councils will be retained locally and the balance paid over to central government.

The level of NNDR paid on business property depends on its 'rateable value'. This is calculated by the Valuation Office Agency (VOA).

Where local businesses believe the current value for business properties is wrong they can:

- appeal to the VOA and ask them to correct details
- appeal the rates if the local business and the VOA can't agree. This appeal is heard by a valuation tribunal.

Where rating appeals are successful, monies to settle the appeals will come out of the Council's funds and will also impact on other local public bodies that precept on the Council. This includes not only claims from 1 April 2013 but also claims that relate to periods before the introduction of the business rates retention scheme. As appeals are to the Valuation Office, authorities may not be aware of the level of claims. Appeals can be speculative in nature and multiple appeals can be made against the same property and valuation on different grounds.

The potential cost of successful rateable value appeals could be significant to the Council. There is a high level of estimation uncertainty in determining an accurate provision for the cost in the financial statements.

In addition, the Council has generated a surplus of £6m on business rates. It will need to pay a £3m levy to the Government for this. Due to timing issues this will be accrued in the General Fund but not the Collection Fund.

We will seek to understand and assess the reasonableness of the Council's methodology in estimating any planned provision in respect of rateable value appeals outstanding at the balance sheet date.

This will involve consideration of both the completeness and accuracy of the data on the number of appeals outstanding and the basis for the assumptions made by the Council on the likelihood of success.

We will assess your proposed treatment of the levy.

**Other risks**

**Our audit approach**

**Town centre development**

During 2013/14 Seymour House has been demolished. The Council is receiving enhanced terms on its lease for Ocean House in return.

We are discussing with officers the accounting treatment for this part of the development.

**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 put in place 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.
- ▶ Inquiry of management about risks of fraud and the controls put in place 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 those identified risks of fraud.
- ▶ Performing mandatory procedures regardless of specifically identified fraud risks.

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

### 3. Economy, Efficiency & Effectiveness

Our work will focus on:

1. Whether there are proper arrangements in place for securing financial resilience at the Council; and
2. Whether there are proper arrangements in place at the Council to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources.

We have not identified any significant risks to the value for money (VFM) conclusion. However, we have identified the following key areas that we will consider to support our VFM conclusion.

Other risks	Our audit approach	
<b>Town centre development</b>		
<p>The Council is a strategic partner in the development. The scheme has progressed in 2013/14 with demolition work in the town centre.</p>	<p>Economy, efficiency and effectiveness</p> <p>Financial resilience</p>	<p>Our approach will focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Reviewing the Council's arrangements for managing its risks as the scheme progresses.</li> <li>▶ Assessing the latest financial implications of the development for the Council</li> </ul>
<b>The Better Care Fund</b>		
<p>The Council has a good track record of delivering its planned savings. However, in common with others, the Council will need to continue to deliver good quality services against a backdrop of growing demand and increased financial challenges.</p> <p>We have reported in the past that the Council needs to maintain an emphasis on strategic policy changes and longer –term savings programmes to shift the balance away from an annual round of identifying savings targets to balance the revenue budget. This theme was brought out by the peer review carried out by the Local Government Association in 2013.</p> <p>This will become ever more important as major changes to funding streams come into place. These include localisation of business rates and the introduction of the Better Care Fund (BCF)</p> <p>The BCF is a single pooled budget for health and social care services to work more closely together in local areas, based on a plan agreed between the NHS and local authorities.</p> <p>It therefore offers a substantial opportunity to the Council to build on its existing partnerships with NHS commissioners and</p>	<p>Economy, efficiency and effectiveness</p> <p>Financial resilience</p>	<p>Our approach will focus on the work being done by the Council to consider the potential impact of these significant changes including the BCF on both its service development, medium term financial planning and other underpinning arrangements to deliver change, such as its workforce planning and IT strategy.</p>

providers to bring resources together to address immediate pressures on services and lay foundations for a much more integrated system of health and care.

This will create both risks and opportunities for the Council. The funding of £3.8 billion is not new or additional money. £1.9 billion will come from clinical commissioning group (CCG) allocations (equivalent to around £10 million for an average CCG) in addition to NHS money already transferred to social care.

---

## 4. Our audit process and strategy

### 4.1 Objective and scope of our audit

Under the Audit Commission's Code of Audit Practice (the Code), dated March 2010, our principal objectives are to review and report on, to the extent required by the relevant legislation and the requirements of the Code, the Council's:

- i) financial statements; and
- ii) arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources.

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, to the extent and in the form required by them, on your Whole of Government Accounts return.

#### **ii) Arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness**

The Code sets out our responsibility to satisfy ourselves that the Council has put in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources. In arriving at our conclusion, to the fullest extent possible, we will place reliance on the reported results of the work of other statutory inspectorates in relation to corporate or service performance. In examining the Council's corporate performance management and financial management arrangements we have regard to 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; and
- ▶ 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.

### 4.2 Audit process overview

#### **Processes**

Our initial assessment of the key processes across the entity has identified the following key processes where we will seek to test key controls, both manual and IT:

- ▶ Accounts receivable
- ▶ Accounts payable
- ▶ Business rates
- ▶ Council tax
- ▶ Cash and bank (Cash receipting)
- ▶ Housing benefits and council tax reduction

- ▶ Payroll

To the fullest extent permissible by auditing standards, we will seek to place reliance on the work of Internal Audit to test controls in its annual programme of work.

We have also identified the following key processes that we will test substantively post year-end:

- ▶ Property, Plant and Equipment
- ▶ Pensions
- ▶ Treasury management
- ▶ Financial Statements Close Process

### **Analytics**

We will use our computer-based analytics tools to enable us to capture whole populations of your financial data, in particular for 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 Governance & Audit Committee.

### **Internal audit**

As in prior years, we will review internal audit plans and the results of work undertaken. We will reflect the findings from these reports, together with reports from other work completed in the year, in our detailed audit plan, where issues are raised that could impact the year-end financial statements.

### **Use of experts**

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 property, plant and equipment valuations.

### **Mandatory procedures required by auditing standards**

In addition to the financial statement risks outlined in section 2, we have to 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.

- ▶ Addressing the risk of fraud and error.
- ▶ Reviewing significant disclosures included in the financial statements.
- ▶ Assessing the effectiveness of entity-wide controls.
- ▶ Reading other information contained in the financial statements and reporting whether it is inconsistent with our understanding and the financial statements.
- ▶ Maintaining 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.
- ▶ Reviewing, and where appropriate, examining evidence that is relevant to the Council's corporate performance management and financial management arrangements and reporting on these arrangements.

## **4.3 Materiality**

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

We have not yet finalised our overall materiality for the Council's financial statements, but this will be set in the range of between £2.7 million and £5.4 million based on 1% - 2% of gross operating expenditure. We will communicate our final materiality levels to members at a future Committee meeting.

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 of the circumstances that may ultimately influence our judgement about materiality. 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 accounts, including the total effect of the audit misstatements we identify, and our evaluation of materiality at that date.

## **4.4 Fees**

The Audit Commission has published a scale fee for all authorities. The scale fee is defined as the fee required by auditors to meet statutory responsibilities under the Audit Commission Act 1998 in accordance with the Code of Audit Practice 2010. The indicative fee scale for the audit of the Council is £138,564.

## **4.5 Your audit team**

The engagement team is led by Helen Thompson, who has significant experience of the Council. Helen Thompson is supported by Catherine Morganti who is responsible for the day-to-day direction of audit work, and who is the key point of contact for the chief accountant.

## **4.6 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; and the deliverables we have agreed to provide to you through the Governance and Audit Committee cycle in 2014. These dates are determined to ensure our alignment with the Audit Commission's rolling calendar of deadlines.

We will provide progress reports to each meeting of the Governance and Audit Committee and will provide a formal report detailing the results of our 2013/14 audit to the September meeting of the Committee. From time to time matters may arise that require immediate communication with the Governance and Audit Committee and we will discuss them with the Committee Chairman as appropriate.

Following the conclusion of our audit we will prepare an annual audit letter in order to communicate to the Council and external stakeholders, including members of the public, the key issues arising from our work.

Audit phase	Timetable	Deliverables
High level planning:	<b>November</b>	Audit Fee Letter
Risk assessment and setting of scope of audit	<b>January – March</b>	Audit Plan
Testing of routine processes and controls	<b>March – April</b>	Audit Plan
Year-end audit	<b>July - September</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Report to those charged with governance</li> <li>▶ Audit report on the financial statements and value for money conclusion</li> <li>▶ Audit Completion certificate</li> <li>▶ Whole of government accounts</li> </ul>
Reporting	<b>October</b>	Annual Audit Letter
Grant Claims	<b>September – December</b>	Annual certification report



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 upon our independence and objectivity. The Ethical Standards, as revised in December 2010, require that we communicate formally both at the planning stage and at the conclusion of the audit, as well as during the course of 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"> <li>▶ The principal threats, if any, to objectivity and independence identified by EY including consideration of all relationships between the you, your affiliates and directors and us;</li> <li>▶ The safeguards adopted and the reasons why they are considered to be effective, including any Engagement Quality review;</li> <li>▶ The overall assessment of threats and safeguards;</li> <li>▶ Information about the general policies and process within EY to maintain objectivity and independence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ 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;</li> <li>▶ Details of non-audit services provided and the fees charged in relation thereto;</li> <li>▶ Written confirmation that we are independent;</li> <li>▶ 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</li> <li>▶ An opportunity to discuss auditor independence issues.</li> </ul>

In addition, during the course of the audit, we are required to communicate with you whenever any significant judgements are made about threats to objectivity and independence and the appropriateness of safeguards put in place, 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 services that have been contracted, and details of any written proposal to provide non-audit services that has been submitted;

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, analysed in appropriate categories, are disclosed.

## 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 the principal threats, if any. However, we have adopted the safeguards noted 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 you. 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 you have 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 you. We confirm that no member of our audit engagement team, including those from other service lines, has objectives or is rewarded in relation to sales to you, 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 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 in relation to which management is required to make judgements or decision 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.

### ***Non audit services provided in 2013/14***

Wokingham, Bracknell Forest & Reading Councils have asked EY to continue to provide services which include financial analysis in respect of its on-going discussions on with FCC Environment (previously named Waste Recycling Group) in respect of the Central Berkshire Waste PFI.

In addition we have provided advice concerning the VAT aspects of the Bracknell town centre Development Agreement.

We assessed these proposals against the potential threats set out above and concluded there were no threats, and appropriate safeguards had been put in place. The assessment was shared with the Audit Commission which provides a regulatory role in relation to safeguarding the independence and objectivity of auditors. The Audit Commission also concluded that appropriate safeguards were in place, and the work did not pose an independence threat.

### ***Overall Assessment***

Overall, we consider that the safeguards that have been adopted appropriately mitigate the principal threats identified. We therefore confirm that EY is independent and the objectivity and independence of Helen Thompson, your 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 in place 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 28 June 2013 and can be found here:

<http://www.ey.com/UK/en/About-us/EY-UK-Transparency-Report-2013>

## Appendix A Fees

A breakdown of our agreed fee is shown below.

	Planned Fee 2013/14 £'000	Actual Fee 2012/13 £'000	Explanation of variance
<b>Total Audit Fee – Code work</b>	<b>138,564</b>	<b>138,564</b>	
Certification of claims and returns*	39,400	51,201	For 2013-14, the Audit Commission has calculated indicative certification fees based on the latest available information on actual certification fees for 2011-12. The fee set is lower than 2012-13 to reflect the changes in the grants regimes.  In addition the 2012-13 fee includes a scale fee variation of £2,601 approved by the Audit Commission for additional work on the housing benefit and council tax benefit claim.
<b>Non-audit work</b>			
Central Berkshire Waste PFI -	15,333	24,000	Less work was carried out in 2013-14
VAT advice	4,600	0	

*\*Our fee for the certification of grant claims is based on the indicative scale fee set by the Audit Commission.*

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

- ▶ The level of risk in relation to the audit of the financial statements is consistent with that in the prior year;
- ▶ We are able to place reliance as planned on the work of internal audit;
- ▶ The financial statements will be available to us in line with the agreed timetable;
- ▶ Working papers and records provided to us in support of the financial statements are provided in line with our agreed timetable, are of a good quality, consistent with the accounts provided for audit, and are reviewed by an appropriate officer;
- ▶ Prompt responses are provided to our draft reports;
- ▶ An effective control environment operates for the whole of the financial year;

- ▶ No significant changes are made by the Audit Commission to the use of resources criteria on which our conclusion will be based;
- ▶ Our accounts opinion and use of resources conclusion being unqualified.

If any of the above assumptions prove to be unfounded, we will seek a variation to the agreed fee. This will be discussed with you 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.

## Appendix B UK required communications with those charged with governance.

There are certain communications that we must provide to the Governance and Audit committee of audited clients. These are detailed here:

Required communication	Reference
<b>Planning and audit approach</b>	
Communication of the planned scope and timing of the audit including any limitations.	Audit Plan
<b>Significant findings from the audit</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Our view about the significant qualitative aspects of accounting practices including accounting policies, accounting estimates and financial statement disclosures</li> <li>▶ Significant difficulties, if any, encountered during the audit</li> <li>▶ Significant matters, if any, arising from the audit that were discussed with management</li> <li>▶ Written representations that we are seeking</li> <li>▶ Expected modifications to the audit report</li> <li>▶ Other matters if any, significant to the oversight of the financial reporting process</li> </ul>	Report to those charged with governance
<b>Misstatements</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Uncorrected misstatements and their effect on our audit opinion</li> <li>▶ The effect of uncorrected misstatements related to prior periods</li> <li>▶ A request that any uncorrected misstatement be corrected</li> <li>▶ In writing, corrected misstatements that are significant</li> </ul>	Report to those charged with governance
<b>Fraud</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Enquiries of the Governance &amp; Audit Committee to determine whether they have knowledge of any actual, suspected or alleged fraud affecting the entity</li> <li>▶ Any fraud that we have identified or information we have obtained that indicates that a fraud may exist</li> <li>▶ A discussion of any other matters related to fraud</li> </ul>	Report to those charged with governance
<b>Related parties</b>	
<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"> <li>▶ Non-disclosure by management</li> <li>▶ Inappropriate authorisation and approval of transactions</li> <li>▶ Disagreement over disclosures</li> <li>▶ Non-compliance with laws and regulations</li> <li>▶ Difficulty in identifying the party that ultimately controls the entity</li> </ul>	Report to those charged with governance
<b>External confirmations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Management's refusal for us to request confirmations</li> <li>▶ Inability to obtain relevant and reliable audit evidence from other procedures</li> </ul>	Report to those charged with governance
<b>Consideration of laws and regulations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ 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</li> </ul>	Report to those charged with governance

Required communication	Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Enquiry of the Governance &amp; 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</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Independence</b></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 partner's consideration of independence and objectivity such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The principal threats</li> <li>▶ Safeguards adopted and their effectiveness</li> <li>▶ An overall assessment of threats and safeguards</li> <li>▶ Information about the general policies and process within the firm to maintain objectivity and independence</li> </ul>	<p>Audit Plan</p> <p>Report to those charged with governance</p>
<p><b>Going concern</b></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"> <li>▶ Whether the events or conditions constitute a material uncertainty</li> <li>▶ Whether the use of the going concern assumption is appropriate in the preparation and presentation of the financial statements</li> <li>▶ The adequacy of related disclosures in the financial statements</li> </ul>	<p>Report to those charged with governance</p>
<p><b>Significant deficiencies in internal controls identified during the audit</b></p>	<p>Report to those charged with governance</p>
<p><b>Certification work</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Summary of certification work undertaken</li> </ul>	<p>Annual Report to those charged with governance summarising grant certification, and Annual Audit Letter if considered necessary</p>
<p><b>Fee Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Breakdown of fee information at the agreement of the initial audit plan</li> <li>▶ Breakdown of fee information at the completion of the audit</li> </ul>	<p>Audit Plan</p> <p>Report to those charged with governance 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](http://ey.com)