



External Audit Plan 2016/2017

Bury Metropolitan Borough Council

January 2016

The Local Government Landscape



Financial Statement Audit



There are no significant changes to the Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in 2016/17, which provides stability in terms of the accounting standards the Authority need to comply with.

Materiality

Materiality for planning purposes has been based on last year's expenditure and set at **£8.5 million**.

We are obliged to report uncorrected omissions or misstatements other than those which are 'clearly trivial' to those charged with governance and this has been set at **£0.4 million**.

Significant risks

Those risks requiring specific audit attention and procedures to address the likelihood of a material financial statement error have been identified as:

- Significant changes in the pension liability due to LGPS Triennial Valuation;
- Valuation of Property, Plant and Equipment; and
- Agresso system upgrade

See pages 3 to 6 for more details.

Value for Money Arrangements work



Our risk assessment regarding your arrangements to secure value for money have identified the following VFM significant risks:

- Financial Standing; and
- Ofsted Inspection

See pages 8 to 12 for more details.

Logistics



Our team is:

- Rashpal Khangura – Engagement Lead
- Jerri Lewis – Manager
- Robert Fenton – Assistant Manager

More details are on **page 15**.

Our work will be completed in four phases from December to July and our key deliverables are this Audit Plan and a Report to those charged with Governance as outlined on **page 14**.

Our fee for the audit is £116,730 (£116,730 2015/2016) see **page 13**.

Introduction

Background and Statutory responsibilities

This document supplements our Audit Fee Letter 2016/17 presented to you in April 2016, which also sets out details of our appointment by Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA).

Our statutory responsibilities and powers are set out in the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 and the National Audit Office's Code of Audit Practice.

Our audit has two key objectives, requiring us to audit/review and report on your:

- *Financial statements (including the Annual Governance Statement):* Providing an opinion on your accounts; and
- *Use of resources:* Concluding on the arrangements in place for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in your use of resources (the value for money conclusion).

The audit planning process and risk assessment is an on-going process and the assessment and fees in this plan will be kept under review and updated if necessary.

Acknowledgements

We would like to take this opportunity to thank officers and Members for their continuing help and co-operation throughout our audit work.

Financial Statements Audit

Our financial statements audit work follows a four stage audit process which is identified below. Appendix 1 provides more detail on the activities that this includes. This report concentrates on the Financial Statements Audit Planning stage of the Financial Statements Audit.



Value for Money Arrangements Work

Our Value for Money (VFM) Arrangements Work follows a five stage process which is identified below. Page 8 provides more detail on the activities that this includes. This report concentrates on explaining the VFM approach for the 2016/17 [and the findings of our VFM risk assessment].





Financial Statements Audit Planning

Our planning work takes place during December 2016 to February 2017. This involves the following key aspects:


- Risk assessment;
- Determining our materiality level; and
- Issuing this audit plan to communicate our audit strategy.

Risk assessment

Professional standards require us to consider two standard risks for all organisations. We are not elaborating on these standard risks in this plan but consider them as a matter of course in our audit and will include any findings arising from our work in our ISA 260 Report.

- **Management override of controls** – Management is typically in a powerful position to perpetrate fraud owing to its ability to manipulate accounting records and prepare fraudulent financial statements by overriding controls that otherwise appear to be operating effectively. Our audit methodology incorporates the risk of management override as a default significant risk. In line with our methodology, we carry out appropriate controls testing and substantive procedures, including over journal entries, accounting estimates and significant transactions that are outside the normal course of business, or are otherwise unusual.
- **Fraudulent revenue recognition** – We do not consider this to be a significant risk for local authorities as there are limited incentives and opportunities to manipulate the way income is recognised. We therefore rebut this risk and do not incorporate specific work into our audit plan in this area over and above our standard fraud procedures.

The diagram opposite identifies, significant risks and other areas of audit focus, which we expand on overleaf. The diagram also identifies a range of other areas considered by our audit approach.



Keys: ● Significant risk ● Other area of audit focus ● Example other areas considered by our approach



Significant Audit Risks

Those risks requiring specific audit attention and procedures to address the likelihood of a material financial statement error.

Risk : Significant changes in the pension liability due to LGPS Triennial Valuation

During the year, the Local Government Pension Scheme for Greater Manchester (the Pension Fund) has undergone a triennial valuation with an effective date of 31 March 2016 in line with the Local Government Pension Scheme (Administration) Regulations 2013. The Authority's share of pensions assets and liabilities is determined in detail, and a large volume of data is provided to the actuary in order to carry out this triennial valuation.

The pension liability numbers to be included in the financial statements for 2016/17 will be based on the output of the triennial valuation rolled forward to 31 March 2017. For 2017/18 and 2018/19 the actuary will then roll forward the valuation for accounting purposes based on more limited data.

There is a risk that the data provided to the actuary for the valuation exercise is inaccurate and that these inaccuracies affect the actuarial figures in the accounts. Most of the data is provided to the actuary by Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council who administer the Pension Fund.

Approach

As part of our audit, we will agree any data provided by the Authority to the actuary, back to the relevant systems and reports from which it was derived, in addition to checking the accuracy of this data.

We will also liaise with Grant Thornton who are the auditors of the Pension Fund, where this data was provided by the Pension Fund on the Authority's behalf to check the completeness and accuracy such data.

Significant Audit Risks

Those risks requiring specific audit attention and procedures to address the likelihood of a material financial statement error.

Risk : Valuation of PPE

The Council policy for asset revaluation is to 're-value sufficiently regularly to ensure that their carrying amount is not materially different from their current value at the year-end, but as a minimum every five years'. The NBV of the fixed assets as at 31 March 2016 was £584.2m.

At the 31 March 2016, there were 46 assets which remained 'unvalued' (in line with rolling five year programme) due to resource constraints in property management. The results of these valuations were available as at the end of June, however these values because of the timing, were not incorporated into the financial statements. This resulted in an unadjusted misstatement of £755k.

The Authority have made good progress developing their processes to ensure the programme of revaluation is up-to-date and the carrying value of the asset base is materially accurate. However, given the historical issues identified with fixed asset revaluations in the past and the significance of the value to the financial statements we have identified this as a significant audit risk.

Approach

We will undertake the following work over the valuation of material land and building balances:

- Consult the Authority early to ensure the current year programme of revaluation is on target;
- assess the competence, capability, objectivity and independence of the internal valuer;
- critically assess the calculation of market value indices movements, including a re-performance of this calculation to confirm that no material movement in the value of land and building assets is indicated;
- critically assess the Authority's formal consideration of indications of impairment and surplus assets within its estate, including the process undertaken and the adequacy of the formal, written decision document used in the process; and
- consider the adequacy of the disclosures about the key judgements and degree of estimation involved in concluding that there has been no material movement in the value of land and buildings since 31 March 2016.



Significant Audit Risks

Those risks requiring specific audit attention and procedures to address the likelihood of a material financial statement error.

Risk : Agresso System Upgrade

The Authority are implementing a significant upgrade to their general ledger system, Agresso, in February 2017.

The upgrade will involve data migration which gives cause for us to recognise this as a significant risk which is pervasive to the financial statements. The Authority have evidenced there is a working group in place to project manage the implementation and we have reviewed a project highlight report that suggests the project is on track for completion in the agreed timescale. Internal Audit are planning to carry out testing to ensure the transfer of the ledger information is complete and accurate.

Approach

We will review the work of internal audit to inform our risk assessment and consult our internal Information Risk Management (IRM) team to determine the approach to testing the data migration as part of the General IT controls testing.

Financial statements audit planning (cont.)



Materiality

We are required to plan our audit to determine with reasonable confidence whether or not the financial statements are free from material misstatement. An omission or misstatement is regarded as material if it would reasonably influence the user of financial statements. This therefore involves an assessment of the qualitative and quantitative nature of omissions and misstatements.


Generally, we would not consider differences in opinion in respect of areas of judgement to represent 'misstatements' unless the application of that judgement results in a financial amount falling outside of a range which we consider to be acceptable.

Materiality for planning purposes has been set at £8.5 million for the Authority's standalone accounts and group accounts, which equates to 1.6 percent of prior year gross expenditure.

We design our procedures to detect errors in specific accounts at a lower level of precision.

Reporting 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 Committee any unadjusted misstatements of lesser amounts to the extent that these are identified by our audit work.



Under ISA 260(UK&I) '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&I) 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 Authority, we propose that an individual difference could normally be considered to be clearly trivial if it is less than £0.4 million.

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 Committee to assist it in fulfilling its governance responsibilities.

Group audit

The Authority's subsidiaries are not deemed significant in the context of the group audit. We will perform standard audit procedures to satisfy ourselves over the consolidation process and substantively test the consolidation schedule.




Background to approach to VFM work

The Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 requires auditors of local government bodies to be satisfied that the authority 'has made proper arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources'.

This is supported by the Code of Audit Practice, published by the NAO in April 2015, which requires auditors to 'take into account their knowledge of the relevant local sector as a whole, and the audited body specifically, to identify any risks that, in the auditor's judgement, have the potential to cause the auditor to reach an inappropriate conclusion on the audited body's arrangements.'

The VFM approach is fundamentally unchanged from that adopted in 2015/2016 and the process is shown in the diagram below. The diagram overleaf shows the details of the criteria for our VFM work.





Overall 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.

Informed decision making

Proper arrangements:

- Acting in the public interest, through demonstrating and applying the principles and values of sound governance.
- Understanding and using appropriate and reliable financial and performance information to support informed decision making and performance management.
- Reliable and timely financial reporting that supports the delivery of strategic priorities.
- Managing risks effectively and maintaining a sound system of internal control.

Sustainable resource deployment

Proper arrangements:

- Planning finances effectively to support the sustainable delivery of strategic priorities and maintain statutory functions.
- Managing and utilising assets to support the delivery of strategic priorities.
- Planning, organising and developing the workforce effectively to deliver strategic priorities.

Working with partners and third parties

Proper arrangements:

- Working with third parties effectively to deliver strategic priorities.
- Commissioning services effectively to support the delivery of strategic priorities.
- Procuring supplies and services effectively to support the delivery of strategic priorities.



VFM audit stage	Audit approach
VFM audit risk assessment	<p>We consider the relevance and significance of the potential business risks faced by all local authorities, and other risks that apply specifically to the Authority. These are the significant operational and financial risks in achieving statutory functions and objectives, which are relevant to auditors' responsibilities under the <i>Code of Audit Practice</i>.</p> <p>In doing so we consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The Authority's own assessment of the risks it faces, and its arrangements to manage and address its risks; ■ Information from the Public Sector Auditor Appointments Limited VFM profile tool; ■ Evidence gained from previous audit work, including the response to that work; and ■ The work of other inspectorates and review agencies.
Linkages with financial statements and other audit work	<p>There is a degree of overlap between the work we do as part of the VFM audit and our financial statements audit. For example, our financial statements audit includes an assessment and testing of the Authority's organisational control environment, including the Authority's financial management and governance arrangements, many aspects of which are relevant to our VFM audit responsibilities.</p> <p>We have always sought to avoid duplication of audit effort by integrating our financial statements and VFM work, and this will continue. We will therefore draw upon relevant aspects of our financial statements audit work to inform the VFM audit.</p>
Identification of significant risks	<p>The Code identifies a matter as significant '<i>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. Significance has both qualitative and quantitative aspects.</i>'</p> <p>If we identify significant VFM risks, then we will highlight the risk to the Authority and consider the most appropriate audit response in each case, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Considering the results of work by the Authority, inspectorates and other review agencies; and ■ Carrying out local risk-based work to form a view on the adequacy of the Authority's arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources.

Value for money arrangements work (cont.)



VFM audit stage	Audit approach
<p>Assessment of work by other review agencies</p> <p>and</p> <p>Delivery of local risk based work</p>	<p>Depending on the nature of the significant VFM risk identified, we may be able to draw on the work of other inspectorates, review agencies and other relevant bodies to provide us with the necessary evidence to reach our conclusion on the risk.</p> <p>If such evidence is not available, we will instead need to consider what additional work we will be required to undertake to satisfy ourselves that we have reasonable evidence to support the conclusion that we will draw. Such work may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Meeting with senior managers across the Authority; ■ Review of minutes and internal reports; ■ Examination of financial models for reasonableness, using our own experience and benchmarking data from within and without the sector.
<p>Concluding on VFM arrangements</p>	<p>At the conclusion of the VFM audit we will consider the results of the work undertaken and assess the assurance obtained against each of the VFM themes regarding the adequacy of the Authority's arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources.</p> <p>If any issues are identified that may be significant to this assessment, and in particular if there are issues that indicate we may need to consider qualifying our VFM conclusion, we will discuss these with management as soon as possible. Such issues will also be considered more widely as part of KPMG's quality control processes, to help ensure the consistency of auditors' decisions.</p>
<p>Reporting</p>	<p>On the following page, we report the results of our initial risk assessment.</p> <p>We will report on the results of the VFM audit through our ISA 260 Report. This will summarise any specific matters arising, and the basis for our overall conclusion.</p> <p>If considered appropriate, we may produce a separate report on the VFM audit, either overall or for any specific reviews that we may undertake.</p> <p>The key output from the work will be the VFM conclusion (i.e. our opinion on the Authority's arrangements for securing VFM), which forms part of our audit report.</p>



Significant VFM Risks

Those risks requiring specific audit attention and procedures to address the likelihood that proper arrangements are not in place to deliver value for money.

Financial Standing

■ Risk

The Revenue budget approved by Council on 24 February 2016 identified the need to achieve savings of £11.58m in the year to 31 March 2017. At Month 6, the Authority's revenue position was showing a projected overspend of £4.92m. The main variances are due demand pressures in Adult Social Care and Children's Services. The Authority expect to mitigate the overspend through use of general fund reserves and are identifying options for use of earmarked reserves. In addition, the budget consultation for the three year period 2017 to 2020 estimates further cuts amounting to £32m, with £13.3m of cuts expected in 2017/18. The Authority are therefore under great pressure to meet their financial targets with an ever reducing budget. There is a risk the Authority do not have the appropriate arrangements in place to deliver the required savings putting increasing pressure on the reserve balances in the future.

■ Approach

We will assess the arrangements in place for identifying potential savings at the Authority and whether an appropriate governance structure exists to manage this process effectively. This will involve review of the controls in place for monitoring financial performance and assessing whether the Authority is using appropriate and reliable financial and performance information (including, where relevant, information from regulatory/monitoring bodies) to support informed decision making. This will involve the work discussed on the previous page.

Ofsted Inspection

■ Risk

The Cabinet Member (Children and Families) submitted a report to the June Overview and Scrutiny Committee, presenting the findings of an Ofsted inspection of Bury Council Children's Services for children in need of help and protection, looked after children and care leavers. The inspection took place over a four week period during February and March 2016. The inspection found that there were no widespread or serious failings that may result in or leave children being harmed or at risk of harm. However, the report included eleven recommendations to assist the Council in preparing an action plan to ensure all services to children and young people are rated 'good' or 'outstanding'. There is a risk the Authority does not have appropriate arrangements in place to ensure delivery against the action plan, failure of which could impact performance and reputation.

■ Approach

We will assess what processes have been put in place to manage the delivery of the action plan including how the Authority monitors performance against it. This will involve understanding the governance arrangements in place to and determining how effective these are.

Whole of government accounts (WGA)

We are required to review your WGA consolidation and undertake the work specified under the approach that is agreed with HM Treasury and the National Audit Office. Deadlines for production of the pack and the specified approach for 2016/17 have not yet been confirmed.

Elector challenge

The Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 gives electors certain rights. These are:

- The right to inspect the accounts;
- The right to ask the auditor questions about the accounts; and
- The right to object to the accounts.

As a result of these rights, in particular the right to object to the accounts, we may need to undertake additional work to form our decision on the elector's objection. The additional work could range from a small piece of work where we interview an officer and review evidence to form our decision, to a more detailed piece of work, where we have to interview a range of officers, review significant amounts of evidence and seek legal representations on the issues raised.

The costs incurred in responding to specific questions or objections raised by electors is not part of the fee. This work will be charged in accordance with the PSAA's fee scales.

Our audit team

Our audit team will be led by Rashpal Khangura, who continues in his role as engagement lead. Rashpal is joined by Jerri Lewis, who as audit manager is responsible for the overall delivery and quality assurance of the audit work. Jerri is new to the audit in 2016/17, and brings with her a wealth of sector knowledge and a fresh perspective to the audit. Appendix 2 provides more details on specific roles and contact details of the team.

Reporting and communication

Reporting is a key part of the audit process, not only in communicating the audit findings for the year, but also in ensuring the audit team are accountable to you in addressing the issues identified as part of the audit strategy. Throughout the year we will communicate with you through meetings with the finance team and the Audit Committee. Our communication outputs are included in Appendix 1.

Independence and Objectivity


Auditors are also required to be independent and objective. Appendix 3 provides more details of our confirmation of independence and objectivity.

Audit fee

Our Audit Fee Letter 2016/2017 presented to you in April 2016 first set out our fees for the 2016/2017 audit. This letter also sets out our assumptions. We have not considered it necessary to make any changes to the agreed fees at this stage.

The planned audit fee for 2016/17 is £116,730 (£116,730 2015/2016). Our audit fee includes our work on the VFM conclusion and our audit of the Authority's financial statements.

Appendix 1: Key elements of our financial statements audit approach



Driving more value from the audit through data and analytics

Technology is embedded throughout our audit approach to deliver a high quality audit opinion. Use of Data and Analytics (D&A) to analyse large populations of transactions in order to identify key areas for our audit focus is just one element. We strive to deliver new quality insight into your operations that enhances our and your preparedness and improves your collective 'business intelligence.' Data and Analytics allows us to:

- Obtain greater understanding of your processes, to automatically extract control configurations and to obtain higher levels assurance.
- Focus manual procedures on key areas of risk and on transactional exceptions.
- Identify data patterns and the root cause of issues to increase forward-looking insight.

We anticipate using data and analytics in our work around key areas such as accounts payable and journals. We also expect to provide insights from our analysis of these tranches of data in our reporting to add further value from our audit.

Appendix 2: Audit team



Your audit team has been drawn from our specialist public sector assurance department. Jerri Lewis has joined the audit team as manager, otherwise our audit team were all part of the Bury MBC audit last year.



Name	Rashpal Khangura
Position	Engagement Lead
Telephone	0113 231 3396
Email	Rashpal.Khangura@kpmg.co.uk
	<p>'My role is to lead our team and ensure the delivery of a high quality, valued added external audit opinion.</p> <p>I will be the main point of contact for the Audit Committee and Chief Executive.'</p>



Name	Jerri Lewis
Position	Manager
Telephone	07342 085 113
Email	Jerri.Lewis@kpmg.co.uk
	<p>'I provide quality assurance for the audit work and specifically any technical accounting and risk areas.</p> <p>I will work closely with Rashpal Khangura to ensure we add value.</p> <p>I will liaise with the Interim Executive Director of Resources and Regulation and other Executive Directors.'</p>



Name	Robert Fenton
Position	Assistant Manager
Telephone	0161 246 4686
Email	Robert.Fenton@kpmg.co.uk
	<p>'I will be responsible for the on-site delivery of our work and will supervise the work of our audit assistants.'</p>

Appendix 3: Independence and objectivity requirements

Independence and objectivity

Professional standards require auditors to communicate to those charged with governance, at least annually, all relationships that may bear on the firm's independence and the objectivity of the audit engagement partner and audit staff. The standards also place requirements on auditors in relation to integrity, objectivity and independence.

The standards define 'those charged with governance' as 'those persons entrusted with the supervision, control and direction of an entity'. In your case this is the Audit Committee.

KPMG LLP is committed to being and being seen to be independent. APB Ethical Standards require us to communicate to you in writing all significant facts and matters, including those related to the provision of non-audit services and the safeguards put in place, in our professional judgement, may reasonably be thought to bear on KPMG LLP's independence and the objectivity of the Engagement Lead and the audit team.

Further to this auditors are required by the National Audit Office's Code of Audit Practice to:

- Carry out their work with integrity, independence and objectivity;
- Be transparent and report publicly as required;
- Be professional and proportional in conducting work;
- Be mindful of the activities of inspectorates to prevent duplication;
- Take a constructive and positive approach to their work;
- Comply with data statutory and other relevant requirements relating to the security, transfer, holding, disclosure and disposal of information.

PSAA's Terms of Appointment includes several references to arrangements designed to support and reinforce the requirements relating to independence, which auditors must comply with. These are as follows:

- Auditors and senior members of their staff who are directly involved in the management, supervision or delivery of PSAA audit work should not take part in political activity.

- No member or employee of the firm should accept or hold an appointment as a member of an audited body whose auditor is, or is proposed to be, from the same firm. In addition, no member or employee of the firm should accept or hold such appointments at related bodies, such as those linked to the audited body through a strategic partnership.
- Audit staff are expected not to accept appointments as Governors at certain types of schools within the local authority.
- Auditors and their staff should not be employed in any capacity (whether paid or unpaid) by an audited body or other organisation providing services to an audited body whilst being employed by the firm.
- Auditors appointed by the PSAA should not accept engagements which involve commenting on the performance of other PSAA auditors on PSAA work without first consulting PSAA.
- Auditors are expected to comply with the Terms of Appointment policy for the Engagement Lead to be changed on a periodic basis.
- Audit suppliers are required to obtain the PSAA's written approval prior to changing any Engagement Lead in respect of each audited body.
- Certain other staff changes or appointments require positive action to be taken by Firms as set out in the Terms of Appointment.

Confirmation statement

We confirm that as of January 2017 in our professional judgement, KPMG LLP is independent within the meaning of regulatory and professional requirements and the objectivity of the Engagement Lead and audit team is not impaired.



© 2017 KPMG LLP, a UK limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative (“KPMG International”), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.

This report is addressed to the Authority and has been prepared for the sole use of the Authority. We take no responsibility to any member of staff acting in their individual capacities, or to third parties. We draw your attention to the Statement of Responsibilities of auditors and audited bodies, which is available on Public Sector Audit Appointments’s website (www.psa.co.uk).

External auditors do not act as a substitute for the audited body’s own responsibility for putting in place proper arrangements to ensure that public business is conducted in accordance with the law and proper standards, and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for, and used economically, efficiently and effectively.

We are committed to providing you with a high quality service. If you have any concerns or are dissatisfied with any part of KPMG’s work, in the first instance you should contact Rashpal Khangura the engagement lead to the Authority, who will try to resolve your complaint. If you are dissatisfied with your response please contact the national lead partner for all of KPMG’s work under our contract with Public Sector Audit Appointments Limited, Andrew Sayers, by email to Andrew.Sayers@kpmg.co.uk. After this, if you are still dissatisfied with how your complaint has been handled you can access PSAA’s complaints procedure by emailing generalenquiries@psaa.co.uk by telephoning 020 7072 7445 or by writing to Public Sector Audit Appointments Limited, 3rd Floor, Local Government House, Smith Square, London, SW1P 3HZ.