



*cutting through complexity™*

# External Audit Plan 2013/14

**Bury Metropolitan Borough  
Council**

March 2014



**The contacts at KPMG in connection with this report are:**

**Trevor Rees**

*Partner*

*KPMG LLP (UK)*

Tel: 0161 246 4063

[trevor.rees@kpmg.co.uk](mailto:trevor.rees@kpmg.co.uk)

**Jillian Burrows**

*Senior Manager*

*KPMG LLP (UK)*

Tel: 0161 246 4705

[jillian.burrows@kpmg.co.uk](mailto:jillian.burrows@kpmg.co.uk)

**Adam Langan**

*Assistant Manager*

*KPMG LLP (UK)*

Tel: 0161 246 4938

[adam.langan@kpmg.co.uk](mailto:adam.langan@kpmg.co.uk)

**Report sections**

	<b>Page</b>
■ Introduction	2
■ Headlines	3
■ Our audit approach	5
■ Key financial statements audit risks	11
■ VFM audit approach	15
■ Audit team, deliverables, timeline and fees	19

**Appendices**

1. Balance of internal controls and substantive testing	23
2. Independence and objectivity requirements	24
3. Quality assurance and technical capacity	25
4. Materiality	27

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. The Audit Commission has issued a document entitled *Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and Audited Bodies*. This summarises where the responsibilities of auditors begin and end and what is expected from the audited body. We draw your attention to this document which is available on the Audit Commission's website at [www.audit-commission.gov.uk](http://www.audit-commission.gov.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.

If you have any concerns or are dissatisfied with any part of KPMG's work, in the first instance you should contact Trevor Rees, the appointed engagement lead to the Authority, who will try to resolve your complaint. If you are dissatisfied with your response please contact Trevor Rees on 0161 246 4000, or by email to [trevor.rees@kpmg.co.uk](mailto:trevor.rees@kpmg.co.uk), who is the national contact partner for all of KPMG's work with the Audit Commission. After this, if you are still dissatisfied with how your complaint has been handled you can access the Audit Commission's complaints procedure. Put your complaint in writing to the Complaints Unit Manager, Audit Commission, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Fry Building, 2 Marsham Street, London, SW1P 4DF or by email to [complaints@audit-commission.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:complaints@audit-commission.gsi.gov.uk). Their telephone number is 0303 444 8330.

**This document describes how we will deliver our audit work for Bury Metropolitan Borough Council.**

### Scope of this report

We are pleased to be appointed as your external auditors for 2013/14. This document supplements our *Audit Fee Letter 2013/14* which was issued to the Executive Director of Finance and Resources in April 2013. It describes how we will deliver our financial statements audit work for Bury Metropolitan Borough Council ('the Authority'). It also sets out our approach to value for money (VFM) work for 2013/14.

We are required to satisfy ourselves that your accounts comply with statutory requirements and that proper practices have been observed in compiling them. We use a risk based audit approach.

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.

### Statutory responsibilities

Our statutory responsibilities and powers are set out in the *Audit Commission Act 1998* and the Audit Commission's *Code of Audit Practice*.

The *Code of Audit Practice* summarises our responsibilities into two objectives, requiring us to 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 Commission's *Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and Audited Bodies* sets out the respective responsibilities of the auditor and the Authority.

### Structure of this report

This report is structured as follows:

- Section 2 includes our headline messages, including any key risks identified this year for the financial statements and Value for Money audit.
- Section 3 describes the approach we take for the audit of the financial statements.
- Section 4 provides further detail on the financial statements audit risks.
- Section 5 explains our approach to VFM work.
- Section 6 provides information on the audit team, our proposed deliverables, the timescales and fees for our work.

### Acknowledgements

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

This table summarises the headline messages. The remainder of this report provides further details on each area.

<b>Audit approach</b>	<p>The Council has brought forward the close down of the accounts in order to have the statutory accounts approved by the Audit Committee on 15th July 2014. As a result the timing of our audit has been brought forward by 3 weeks. Our overall audit approach is unchanged from last year.</p> <p>Our work is carried out in four stages and the timings for these, and specifically our on site work, have been agreed with Andrew Baldwin (Head of Finance).</p> <p>Our audit strategy and plan remain flexible as risks and issues change throughout the year. We will review the initial assessments presented in this document throughout the year and should any new risks emerge we will evaluate these and respond accordingly.</p>
<b>Key financial statements audit risks and areas of audit focus</b>	<p>We have completed our initial risk assessment for the financial statements audit and have identified the following significant risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ LGPS Triennial Valuation – the Local Government Pension Scheme has undergone a triennial valuation in year. A large volume of data is provided by the Authority to the actuary in order to carry out this triennial valuation and inaccuracies in this data affect the actuarial figures in the accounts. As part of our audit, we will test the accuracy of the data provided by the Council and review the balances disclosed in the accounts against information provided by the actuary.</li> </ul> <p>We have also identified the following areas of audit focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Savings Plan – the Authorities performance against budget and VFM requirements in the context of the substantial savings required in current and future years due to further reductions to local authority funding . In conjunction with our VFM work and as part of our audit we will perform procedures to critically assess the authorities performance in controlling and managing its saving plan; and</li> <li>■ Early Accounts Closedown – the potential that the Authority may need to include more estimates in the final accounts such as accruals and pension balances due to the early close down of accounts. This will be reflected in our audit approach and consideration will be given to the supporting evidence provided for such estimates.</li> </ul> <p>These are described in more detail on pages 11 to 14. We will assess the Authority’s progress in addressing these risk areas as part of our interim work and conclude this work at year end.</p>
<b>VFM audit approach</b>	<p>We have completed our initial risk assessment for the VFM conclusion and have not identified any significant risks at this stage.</p>



## Section two Headlines (continued)

This table summarises the headline messages. The remainder of this report provides further details on each area.

### Audit team, deliverables, timeline and fees

We have refreshed our audit team this year. Jillian Burrows has returned as the Senior Manager and Adam Langan is the new Assistant Manager. Jillian was Senior Manager on the Bury MBC audit four years ago. Adam has worked on the Bury MBC Audit for the past three years.


Our main year end audit is currently planned to commence on 9<sup>th</sup> June. Upon conclusion of our work we will again present our findings to you in our *Report to Those Charged with Governance (ISA 260 Report)*.

The planned fee for the 2013/14 audit is £154,170. This is unchanged from the position set out in our *Audit Fee Letter 2013/14*.

We undertake our work on your financial statements in four key stages during 2014:

- **Planning**  
(January to February).
- **Control Evaluation**  
(February to April).
- **Substantive Procedures**  
(June to July).
- **Completion** (July).

We have summarised the four key stages of our financial statements audit process for you below:



During January and February 2014 we complete our planning work.

We assess the key risks affecting the Authority's financial statements and discuss these with officers.

We assess if there are any weaknesses in respect of central processes, including the Authority's IT systems, that would impact on our audit.

Our planning work takes place in January and February 2014. This involves the following aspects:

### Planning

- Update our business understanding and risk assessment.
- Assess the organisational control environment.
- Determine our audit strategy and plan the audit approach.
- Issue our *Accounts Audit Protocol*.

#### Business understanding and risk assessment

We update our understanding of the Authority's operations and identify any areas that will require particular attention during our audit of the Authority's financial statements.

We identify the key risks affecting the Authority's financial statements. These are based on our knowledge of the Authority, our sector experience and our ongoing dialogue with Authority staff. Any risks identified to date through our risk assessment process are set out in this document. Our audit strategy and plan will, however, remain flexible as the risks and issues change throughout the year. It is the Authority's responsibility to adequately address these issues. We encourage the Authority to raise any technical issues with us as early as possible so that we can agree the accounting treatment in advance of the audit visit.

We meet with the head of financial management on a bi-monthly basis to consider issues and how they are addressed during the financial year end closedown and accounts preparation.

#### Organisational control environment

Controls operated at an organisational level often have an impact on controls at an operational level and if there were weaknesses this would impact on our audit.

In particular risk management, internal control and ethics and conduct have implications for our financial statements audit. The scope of the work of your internal auditors also informs our risk assessment.

The Authority relies on information technology (IT) to support both financial reporting and internal control processes. In order to satisfy ourselves that we can rely on the use of IT, we test controls over access to systems and data, system changes, system development and computer operations. Whilst we undertake some general IT controls work, we also focus on testing the specific applications and reports that are pivotal to the production of the financial statements.

#### Audit strategy and approach to materiality

Our audit is performed in accordance with International Standards on Auditing (ISAs) (UK and Ireland). The Engagement Lead sets the overall direction of the audit and decides the nature and extent of audit activities. We design audit procedures in response to the risk that the financial statements are materially misstated. The materiality level is a matter of judgement and is set by the Engagement Lead.

In accordance with ISA 320 '*Audit materiality*', we plan and perform our audit to provide reasonable assurance that the financial statements are free of material misstatement and give a true and fair view. Information is material if its omission or misstatement could influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements.

An indicative level of materiality for 2013/14 is £10.789 million. This is based on the prior year Statement of Accounts and on our understanding of the projected outturn for the current year. This figure is a guide only. The overriding objective is to preserve the true and fair view presented by the financial statements and we will consider any audit differences, individually and cumulatively, in that context. See appendix 4 for further details.



**We will report on any significant matters arising from the work of the auditors of Six Town Housing which we seek to rely on to support our audit of the Authority's group accounts.**

**We will issue our *Accounts Audit Protocol* following completion of our planning work.**

#### **Group audit**

In addition to the Authority we deem Six Town Housing to be significant in the context of the group audit.

To support our audit work on the Authority's group accounts, we seek to place reliance on the work of Baker Tilly who are the auditors to this subsidiary. We will liaise with them in order to confirm that their programme of work is adequate for our purposes and they satisfy professional requirements.

We will report the following matters in our *ISA 260 Report*:

- any deficiencies in the system of internal controls or instances of fraud which the subsidiary auditors identify;
- any limitations on the group audit, for example, where the our access to information may have been restricted; and
- any instances where our evaluation of the work the subsidiary auditors gives rise to concern about the quality of that auditor's work.

#### **Accounts audit protocol**

At the end of our planning work we will issue our *Accounts Audit Protocol*. This important document sets out our audit approach and timetable. It also summarises the working papers and other evidence we require the Authority to provide during our interim and final accounts visits.

We met with Andrew Baldwin to discuss mutual learning points from the 2012/13 audit. These will be incorporated into our work plan for 2013/14. We revisit progress against areas identified for development as the audit progresses.



**During February to April 2014 we will complete our interim audit work.**

**We assess if controls over key financial systems were effective during 2013/14. We work with your internal audit team to avoid duplication.**

**We work with your finance team to enhance the efficiency of the accounts audit.**

**We will report any significant findings arising from our work to the Audit Committee.**

Our interim visit on site will be completed during 24<sup>th</sup> February – 7<sup>th</sup> March. During this time we will complete work in the following areas:

### Control Evaluation

- Evaluate and test controls over key financial systems identified as part of our risk assessment.
- Review the work undertaken by the internal audit function on controls relevant to our risk assessment.
- Review the accounts production process.
- Review progress on critical accounting matters.

### Controls over key financial systems

We update our understanding of the Authority's key financial processes where our risk assessment has identified that these are relevant to our final accounts audit and where we have determined that this is the most efficient audit approach to take. We confirm our understanding by completing walkthroughs for these systems. We then test selected controls that address key risks within these systems. The strength of the control framework informs the substantive testing we complete during our final accounts visit.

Where our audit approach is to undertake controls work on financial systems, we seek to rely on any relevant work internal audit have completed to minimise unnecessary duplication of work. Our audit fee is set on the assumption that we can place reliance on their work. We have a joint working protocol and have met with the Head of Internal Audit to discuss the principles and timetables for the managed audit process for 2013/14.

### Review of internal audit

Where we intend to rely on internal audit's work in respect of the key financial systems identified as part of our risk assessment, auditing standards require us to review aspects of their work. This includes re-performing a sample of tests completed by internal audit. We will provide detailed feedback to the Head of Internal Audit at the end of our interim visit.

### Accounts production process

We raised no recommendations in our 2012/13 Report to Those Charged with Governance (ISA 260 Report) relating to the accounts production process. The Council has brought forward the accounts production process in order to have the statutory accounts approved by the Audit Committee on 15th July 2014. A detailed accounts close down plan has been developed by the Head of Financial Management in order to meet this deadline.

### Critical accounting matters

We will discuss the work completed to address the specific risks we identified at the planning stage. Wherever possible, we seek to review relevant workings and evidence and agree the accounting treatment as part of our interim work.

During June to August 2014 we will be on site for our substantive work.

We complete detailed testing of accounts and disclosures and conclude on critical accounting matters, such as specific risk areas. We then agree any audit adjustments required to the financial statements.

We also review the Annual Governance Statement for consistency with our understanding.

We will present our *ISA 260 Report to the Audit Committee* in July 2014.

Our final accounts visit on site has been provisionally scheduled for the period 9<sup>th</sup> June to the 10<sup>th</sup> July. During this time, we will complete the following work:

### Substantive Procedures

- Plan and perform substantive audit procedures.
- Conclude on critical accounting matters.
- Identify and assess any audit adjustments.
- Review the Annual Governance Statement.

### Substantive audit procedures

We complete detailed testing on significant balances and disclosures. The extent of our work is determined by the Engagement Lead based on various factors such as our overall assessment of the Authority's control environment, the effectiveness of controls over individual systems and the management of specific risk factors.

### Critical accounting matters

We conclude our testing of key risk areas identified at the planning stage and any additional issues that may have emerged since.

We will discuss our early findings of the Authority's approach to address the key risk areas with the Head of Financial Management in June and July 2014, prior to reporting to the Audit Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> July 2014.

### Audit adjustments

During our on site work, we will meet with the Head of Financial Management on a weekly basis to discuss the progress of the audit, any differences found and any other issues emerging.

At the end of our on site work, we will hold a closure meeting, where we will provide a schedule of audit differences and agree a timetable for the completion stage and the accounts sign off.

To comply with auditing standards, we are required to report uncorrected audit differences to the Audit Committee. We also report any material misstatements which have been corrected and which we believe should be communicated to you to help you meet your governance responsibilities.

### Annual Governance Statement

We are also required to satisfy ourselves that your Annual Governance Statement complies with the applicable framework and is consistent with our understanding of your operations. Our review of the work of internal audit and consideration of your risk management and governance arrangements are key to this.

We report the findings of our final accounts work in our *ISA 260 Report*, which we will issue in July 2014.

**In addition to the financial statements, we also audit the Authority's Whole of Government Accounts pack.**

**We may need to undertake additional work if we receive objections to the accounts from local electors.**

**We will communicate with you throughout the year, both formally and informally.**

### Whole of government accounts (WGA)

We are required to review and issue an opinion on your WGA consolidation to confirm that this is consistent with your financial statements. The audit approach has been agreed with HM Treasury and the National Audit Office. Deadlines for production of the pack and issue of our opinion on the pack have not yet been confirmed.

### Elector challenge

The Audit Commission Act 1998 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 Audit Commission's fee scales.

### 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 deliverables are included on page 19.

### Independence and objectivity confirmation

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 Standard 1 Integrity, Objectivity and Independence requires 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 which, 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.

Appendix 1 provides further detail on auditors' responsibilities regarding independence and objectivity.

### Confirmation statement

We confirm that as of 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2014 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.

**In this section we set out our assessment of the significant risks to the audit of the Authority's financial statements for 2013/14.**

**We have identified one significant risk at this stage.**

**We have also identified two areas of audit focus.**

**For each significant risk and area of audit focus we have outlined the impact on our audit plan.**

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*. These risks are:


- 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.

Our initial assessment has identified one risk that is specific to the Authority relating to the local government pension scheme triennial valuation.


The table on the following pages sets out the significant risks and areas of audit focus we have identified through our planning work that are specific to the audit of the Authority's financial statements for 2013/14.

We will revisit our assessment throughout the year and should any risks present themselves we will adjust our audit strategy as necessary.


For each significant risk and area of audit focus we have outlined the impact on our audit plan.

Key audit risks	Impact on audit
 <p><b>Audit areas affected</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Pensions Liability</li> <li>■ Actuarial gains or losses</li> </ul>	<p><b>Risk</b></p> <p>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 2013 in line with the Local Government Pension Scheme (Administration) Regulations 2008. 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.</p> <p>The IAS 19 numbers to be included in the financial statements for 2013/14 will be based on the output of the triennial valuation rolled forward to 31 March 2014. For 2014/15 and 2015/16 the actuary will then roll forward the valuation for accounting purposes based on more limited data.</p> <p>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 Council who administer the Pension Fund.</p> <p><b>Our audit work</b></p> <p>As part of our audit, we will need to agree the data provided to the actuary back to the systems and reports from which it was derived, and test the accuracy of this data.</p> <p>We will 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. The Pension Fund may seek to recharge any additional costs arising from this work.</p>

For each significant risk and area of audit focus we have outlined the impact on our audit plan.

Area of Audit focus	Impact on audit
 <p><b>Audit areas affected</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Reserves and balances</li> <li>■ Provisions</li> <li>■ VFM</li> </ul>	<p><b>Risk</b></p> <p>As at December 2013, the Authority is forecasting that it will deliver its 2013/14 budget in overall terms.</p> <p>The Authority has identified another £9.7million in savings to be achieved during 2014/15 to address the further reductions to local authority funding. The proposals for these savings were consulted on and approved at council on 19<sup>th</sup> February 2014. The Council has begun working on the approach for a further £16million of savings in 2015/16. These savings are to be made against a backdrop of continued demand pressures across the Authority, and therefore it will become more and more difficult to deliver these savings in a way that secures longer term financial and operational sustainability.</p> <p>If there are any related liabilities at year end, these will need to be accounted for in the 2013/14 financial statements as appropriate.</p> <p><b>Our audit work</b></p> <p>In conjunction with our VFM work we will critically assess the controls the Authority has in place to ensure a sound financial standing, specifically that its Medium Term Financial Plan has duly taken into consideration the potential funding reductions and that it is sufficiently robust to ensure that the Authority can continue to provide services effectively. We will also review how the Authority is planning and managing its savings plans.</p> <p>As part of our final accounts audit we will review the Authority's assessment of any potential liabilities arising from its savings plans against the Code. If applicable, we will review the Authority's provisions, including the methodology, assumptions and calculations.</p>

For each significant risk and area of audit focus we have outlined the impact on our audit plan.

Area of Audit focus	Impact on audit
	<p><b>Risk</b></p> <p>The Council has brought forward the close down of the accounts in order to have the statutory accounts approved by the Audit Committee on 15th July 2014. As a result the timing of our audit has been brought forward by 3 weeks.</p> <p>The early close down of accounts increases the time pressure on staff and therefore may lead to increased errors and the potential need to include more estimates in the production of final accounts such as accruals and pension balances. The Authority has developed a detailed plan for early close down which include strict deadlines for completion of working papers in order for staff to meet the final deadlines.</p> <p><b>Our audit work</b></p> <p>Our standard audit procedures are designed to identify material misstatements in the accounts. We will place an increased focus on cut-off to ensure that items are included in the correct period. As part of our final accounts audit we will also review the methodology the methodology, assumptions and calculations of all estimates included in the final accounts.</p>



Our approach to VFM work follows guidance provided by the Audit Commission.

### Background to approach to VFM work

In meeting their statutory responsibilities relating to economy, efficiency and effectiveness, the Commission's *Code of Audit Practice* requires auditors to:

- plan their work based on consideration of the significant risks of giving a wrong conclusion (audit risk); and
- carry out only as much work as is appropriate to enable them to give a safe VFM conclusion.

To provide stability for auditors and audited bodies, the Audit Commission has kept the VFM audit methodology unchanged from last year. There are only relatively minor amendments to reflect the key issues facing the local government sector.


The approach is structured under two themes, as summarised below.

Specified criteria for VFM conclusion	Focus of the criteria	Sub-sections
The organisation has proper arrangements in place for securing <b>financial resilience</b> .	The organisation has robust systems and processes to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ manage effectively financial risks and opportunities; and</li> <li>■ secure a stable financial position that enables it to continue to operate for the foreseeable future.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Financial governance</li> <li>■ Financial planning</li> <li>■ Financial control</li> </ul>
The organisation has proper arrangements for challenging how it <b>secures economy, efficiency and effectiveness</b> .	The organisation is prioritising its resources within tighter budgets, for example by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ achieving cost reductions; and</li> <li>■ improving efficiency and productivity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Prioritising resources</li> <li>■ Improving efficiency and productivity</li> </ul>

We will follow a risk based approach to target audit effort on the areas of greatest audit risk.

### Overview of the VFM audit approach

The key elements of the VFM audit approach are summarised below.



Each of these stages are summarised further below.

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"> <li>the Authority's own assessment of the risks it faces, and its arrangements to manage and address its risks;</li> <li>information from the Audit Commission's VFM profile tool and financial ratios tool;</li> <li>evidence gained from previous audit work, including the response to that work; and</li> <li>the work of other inspectorates and review agencies.</li> </ul>

Our VFM audit will draw heavily on other audit work which is relevant to our VFM responsibilities and the results of last year's VFM audit.

We will then form an assessment of residual audit risk to identify if there are any areas where more detailed VFM audit work is required.

VFM audit stage	Audit approach
<b>Linkages with financial statements and other audit work</b>	<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>
<b>Assessment of residual audit risk</b>	<p>It is possible that further audit work may be necessary in some areas to ensure sufficient coverage of the two VFM criteria.</p> <p>Such work may involve interviews with relevant officers and /or the review of documents such as policies, plans and minutes. We may also refer to any self assessment the Authority may prepare against the characteristics.</p> <p>To inform any further work we must draw together an assessment of residual audit risk, taking account of the work undertaken already. This will identify those areas requiring further specific audit work to inform the VFM conclusion.</p> <p>At this stage it is not possible to indicate the number or type of residual audit risks that might require additional audit work, and therefore the overall scale of work cannot be easily predicted. If a significant amount of work is necessary then we will need to review the adequacy of our agreed audit fee.</p>
<b>Identification of specific VFM audit work</b>	<p>If we identify residual audit 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"> <li>■ considering the results of work by the Authority, inspectorates and other review agencies; and</li> <li>■ 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.</li> </ul>

Where relevant, we may draw upon the range of audit tools and review guides developed by the Audit Commission.

We will conclude on the results of the VFM audit through our ISA 260 Report.

VFM audit stage	Audit approach
<p><b>Delivery of local risk based work</b></p>	<p>Depending on the nature of the residual audit risk identified, we may be able to draw on audit tools and sources of guidance when undertaking specific local risk-based audit work, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ local savings review guides based on selected previous Audit Commission national studies; and</li> <li>■ update briefings for previous Audit Commission studies.</li> </ul> <p>The tools and guides will support our work where we have identified a local risk that is relevant to them. For any residual audit risks that relate to issues not covered by one of these tools, we will develop an appropriate audit approach drawing on the detailed VFM guidance and other sources of information.</p>
<p><b>Concluding on VFM arrangements</b></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><b>Reporting</b></p>	<p>We will report on the results of the VFM audit through our <i>ISA 260 Report</i>. This will summarise any specific matters arising, and the basis for our overall conclusion.</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>

Your audit team has been drawn from our specialist public sector assurance department. Jillian Burrows has returned as the Senior Manager and the Assistant Manager this year is Adam Langan. Adam has worked on the Bury MBC Audit for the past 3 years.

Contact details are shown on page 1.

The audit team will be assisted by other KPMG specialists as necessary.



Trevor Rees  
Partner

“My role is to lead our team and ensure the delivery of a high quality, valued added external audit opinion.

I will be the main point of contact for the Audit Committee and Chief Executive.”



Jillian Burrows  
Senior Manager

“I provide quality assurance for the audit work and specifically any technical accounting and risk areas.

I will work closely with the Partner to ensure we add value.

I will liaise with the Director of Finance and other Executive Directors.”



Adam Langan  
Assistant Manager

“I am responsible for the management, review and delivery of the audit.

I will liaise with the Head of Finance and Head of Internal Audit.”



## Section six Audit deliverables

At the end of each stage of our audit we issue certain deliverables, including reports and opinions.

Our key deliverables will be delivered to a high standard and on time.

We will discuss and agree as appropriate each report with the Authority's officers prior to publication.

Deliverable	Purpose	Committee dates
<b>Planning</b>		
<b>External Audit Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Outlines our audit approach.</li> <li>■ Identifies areas of audit focus and planned procedures.</li> </ul>	<b>March 2014</b>
<b>Control evaluation and Substantive procedures</b>		
<b>Report to Those Charged with Governance (ISA 260 Report)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Details control and process issues.</li> <li>■ Details the resolution of key audit issues.</li> <li>■ Communicates adjusted and unadjusted audit differences.</li> <li>■ Highlights performance improvement recommendations identified during our audit.</li> <li>■ Comments on the Authority's value for money arrangements.</li> </ul>	<b>July 2014</b>
<b>Completion</b>		
<b>Auditor's Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Provides an opinion on your accounts (including the Annual Governance Statement).</li> <li>■ Concludes on the arrangements in place for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in your use of resources (the VFM conclusion).</li> </ul>	<b>July 2014</b>
<b>Whole of Government Accounts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Provide our opinion on the Authority's WGA pack submission.</li> </ul>	<b>August 2014</b>
<b>Annual Audit Letter</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Summarises the outcomes and the key issues arising from our audit work for the year.</li> </ul>	<b>September 2014</b>

We will be in continuous dialogue with you throughout the audit.


Key formal interactions with the Audit Committee are:

- February – External Audit Plan;
- July – ISA 260 Report;
- December – Annual Audit Letter.

We work with the finance team and internal audit throughout the year.

Our main work on site will be our:

- Interim audit visits during February and March.
- Final accounts audit during June - July.



Key: ● Audit Committee meetings.



The fee for the 2013/14 audit of the Authority is £154,170. The fee has not changed from that set out in our *Audit Fee Letter 2013/14* issued in April 2013.

Our audit fee remains indicative and based on you meeting our expectations of your support.

Meeting these expectations will help the delivery of our audit within the proposed audit fee.

#### Audit fee

Our *Audit Fee Letter 2013/14* presented to you in April 2013 first set out our fees for the 2013/14 audit. We have not considered it necessary to make any changes to the agreed fees at this stage.

Our audit fee includes our work on the VFM conclusion and our audit of the Authority's financial statements.

The planned audit fee for 2013/14 is £154,170. This is in line with the final 2012/13 audit fee.

#### Audit fee assumptions

The fee is based on a number of assumptions, including that you will provide us with complete and materially accurate financial statements, with good quality supporting working papers, within agreed timeframes. It is imperative that you achieve this. If this is not the case and we have to complete more work than was envisaged, we will need to charge additional fees for this work. In setting the fee, we have assumed:

- the level of risk in relation to the audit of the financial statements is not significantly different from that identified for 2012/13;
- you will inform us of any significant developments impacting on our audit;
- you will identify and implement any changes required under the *CIPFA Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the UK 2013/14* within your 2013/14 financial statements;
- you will comply with the expectations set out in our *Accounts Audit Protocol*, including:
  - the financial statements are made available for audit in line with the agreed timescales;
  - good quality working papers and records will be provided at the start of the final accounts audit;

- requested information will be provided within the agreed timescales;
- prompt responses will be provided to queries and draft reports;
- internal audit meets appropriate professional standards;
- internal audit adheres to our joint working protocol and completes appropriate work on all systems that provide material figures for the financial statements and we can place reliance on them for our audit; and
- additional work will not be required to address questions or objections raised by local government electors or for special investigations such as those arising from disclosures under the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998.

Meeting these expectations will help ensure the delivery of our audit within the agreed audit fee.

The Audit Commission requires us to inform you of specific actions you could take to keep the audit fee low. Future audit fees can be kept to a minimum if the Authority achieves an efficient and well-controlled financial closedown and accounts production process which complies with good practice and appropriately addresses new accounting developments and risk areas.

#### Changes to the audit plan


Changes to this plan and the audit fee may be necessary if:

- new significant audit risks emerge;
- additional work is required of us by the Audit Commission or other regulators; and
- additional work is required as a result of changes in legislation, professional standards or financial reporting requirements.

If changes to this plan and the audit fee are required, we will discuss and agree these initially with the Assistant Director of Resources.

# Appendix 1: Balance of internal controls and substantive testing

This appendix illustrates how we determine the most effective balance of internal controls and substantive audit testing.



**This appendix summarises auditors' responsibilities regarding independence and objectivity.**

**Independence and objectivity**

Auditors are required by the Code to:

- carry out their work with independence and objectivity;
- exercise their professional judgement and act independently of both the Commission and the audited body;
- maintain an objective attitude at all times and not act in any way that might give rise to, or be perceived to give rise to, a conflict of interest; and
- resist any improper attempt to influence their judgement in the conduct of the audit.

In addition, the Code specifies that auditors should not carry out work for an audited body that does not relate directly to the discharge of the auditors' functions under the Code. If the Authority invites us to carry out risk-based work in a particular area, which cannot otherwise be justified to support our audit conclusions, it will be clearly differentiated as work carried out under section 35 of the Audit Commission Act 1998.

The Code also states that the Commission issues guidance under its powers to appoint auditors and to determine their terms of appointment. The Standing Guidance for Auditors 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 Commission-related work, and senior members of their audit teams 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.
- Firms are expected to comply with the requirements of the Commission's protocols on provision of personal financial or tax advice to certain senior individuals at audited bodies, independence considerations in relation to procurement of services at audited bodies, and area wide internal audit work.
- Auditors appointed by the Commission should not accept engagements which involve commenting on the performance of other Commission auditors on Commission work without first consulting the Commission.
- Auditors are expected to comply with the Commission's policy for the Engagement Lead to be changed on a periodic basis.
- Audit suppliers are required to obtain the Commission'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 standing guidance.

**We continually focus on delivering a high quality audit.**

**This means building robust quality control procedures into the core audit process rather than bolting them on at the end, and embedding the right attitude and approaches into management and staff.**

**KPMG’s Audit Quality Framework consists of seven key drivers combined with the commitment of each individual in KPMG.**

**The diagram summarises our approach and each level is expanded upon.**

At KPMG we consider audit quality is not just about reaching the right opinion, but how we reach that opinion. KPMG views the outcome of a quality audit as the delivery of an appropriate and independent opinion in compliance with the auditing standards. It is about the processes, thought and integrity behind the audit report. This means, above all, being independent, compliant with our legal and professional requirements, and offering insight and impartial advice to you, our client.

KPMG’s Audit Quality Framework consists of seven key drivers combined with the commitment of each individual in KPMG. We use our seven drivers of audit quality to articulate what audit quality means to KPMG.


We believe it is important to be transparent about the processes that sit behind a KPMG audit report, so you can have absolute confidence in us and in the quality of our audit.

**Tone at the top:** We make it clear that audit quality is part of our culture and values and therefore non-negotiable. Tone at the top is the umbrella that covers all the drivers of quality through a focused and consistent voice. Trevor Rees as the Engagement Lead sets the tone on the audit and leads by example with a clearly articulated audit strategy and commits a significant proportion of his time throughout the audit directing and supporting the team.

**Association with right clients:** We undertake rigorous client and engagement acceptance and continuance procedures which are vital to the ability of KPMG to provide high-quality professional services to our clients.

**Clear standards and robust audit tools:** We expect our audit professionals to adhere to the clear standards we set and we provide a range of tools to support them in meeting these expectations. The global rollout of KPMG’s eAudit application has significantly enhanced

existing audit functionality. eAudit enables KPMG to deliver a highly technically enabled audit. All of our staff have a searchable data base, Accounting Research Online, that includes all published accounting standards, the KPMG Audit Manual Guidance as well as other relevant sector specific publications, such as the Audit Commission’s *Code of Audit Practice*.



**Recruitment, development and assignment of appropriately qualified personnel:** One of the key drivers of audit quality is assigning professionals appropriate to the Authority’s risks. We take care to assign the right people to the right clients based on a number of factors including their skill set, capacity and relevance experience.

We have a well developed technical infrastructure across the firm that puts us in a strong position to deal with any emerging issues. This includes:

- A national public sector technical director who has responsibility for co-ordinating our response to emerging accounting issues, influencing accounting bodies (such as CIPFA) as well as acting as a sounding board for our auditors.

- A national technical network of public sector audit professionals is established that meets on a monthly basis and is chaired by our national technical director.

- A dedicated Department of Professional Practice comprised of over 100 staff that provide support to our audit teams and deliver our web-based quarterly technical training.

**We continually focus on delivering a high quality audit.**

**This means building robust quality control procedures into the core audit process rather than bolting them on at the end, and embedding the right attitude and approaches into management and staff.**

**Quality must build on the foundations of well trained staff and a robust methodology.**

**Commitment to technical excellence and quality service delivery:** Our professionals bring you up-to-the-minute and accurate technical solutions and together with our specialists are capable of solving complex audit issues and delivering valued insights.

Our audit team draws upon specialist resources including Forensic, Corporate Finance, Transaction Services, Advisory, Taxation, Actuarial and IT. We promote technical excellence and quality service delivery through training and accreditation, developing business understanding and sector knowledge, investment in technical support, development of specialist networks and effective consultation processes.

**Performance of effective and efficient audits:** We understand that how an audit is conducted is as important as the final result. Our drivers of audit quality maximise the performance of the engagement team during the conduct of every audit. We expect our people to demonstrate certain key behaviours in the performance of effective and efficient audits. The key behaviours that our auditors apply throughout the audit process to deliver effective and efficient audits are outlined below:

- timely Engagement Lead and manager involvement;
- critical assessment of audit evidence;
- exercise of professional judgment and professional scepticism;
- ongoing mentoring and on the job coaching, supervision and review;
- appropriately supported and documented conclusions;
- if relevant, appropriate involvement of the Engagement Quality Control reviewer (EQC review);
- clear reporting of significant findings;
- insightful, open and honest two-way communication with those charged with governance; and
- client confidentiality, information security and data privacy.

**Commitment to continuous improvement:** We employ a broad range of mechanisms to monitor our performance, respond to feedback and understand our opportunities for improvement.

#### **Our quality review results**

We are able to evidence the quality of our audits through the results of National Audit Office and Audit Commission reviews. The Audit Commission publishes information on the quality of work provided by KPMG (and all other firms) for audits undertaken on behalf of them (<http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/audit-regime/audit-quality-review-programme/principal-audits/kpmg-audit-quality>).

The latest Annual Regulatory Compliance and Quality Report (issued June 2013) showed that we performed highly against the Audit Commission's criteria. We were one of only two firms to receive a combined audit quality and regulatory compliance rating of green for 2012/13.

When we determine our audit strategy we set a monetary materiality level for planning purposes.


For 2013/14 we have set this at £10.789 million.

We will report all audit differences over £538 thousand to the Audit Committee.

### Materiality

The assessment of what is material is a matter of professional judgment and includes consideration of three aspects: materiality by value, nature and context.

- Material errors by value are those which are simply of significant numerical size to distort the reader's perception of the financial statements. Our assessment of the threshold for this depends upon the size of key figures in the financial statements, as well as other factors such as the level of public interest in the financial statements.
- Errors which are material by nature may not be large in value, but may concern accounting disclosures of key importance and sensitivity, for example the salaries of senior staff.
- Errors that are material by context are those that would alter key figures in the financial statements from one result to another – for example, errors that change successful performance against a target to failure.



Materiality for planning purposes has been set at £10.789 million for the Authority's standalone accounts, and for the group accounts, which [in both cases] equates to around 2 percent of gross revenues.

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

Under ISA 260, we are obliged to report omissions or misstatements other than those which are 'clearly trivial' to those charged with governance. ISA 260 defines 'clearly trivial' as matters that are clearly inconsequential, whether taken individually or in aggregate and whether judged by any quantitative or qualitative criteria.

ISA 450 requires us to request that uncorrected misstatements are corrected.

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 £538 thousand.

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.



*cutting through complexity™*

© 2014 KPMG LLP, a UK limited liability partnership, is a subsidiary of KPMG Europe LLP 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.

The KPMG name, logo and 'cutting through complexity' are registered trademarks or trademarks of KPMG International Cooperative (KPMG International).