

External Audit Plan

Southwark Council

Year ending 31 March 2022

18 July 2022



Contents



Your key Grant Thornton team members are:

Ciaran McLaughlin

Key Audit Partner

T: +44 (0)20 7728 2936

E: Ciaran.T.McLaughlin@uk.gt.com

Matt Dean

Senior Manager

T: +44 (0)20 7728 3181

E: Matt.Dean@uk.gt.com

Ibby Oluwasegun

Manager

T: +44 (0)20 7728 3116

E: Ibukun.O.Oluwasegun@uk.gt.com

Section

| | |
|--|--|
| Key matters | |
| Introduction and headlines | |
| Significant risks identified | |
| Other risks identified | |
| Accounting estimates and related disclosures | |
| Other matters | |
| Materiality | |
| IT Audit Strategy | |
| Value for Money Arrangements | |
| Risks of significant VFM weaknesses | |
| Audit logistics and team | |
| Audit fees | |
| Independence and non-audit services | |
| Digital Audit | |

Page

| |
|----|
| 3 |
| 4 |
| 5 |
| 8 |
| 9 |
| 12 |
| 13 |
| 14 |
| 15 |
| 16 |
| 17 |
| 18 |
| 19 |
| 21 |

The contents of this report relate only to the matters which have come to our attention, which we believe need to be reported to you as part of our audit planning process. It is not a comprehensive record of all the relevant matters, which may be subject to change, and in particular we cannot be held responsible to you for reporting all of the risks which may affect the Council or all weaknesses in your internal controls. This report has been prepared solely for your benefit and should not be quoted in whole or in part without our prior written consent. We do not accept any responsibility for any loss occasioned to any third party acting, or refraining from acting on the basis of the content of this report, as this report was not prepared for, nor intended for, any other purpose.

Grant Thornton UK LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales: No.OC307742. Registered office: 30 Finsbury Square, London, EC2A 1AG. A list of members is available from our registered office. Grant Thornton UK LLP is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority. Grant Thornton UK LLP is a member firm of Grant Thornton International Ltd (GTIL). GTIL and the member firms are not a worldwide partnership. Services are delivered by the member firms. GTIL and its member firms are not agents of, and do not obligate, one another and are not liable for one another's acts or omissions.

Key matters

Factors

Canada Water Development

In 2018 the Council signed an agreement with British Land for the redevelopment of Canada Water under the Canada Water Master Development Agreement (MDA). In May 2020 planning consent for the MDA was granted, and following the dismissal of a claim for Judicial Review in November 2020 the scheme has since commenced. The headlease combines the Council's Land with the assets held by British Land to facilitate the MDA. At each stage of the MDA the Council has a range of options available to it in terms of investment, which will need to be managed carefully as the MDA progresses.

Change in Management

During the course of 2022, the Council's long-service Chief Executive, Eleanor Kelly, retired, to be replaced by Althea Loderick, who joined the Council from the London Borough of Newham. We will look to liaise closely with Althea to understand her plans for the Council and how this may shape how the Council operates moving forward.

Infrastructure Assets

Since the start of 2022, issues have been raised over the valuation of Infrastructure Assets included within all Local Authorities Accounts, particularly relating to how assets are written out when they reach the end of their useful life and are replaced. Whilst most Local Authorities, including Southwark, have a policy for depreciating these assets over their useful life, there is often no policy on the formal write out of these assets at the end of that useful life. What this leads to is an overstatement of the gross book value of these assets in the Accounts, which could potentially have an impact on our audit opinions where material. As a result of these challenges, CIPFA has launched a consultation on potential changes to the Code to simplify the reporting requirements in this area to help reduce the risk of potential qualifications to audit opinions. This consultation is currently reaching a conclusion and we are hopeful that some updated guidance will be issued to allow us to both bring the 2020-21 Audit to a close along with considering the issue for the 2021-22 Accounts.

Our response

- We will review the accounting for the Council's involvement in the MDA during this year's Accounts Audit and ensure that adequate disclosures are provided.
- We will also consider the decision making around the Council's involvement as part of our Value for Money work.
- We will liaise with the Chief Executive as part of our routine audit liaison.
- We will monitor the progress of the CIPFA consultation and the potential impacts on the 2020-21 and 2021-22 Accounts. We will also look to work with Management to understand these impacts and ensure these are correctly reflected in the final Accounts.

Introduction and headlines

Purpose

This document provides an overview of the planned scope and timing of the statutory audit of Southwark Council ('the Council') for those charged with governance.

Respective responsibilities

The National Audit Office ('the NAO') has issued a document entitled Code of Audit Practice ('the Code'). This summarises where the responsibilities of auditors begin and end and what is expected from the audited body. Our respective responsibilities are also set out in the agreed in the Terms of Appointment and Statement of Responsibilities issued by Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA), the body responsible for appointing us as auditor of Southwark Council. We draw your attention to both of these documents.

Scope of our audit

The scope of our audit is set in accordance with the Code and International Standards on Auditing (ISAs) (UK). We are responsible for forming and expressing an opinion on the Council [and group]'s financial statements that have been prepared by management with the oversight of those charged with governance (the Audit, Governance and Standards Committee); and we consider whether there are sufficient arrangements in place at the Council for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in your use of resources. Value for money relates to ensuring that resources are used efficiently to maximise the outcomes that can be achieved.

The audit of the financial statements does not relieve management or the Audit, Governance and Standards Committee of your responsibilities. It is the responsibility of the Council to ensure that proper arrangements are in place for the conduct of its business, and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for. We have considered how the Council is fulfilling these responsibilities.

Our audit approach is based on a thorough understanding of the Council's business and is risk based.

Significant risks

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

- The revenue cycle includes fraudulent transactions – this risk has been rebutted as documented on page 5
- The expenditure cycle includes fraudulent transactions – this risk has been rebutted as documented on page 5
- Management over-ride of controls
- Valuation of Land and Buildings
- Valuation of the Pension Fund Net Liability
- Valuation of Investment Properties

We will communicate significant findings on these areas as well as any other significant matters arising from the audit to you in our Audit Findings (ISA 260) Report.

Materiality

We have determined planning materiality to be £17.9m (PY £18m) for the Council, which equates to approximately 1.4% of your prior year gross expenditure for the year. We are obliged to report uncorrected omissions or misstatements other than those which are 'clearly trivial' to those charged with governance. Clearly trivial has been set at £900k (PY £900k).

Value for Money arrangements

Our risk assessment regarding your arrangements to secure value for money have identified the following area of focus for our value for money assessment

- Delivery of the planned financial performance in 2020-21, along with the future plans of the Council in 2021-22 and beyond
- Managing the continued impact of Covid-19 on the Council's Service Delivery and Governance Arrangements
- What arrangements the Council is looking to implement post Pandemic to build on some of the changes which have taken place over the course of the past 18 months

Audit logistics

Our interim visit took place in April 2022 and our final visit will take place between September and November 2022. Our key deliverables are this Audit Plan, our Audit Findings Report and Auditor's Annual Report.

Our fee for the audit will be £252,718 (PY: £257,718] for the Council, subject to the Council delivering a good set of financial statements and working papers.

We have complied with the Financial Reporting Council's Ethical Standard (revised 2019) and we as a firm, and each covered person, confirm that we are independent and are able to express an objective opinion on the financial statements.

Significant risks identified

Significant risks are defined by ISAs (UK) as risks that, in the judgement of the auditor, require special audit consideration. In identifying risks, audit teams consider the nature of the risk, the potential magnitude of misstatement, and its likelihood. Significant risks are those risks that have a higher risk of material misstatement.

| Risk | Reason for risk identification | Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk |
|---|---|--|
| The revenue cycle includes fraudulent transactions (rebutted) | <p>Under ISA (UK) 240 there is a rebuttable presumed risk that revenue may be misstated due to the improper recognition of revenue. This presumption can be rebutted if the auditor concludes that there is no risk of material misstatement due to fraud relating to revenue recognition.</p> <p>Having considered the risk factors set out in ISA240 and the nature of the revenue streams at the Authority, we have determined that the risk of fraud arising from revenue recognition can be rebutted, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is little incentive to manipulate revenue recognition • opportunities to manipulate revenue recognition are very limited • the culture and ethical frameworks of local authorities, including Southwark Council, mean that all forms of fraud are seen as unacceptable <p>Therefore we do not consider this to be a significant risk for Southwark Council.</p> | |
| The expenditure cycle includes fraudulent transactions (rebutted) | <p>Practice Note 10 suggests that the risk of material misstatement due to fraudulent financial reporting that may arise from the manipulation of expenditure recognition needs to be considered, especially if an entity is required to meet financial targets.</p> <p>Having considered the risk factors relevant to the Authority, we have determined that no separate significant risk relating to expenditure recognition is necessary, as the same rebuttal factors listed above relating to revenue recognition apply. We consider that the risk relating to expenditure recognition would relate primarily to period-end journals and accruals which are considered as part of the standard audit tests mentioned and our testing in relation to the significant risk of Management Over-ride of Controls as mentioned on page 6.</p> | <p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • obtain an understanding of the design effectiveness of controls relating to operating expenditure. • perform testing over post-year end transactions to assess completeness of expenditure recognition. • test a sample of operating expenditure to gain assurance in respect of the accuracy of expenditure recorded during the financial year. |

Significant risks identified

Significant risks are defined by ISAs (UK) as risks that, in the judgement of the auditor, require special audit consideration. In identifying risks, audit teams consider the nature of the risk, the potential magnitude of misstatement, and its likelihood. Significant risks are those risks that have a higher risk of material misstatement.

| Risk | Reason for risk identification | Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk |
|---|---|---|
| Management over-ride of controls | <p>Under ISA (UK) 240 there is a non-rebuttable presumed risk that the risk of management over-ride of controls is present in all entities.</p> <p>We therefore identified management override of control, in particular journals, management estimates and transactions outside the course of business as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement.</p> | <p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluate the design effectiveness of management controls over journals • analyse the journals listing and determine the criteria for selecting high risk unusual journals • test unusual journals made during the year and after the draft accounts stage for appropriateness and corroboration • gain an understanding of the accounting estimates and critical judgements applied made by management and consider their reasonableness • evaluate the rationale for any changes in accounting policies, estimates or significant unusual transactions. |
| Valuation of Land and Buildings | <p>The Authority revalues its land and buildings on a rolling five-yearly basis. This valuation represents a significant estimate by management in the financial statements due to the size of the numbers involved (£5.329 billion) and the sensitivity of this estimate to changes in key assumptions. Additionally, management will need to ensure the carrying value in the Authority financial statements is not materially different from the current value at the financial statements date, where a rolling programme is used.</p> <p>We therefore identified valuation of land and buildings, particularly revaluations and impairments, as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement.</p> | <p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluate management's processes and assumptions for the calculation of the estimate, the instructions issued to valuation experts and the scope of their work • evaluate the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the valuation expert • discuss with the valuer the basis on which the valuation was carried out • challenge the information and assumptions used by the valuer to assess completeness and consistency with our understanding. We will engage our own valuer to assess the instructions to the Authority's valuer, the Authority's valuer's report and the assumptions that underpin the valuation. • test revaluations made during the year to see if they had been input correctly into the Authority's asset register • evaluating the assumptions made by management for those assets not revalued during the year and how management has satisfied themselves that these are not materially different to current value at year end. |

Significant risks identified

Significant risks are defined by ISAs (UK) as risks that, in the judgement of the auditor, require special audit consideration. In identifying risks, audit teams consider the nature of the risk, the potential magnitude of misstatement, and its likelihood. Significant risks are those risks that have a higher risk of material misstatement.

| Risk | Reason for risk identification | Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk |
|---|--|---|
| Valuation of the Pension Fund Net Liability | <p>The Authority's pension fund net liability, as reflected in its balance sheet as the net defined benefit liability, represents a significant estimate in the financial statements.</p> <p>The pension fund net liability is considered a significant estimate due to the size of the numbers involved (£688 million in the Authority's balance sheet) and the sensitivity of the estimate to changes in key assumptions.</p> <p>We therefore identified valuation of the Authority's pension fund net liability as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement.</p> | <p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • update our understanding of the processes and controls put in place by management to ensure that the Authority's pension fund net liability is not materially misstated and evaluate the design of the associated controls; • evaluate the instructions issued by management to their management expert (an actuary) for this estimate and the scope of the actuary's work; • assess the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the actuary who carried out the Authority's pension fund valuation; • assess the accuracy and completeness of the information provided by the Authority to the actuary to estimate the liability; • test the consistency of the pension fund asset and liability and disclosures in the notes to the core financial statements with the actuarial report from the actuary; and • undertake procedures to confirm the reasonableness of the actuarial assumptions made by reviewing the report of the consulting actuary (as auditor's expert) and performing any additional procedures suggested within the report. |
| Valuation of Investment Properties | <p>The Authority revalues its Investment Properties on an annual basis to ensure that these assets are held at Fair Value at the financial statements date. This valuation represents a significant estimate by management in the financial statements due to the size of the numbers involved (£329 million) and the sensitivity of this estimate to changes in key assumptions.</p> <p>Management have engaged the services of a valuer to estimate the current value as at 31 March 2022.</p> <p>We therefore identified valuation of Investment Properties, particularly revaluations and impairments, as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement.</p> | <p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluate management's processes and assumptions for the calculation of the estimate, the instructions issued to the valuation experts and the scope of their work • evaluate the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the valuation expert • write to the valuer to confirm the basis on which the valuations were carried out • challenge the information and assumptions used by the valuer to assess completeness and consistency with our understanding, which will include engaging our own valuer to assess the instructions to the Authority's valuer, the Authority's valuer's report and the assumptions that underpin the valuation. • test, on a sample basis, revaluations made during the year to ensure they have been input correctly into the Authority's asset register • evaluate the assumptions made by management for any assets not revalued during the year and how management has satisfied themselves that these are not materially different to current value. |

Other risks identified

| Risk | Reason for risk identification | Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Value of Infrastructure assets and the presentation of the gross cost and accumulated depreciation in the PPE note</p> | <p>Infrastructure assets includes roads, highways, streetlighting and coastal assets. Each year the Council spends circa £31 million on Infrastructure capital additions. As at 31 March 2021, the net book value of infrastructure assets was £316 million which is over 17 times materiality.</p> <p>In accordance with the LG Code, Infrastructure assets are measured using the historical cost basis, and carried at depreciated historical cost. With respect to the financial statements, there are two risks which we plan to address</p> <p>The risk that the value of infrastructure assets is materially misstated as a result of applying an inappropriate Useful Economic Life (UEL) to components of infrastructure assets.</p> <p>The risk that the presentation of the PPE note is materially misstated insofar as the gross cost and accumulated depreciation of Infrastructure assets is overstated. It will be overstated if management do not derecognise components of Infrastructure when they are replaced.</p> <p>For the avoidance of any doubt, these two risks have not been assessed as a significant risk at this stage, but we have assessed that there is some risk of material misstatement that requires an audit response.</p> | <p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconcile the Fixed Asset Register to the Financial statements • Using our own point estimate, consider the reasonableness of depreciation charge to Infrastructure assets • Obtain assurance that the UEL applied to Infrastructure assets is reasonable • Document our understanding of management’s process for derecognising Infrastructure assets on replacement and obtain assurances that the disclosure in the PPE note is not materially misstated |

We will communicate significant findings on these areas as well as any other significant matters arising from the audit to you in our Audit Findings Report.

Accounting estimates and related disclosures

The Financial Reporting Council issued an updated ISA (UK) 540 (revised): *Auditing Accounting Estimates and Related Disclosures* which includes significant enhancements in respect of the audit risk assessment process for accounting estimates.

Introduction

Under ISA (UK) 540 (Revised December 2018) auditors are required to understand and assess an entity's internal controls over accounting estimates, including:

- The nature and extent of oversight and governance over management's financial reporting process relevant to accounting estimates;
- How management identifies the need for and applies specialised skills or knowledge related to accounting estimates;
- How the entity's risk management process identifies and addresses risks relating to accounting estimates;
- The entity's information system as it relates to accounting estimates;
- The entity's control activities in relation to accounting estimates; and
- How management reviews the outcomes of previous accounting estimates.

As part of this process auditors also need to obtain an understanding of the role of those charged with governance, which is particularly important where the estimates have high estimation uncertainty, or require significant judgement.

Specifically do Audit, Governance and Standards Committee members:

- Understand the characteristics of the methods and models used to make the accounting estimates and the risks related to them;
- Oversee management's process for making accounting estimates, including the use of models, and the monitoring activities undertaken by management; and
- Evaluate how management made the accounting estimates?



Accounting estimates and related disclosures

Additional information that will be required

To ensure our compliance with this revised auditing standard, we will be requesting further information from management and those charged with governance during our audit for the year ended 31 March 2022.

Based on our knowledge of the Council we have identified the following material accounting estimates for which this is likely to apply:

- Valuations of land and buildings, council dwellings, investment properties and infrastructure
- Depreciation
- Year end provisions and accruals, specifically for demand led services such as Adult's and Children's services
- Credit loss and impairment allowances
- Valuation of defined benefit net pension fund liabilities
- Fair value estimates
- Valuation of level 2 investments

The Council's Information systems

In respect of the Council's information systems we are required to consider how management identifies the methods, assumptions and source data used for each material accounting estimate and the need for any changes to these. This includes how management selects, or designs, the methods, assumptions and data to be used and applies the methods used in the valuations.

When the models used include increased complexity or subjectivity, as is the case for many valuation models, auditors need to understand and assess the controls in place over the models and the data included therein. Where adequate controls are not in place we may need to report this as a significant control deficiency and this could affect the amount of detailed substantive testing required during the audit.

If management has changed the method for making an accounting estimate we will need to fully understand management's rationale for this change. Any unexpected changes are likely to raise the audit risk profile of this accounting estimate and may result in the need for additional audit procedures.

We are aware that the Council uses management experts in deriving some of its more complex estimates, such as its asset valuations and pensions liabilities. However, it is important to note that the use of management experts does not diminish the responsibilities of management and those charged with governance to ensure that:

- All accounting estimates and related disclosures included in the financial statements have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the financial reporting framework, and are materially accurate;
- There are adequate controls in place at the Council (and where applicable its service provider or management expert) over the models, assumptions and source data used in the preparation of accounting estimates.



Estimation uncertainty

Under ISA (UK) 540 we are required to consider the following:

- How management understands the degree of estimation uncertainty related to each accounting estimate; and
- How management address this estimation uncertainty when selecting their point estimate.

For example, how management identified and considered alternative, methods, assumptions or source data that would be equally valid under the financial reporting framework, and why these alternatives were rejected in favour of the point estimate used.

The revised standard includes increased emphasis on the importance of the financial statement disclosures. Under ISA (UK) 540 (Revised December 2018), auditors are required to assess whether both the accounting estimates themselves and the related disclosures are reasonable.

Where there is a material uncertainty, that is where there is a significant risk of a material change to the estimated carrying value of an asset or liability within the next year, there needs to be additional disclosures. Note that not all material estimates will have a material uncertainty and it is also possible that an estimate that is not material could have a risk of material uncertainty.

Where there is material estimation uncertainty, we would expect the financial statement disclosures to detail:

- What the assumptions and uncertainties are;
- How sensitive the assets and liabilities are to those assumptions, and why;
- The expected resolution of the uncertainty and the range of reasonably possible outcomes for the next financial year; and
- An explanation of any changes made to past assumptions if the uncertainty is unresolved.

Planning enquiries

As part of our planning risk assessment procedures we have shared a questionnaire with Management to obtain their responses over these Accounting Estimates. This document is on the Committee Agenda for approval by Those Charged with Governance in advance of including on our audit file

Further information

Further details on the requirements of ISA (UK) 540 (Revised December 2018) can be found in the auditing standard on the Financial Reporting Council's website:

[https://www.frc.org.uk/getattachment/0fa69c03-49ec-49ae-a8c9-cc7a2b65382a/ISA-\(UK\)-540_Revised-December-2018_final.pdf](https://www.frc.org.uk/getattachment/0fa69c03-49ec-49ae-a8c9-cc7a2b65382a/ISA-(UK)-540_Revised-December-2018_final.pdf)

Other matters

Other work

In addition to our responsibilities under the Code of Practice, we have a number of other audit responsibilities, as follows:

- We read your Narrative Report and Annual Governance Statement to check that they are consistent with the financial statements on which we give an opinion and our knowledge of the Council.
- We carry out work to satisfy ourselves that disclosures made in your Annual Governance Statement are in line with requirements set by CIPFA.
- We carry out work on your consolidation schedules for the Whole of Government Accounts process in accordance with NAO group audit instructions.
- We consider our other duties under legislation and the Code, as and when required, including:
 - giving electors the opportunity to raise questions about your 2021/22 financial statements, consider and decide upon any objections received in relation to the 2021/22 financial statements;
 - issuing a report in the public interest or written recommendations to the Council under section 24 of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 (the Act).
 - application to the court for a declaration that an item of account is contrary to law under section 28 or a judicial review under section 31 of the Act
 - issuing an advisory notice under section 29 of the Act
- We certify completion of our audit.

Other material balances and transactions

Under International Standards on Auditing, "irrespective of the assessed risks of material misstatement, the auditor shall design and perform substantive procedures for each material class of transactions, account balance and disclosure". All other material balances and transaction streams will therefore be audited. However, the procedures will not be as extensive as the procedures adopted for the risks identified in this report.

Materiality

The concept of materiality

Materiality is fundamental to the preparation of the financial statements and the audit process and applies not only to the monetary misstatements but also to disclosure requirements and adherence to acceptable accounting practice and applicable law. Misstatements, including omissions, are considered to be material if they, individually or in the aggregate, could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements.

Materiality for planning purposes

We have determined financial statement materiality based on a proportion of the gross expenditure of the Council for the financial year. In the prior year we used the same benchmark. Materiality at the planning stage of our audit is £17.9 million (PY £18 million) for the Council, which equates to approximately 1.4% of your forecast gross expenditure for the year. We reconsider planning materiality if, during the course of our audit engagement, we become aware of facts and circumstances that would have caused us to make a different determination of planning materiality.


Matters we will report to the Audit Committee

Whilst our audit procedures are designed to identify misstatements which are material to our opinion on the financial statements as a whole, we nevertheless report to the Audit Committee any unadjusted misstatements of lesser amounts to the extent that these are identified by our audit work. Under ISA 260 (UK) ‘Communication with those charged with governance’, we are obliged to report uncorrected omissions or misstatements other than those which are ‘clearly trivial’ to those charged with governance. ISA 260 (UK) defines ‘clearly trivial’ as matters that are clearly inconsequential, whether taken individually or in aggregate and whether judged by any quantitative or qualitative criteria. In the context of the Council, we propose that an individual difference could normally be considered to be clearly trivial if it is less than £900k (PY £900k).

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, Governance and Standards Committee to assist it in fulfilling its governance responsibilities.


Prior year gross operating costs

£1,279 million
(PY: £1,269 million)



- Prior year gross operating costs
- Materiality

Materiality



IT Audit Strategy

In accordance with ISA (UK) 315, we are required to obtain an understanding of the information systems relevant to financial reporting to identify and assess the risks of material misstatement. As part of this we obtain an understanding of the controls operating over relevant Information Technology (IT) systems i.e., IT general controls (ITGCs). Our audit will include completing an assessment of the design of ITGCs related to security management; technology acquisition, development and maintenance; and technology infrastructure. Based on the level of assurance required for each IT system the assessment may focus on evaluating key risk areas ('streamlined assessment') or be more in depth ('detailed assessment').

The following IT systems have been judged to be in scope for our audit and based on the planned financial statement audit approach we will perform the indicated level of assessment:

| IT system | Audit area | Planned level IT audit assessment |
|--------------------------|----------------------|---|
| SAP (General Ledger) | Financial reporting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed ITGC assessment (design and operating effectiveness) |
| NEC (formerly Northgate) | Council Tax and NNDR | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed ITGC assessment (design and operating effectiveness) |

Value for Money arrangements

Approach to Value for Money work for 2021/22

The National Audit Office (NAO) issued updated guidance for auditors in April 2020. The Code requires auditors to consider whether the body has put in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources. When reporting on these arrangements, the Code requires auditors to structure their commentary on arrangements under three specified reporting criteria. These are as set out in the boxes on this page.



Improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness

Arrangements for improving the way the body delivers its services. This includes arrangements for understanding costs and delivering efficiencies and improving outcomes for service users.



Financial Sustainability

Arrangements for ensuring the body can continue to deliver services. This includes planning resources to ensure adequate finances and maintain sustainable levels of spending over the medium term (3-5 years)



Governance

Arrangements for ensuring that the body makes appropriate decisions in the right way. This includes arrangements for budget setting and management, risk management, and ensuring the body makes decisions based on appropriate information



Risks of significant VFM weaknesses

As part of our planning work, we considered whether there were any risks of significant weakness in the body's arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources that we needed to perform further procedures on. Whilst our planning assessment did not identify any significant weaknesses in arrangements at this stage, we have highlighted further key areas of focus which are listed below. We may need to make recommendations following the completion of our work. The potential different types of recommendations we could make are set out in the second table below.

Key areas of focus

Our Value for Money work will primarily focus on the aspects listed below, but may increase in scope as further work is performed:

- Delivery of the planned financial performance in 2021-22, along with the future plans of the Authority in 2022-23 and beyond.

Potential types of recommendations

A range of different recommendations could be made following the completion of work on risks of significant weakness, as follows:



Statutory recommendation

Written recommendations to the body under Section 24 (Schedule 7) of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014. A recommendation under schedule 7 requires the body to discuss and respond publicly to the report.



Key recommendation

The Code of Audit Practice requires that where auditors identify significant weaknesses in arrangements to secure value for money they should make recommendations setting out the actions that should be taken by the body. We have defined these recommendations as 'key recommendations'.



Improvement recommendation

These recommendations, if implemented should improve the arrangements in place at the body, but are not made as a result of identifying significant weaknesses in the body's arrangements

Audit logistics and team



Ciaran McLaughlin, Key Audit Partner

Ciaran will be the main point of contact for the Chief Executive, Section 151 Officer and Members. Ciaran will share his wealth of knowledge and experience across the sector providing challenge, sharing good practice, providing pragmatic solutions and acting as a sounding board with Members and the Audit, Governance and Standards Committee. Ciaran will ensure our audit is tailored specifically to you and is delivered efficiently. Ciaran will review all reports and the team's work.



Matt Dean, Audit Manager

Matt will work with the senior members of the finance team ensuring early delivery of testing and agreement of accounting issues on a timely basis. Matt will attend Audit, Governance and Standards Committees, undertake reviews of the team's work and draft reports ensuring they remain clear, concise and understandable to all. Matt will also work with Internal Audit to secure efficiencies and avoid any duplication across the audit.



Ibbby Oluwasegun, Assistant Manager

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

Audited body responsibilities

Where audited bodies do not deliver to the timetable agreed, we need to ensure that this does not impact on audit quality or absorb a disproportionate amount of time, thereby disadvantaging other audits. Where the elapsed time to complete an audit exceeds that agreed due to a client not meeting its obligations we will not be able to maintain a team on site. Similarly, where additional resources are needed to complete the audit due to a client not meeting their obligations we are not able to guarantee the delivery of the audit to the agreed timescales. In addition, delayed audits will incur additional audit fees.

Our requirements

To minimise the risk of a delayed audit, you need to ensure that you:

- produce draft financial statements of good quality by the agreed timetable you have agreed with us, including all notes, the Narrative Report and the Annual Governance Statement
- ensure that good quality working papers are available at the start of the audit, in accordance with the working paper requirements schedule that we have shared with you
- ensure that the agreed data reports are available to us at the start of the audit and are reconciled to the values in the accounts, in order to facilitate our selection of samples for testing
- ensure that all appropriate staff are available on site throughout (or as otherwise agreed) the planned period of the audit
- respond promptly and adequately to audit queries.

Audit fees

In 2018, PSAA awarded a contract of audit for Southwark Council to begin with effect from 2018/19. The fee agreed in the contract was £182,718. Since that time, there have been a number of developments, particularly in relation to the revised Code and ISA's which are relevant for the 2021/22 audit.

Across all sectors and firms, the FRC has set out its expectation of improved financial reporting from organisations and the need for auditors to demonstrate increased scepticism and challenge and to undertake additional and more robust testing, as detailed on page 9 in relation to the updated ISA (UK) 540 (revised): Auditing Accounting Estimates and Related Disclosures.

As a firm, we are absolutely committed to meeting the expectations of the FRC with regard to audit quality and public sector financial reporting. We have engaged an audit expert to improve the level of assurance we require for our work on the Council's property valuations estimates, which has been included in our proposed audit fee. Our proposed work and fee for 2021/22, as set out below, is detailed overleaf and has been agreed with the Strategic Director of Finance and Governance.

| | Actual Fee 2019/20 | Proposed Fee 2020/21 | Proposed fee 2021/22 |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Main Accounts Audit | £246,926 | £257,718 | £252,718 |
| Total audit fees (excluding VAT) | £246,926 | £257,718 | £252,718 |

Our fee for 2020/21 has yet to be finalised as we are still drawing to a close our work on this audit, and we will provide an update to Management and the Audit, Governance and Standards Committee once this fee has been finalised.

Assumptions

In setting the above fees, we have assumed that the Council will:

- prepare a good quality set of financial statements, supported by comprehensive and well presented working papers which are ready at the start of the audit
- provide appropriate analysis, support and evidence to support all critical judgements and significant judgements made during the course of preparing the financial statements
- provide early notice of proposed complex or unusual transactions which could have a material impact on the financial statements.

Relevant professional standards

In preparing our fee estimate, we have had regard to all relevant professional standards, including paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 of the FRC's [Ethical Standard \[revised 2019\]](#) which stipulate that the Engagement Lead (Key Audit Partner) must set a fee sufficient to enable the resourcing of the audit with partners and staff with appropriate time and skill to deliver an audit to the required professional and Ethical standards.

Independence and non-audit services

Auditor independence

Ethical Standards and ISA (UK) 260 require us to give you timely disclosure of all significant facts and matters that may bear upon the integrity, objectivity and independence of the firm or covered persons, relating to our independence. We encourage you to contact us to discuss these or any other independence issues with us. We will also discuss with you if we make additional significant judgements surrounding independence matters.

We confirm that there are no significant facts or matters that impact on our independence as auditors that we are required or wish to draw to your attention. We have complied with the Financial Reporting Council's Ethical Standard (Revised 2019) and we as a firm, and each covered person, confirm that we are independent and are able to express an objective opinion on the financial statements. Further, we have complied with the requirements of the National Audit Office's Auditor Guidance Note 01 issued in May 2020 which sets out supplementary guidance on ethical requirements for auditors of local public bodies.

We confirm that we have implemented policies and procedures to meet the requirements of the Ethical Standard. For the purposes of our audit we have made enquiries of all Grant Thornton UK LLP teams providing services to the Council.

Other services

The following other services provided by Grant Thornton were identified {set out in the table below}

The amounts detailed are fees agreed to-date for audit related and non-audit services to be undertaken by Grant Thornton UK LLP in the current financial year. These services are consistent with the Council's policy on the allotment of non-audit work to your auditors. Any changes and full details of all fees charged for audit related and non-audit related services by Grant Thornton UK LLP and by Grant Thornton International Limited network member Firms will be included in our Audit Findings report at the conclusion of the audit.

None of the services provided are subject to contingent fees.

| Service | Fees £ | Threats | Safeguards |
|---|--------|---|---|
| Audit related | | | |
| Certification of Housing Capital Receipts Grant | 8,000 | Self-Interest (because this is a recurring fee) | The level of this recurring fee taken on its own is not considered a significant threat to independence as the fee for this work is £8,000 in comparison to the total fee for the audit of £252,718 and in particular relative to Grant Thornton UK LLP's turnover overall. Further, it is a fixed fee and there is no contingent element to it. These factors all mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level. |
| Certification of the Teachers Pensions Return | 10,000 | Self-Interest (because this is a recurring fee) | The level of this recurring fee taken on its own is not considered a significant threat to independence as the fee for this work is £10,000 in comparison to the total fee for the audit of £252,718 and in particular relative to Grant Thornton UK LLP's turnover overall. Further, it is a fixed fee and there is no contingent element to it. These factors all mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level. |


Independence and non-audit services (cont.)

| Service | Fees £ | Threats | Safeguards |
|---|--------|---|---|
| Audit related | | | |
| Certification of Housing Benefit Subsidy Return | 46,000 | Self-Interest (because this is a recurring fee) | The level of this recurring fee taken on its own is not considered a significant threat to independence as the fee for this work is £46,000 in comparison to the total fee for the audit of £252,718 and in particular relative to Grant Thornton UK LLP's turnover overall. Further, it is a fixed fee and there is no contingent element to it. These factors all mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level. |
| Non-audit related | | | |
| CFO Insights subscription | 10,000 | Self-Interest (because this is a recurring fee) | The level of this recurring fee taken on its own is not considered a significant threat to independence as the fee for this work is £10,000 in comparison to the total fee for the audit of £252,718 and in particular relative to Grant Thornton UK LLP's turnover overall. Further, it is a fixed fee and there is no contingent element to it. These factors all mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level. |

Our digital audit experience

A key component of our overall audit experience is our comprehensive data analytics tool, which is supported by Inflo Software technology. This tool has a number of key functions within our audit process:

| Function | Benefits for you |
|--------------------|--|
| Data extraction | Providing us with your financial information is made easier |
| File sharing | An easy-to-use, ISO 27001 certified, purpose-built file sharing tool |
| Project management | Effective management and oversight of requests and responsibilities |
| Data analytics | Enhanced assurance from access to complete data populations |



Grant Thornton's Analytics solution is supported by Inflo Software technology

Our digital audit experience

A key component of our overall audit experience is our comprehensive data analytics tool, which is supported by Inflo Software technology. This tool has a number of key functions within our audit process:



Data extraction

- Real-time access to data
- Easy step-by-step guides to support you upload your data



File sharing

- Task-based ISO 27001 certified file sharing space, ensuring requests for each task are easy to follow
- Ability to communicate in the tool, ensuring all team members have visibility on discussions about your audit, reducing duplication of work



Project management

- Facilitates oversight of requests
- Access to a live request list at all times



Data analytics

- Relationship mapping, allowing understanding of whole cycles to be obtained quickly
- Visualisation of transactions, allowing easy identification of trends and anomalies

How will analytics add value to your audit?

Analytics will add value to your audit in a number of ways. We see the key benefits of extensive use of data analytics within the audit process to be the following:

Improved fraud procedures using powerful anomaly detection

Being able to analyse every accounting transaction across your business enhances our fraud procedures. We can immediately identify high risk transactions, focusing our work on these to provide greater assurance to you, and other stakeholders.

Examples of anomaly detection include analysis of user activity, which may highlight inappropriate access permissions, and reviewing seldom used accounts, which could identify efficiencies through reducing unnecessary codes and therefore unnecessary internal maintenance.

Another product of this is identification of issues that are not specific to individual postings, such as training requirements being identified for members of staff with high error rates, or who are relying on use of suspense accounts.

More time for you to perform the day job

Providing all this additional value does not require additional input from you or your team. In fact, less of your time is required to prepare information for the audit and to provide supporting information to us.

Complete extracts from your general ledger will be obtained from the data provided to us and requests will therefore be reduced.

We provide transparent project management, allowing us to seamlessly collaborate with each other to complete the audit on time and around other commitments.

We will both have access to a dashboard which provides a real-time overview of audit progress, down to individual information items we need from each other. Tasks can easily be allocated across your team to ensure roles and responsibilities are well defined.

Using filters, you and your team will quickly be able to identify actions required, meaning any delays can be flagged earlier in the process. Accessible through any browser, the audit status is always available on any device providing you with the information to work flexibly around your other commitments.



© 2022 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

'Grant Thornton' refers to the brand under which the Grant Thornton member firms provide assurance, tax and advisory services to their clients and/or refers to one or more member firms, as the context requires. Grant Thornton UK LLP is a member firm of Grant Thornton International Ltd (GTIL). GTIL and the member firms are not a worldwide partnership. GTIL and each member firm is a separate legal entity. Services are delivered by the member firms. GTIL does not provide services to clients. GTIL and its member firms are not agents of, and do not obligate, one another and are not liable for one another's acts or omissions.