

Plymouth City Council audit plan

Year ending 31 March 2024



Contents



Your key Grant Thornton team members are:

Jackson Murray
Key Audit Partner
T 0117 305 7859
E Jackson.Murray@uk.gt.com

David Johnson
Audit Manager
T 0117 305 7727
E David.A.Johnson@uk.gt.com

Aman Gandhi
Assistant Manager
T 0151 224 7200
E Aman.Gandhi@uk.gt.com

Section	Page
Key matters	3
Introduction and headlines	6
Significant risks identified	8
Other matters	11
Our approach to materiality	12
IT Audit Strategy	14
Value for Money Arrangements	15
Risks of significant VFM weaknesses	16
Audit logistics and team	18
Audit fees and updated auditing standards	19
IFRS 16 ‘Leases’ and related disclosures	21
Independence and non-audit services	22
Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance	24
Escalation policy	26

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

National context

The national economic context continues to present challenges to the local government sector. There are increasing cost pressures, such as a growing population and increasing demand for local government services, especially in adult and children's social care. Combined with inflationary pressures, pay demands and energy price rises, the environment in which local authorities operate is highly challenging. Local Government funding continues to be stretched and there have been considerable reductions in the grants received by local authorities from government.

Recently, we have seen the additional strain on some councils from equal pay claims, and there has been a concerning rise in the number of councils issuing s.114 notices. These are issued when a council's Chief Financial Officer does not believe the council can meet its expenditure commitments from its income. Additionally, the levels of indebtedness at many councils is now highly concerning, and we have seen commissioners being sent in to oversee reforms at a number of entities. We are aware of the current issues surrounding the pension fund transaction and that Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) has, in principle, agreed to a capitalisation directive to cover the value of the transaction. We will continue to monitor this situation and update officers and Audit & Governance Committee when this has been finalised.

Our recent value for money work has highlighted a growing number of governance and financial stability issues at a national level, which is a further indication of the mounting pressure on audited bodies to keep delivering services, whilst also managing transformation and making savings at the same time.

In planning our audit, we have taken account of this national context in designing a local audit programme which is tailored to your risks and circumstances.

Audit Reporting Delays

Against a backdrop of ongoing audit reporting delays, in October 2023 PSAA found that only five local government accounts had been signed by the September deadline. In June 2023 the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) also produced a report setting out their concerns over these audit reporting delays. We issued our report [About time?](#) In March 2023 which explored the reasons for delayed publication of audited local authority accounts.

The financial statements for 2021/22 and 2022/23 will have a disclaimed opinion to reflect that these will not be audited due to the delay in completion of prior year audits as a result of significant issues identified and subsequently resolved. This work has resulted in material adjustment to the 2019/20 and 2020/21 financial statements and as noted above further support being provided by MHCLG. This will allow the audit team to complete the 2023/24 audit in line with national timelines.

In our view, to enable a timely sign off of the financial statements, it is critical that draft local authority accounts are prepared to a high standard and are supported by strong working papers.

Key matters - continued

Our Responses

- As a firm, we are absolutely committed to audit quality and financial reporting in the local government sector. Our proposed work and fee, as set out in this Audit Plan has been agreed with the Service Director for Finance.
- To ensure close work with our local audited bodies and an efficient audit process, our preference as a firm is work on site with you and your officers. Please confirm in writing if this is acceptable to you, and that your officers will make themselves available to our audit team. This is also in compliance with our delivery commitments in our contract with PSAA.
- We offer a private meeting with the Chief Executive twice a year, and with the Director of Finance quarterly, as part of our commitment to keep you fully informed on the progress of the audit.
- At an appropriate point within the audit, we would also like to meet informally with the Chair of your Audit and Governance Committee, to brief them on the status and progress of the audit work to date.
- We will consider your arrangements for managing and reporting your financial resources as part of our audit in completing our Value for Money work.
- Our Value for Money work will also consider your arrangements relating to governance and improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness. Should the NAO revise the VFM code during 2023/24, these areas of focus may change and this line may need amending for different emphases.
- We will continue to provide you and your Audit and Governance Committee with sector updates providing our insight on issues from a range of sources and other sector commentators via our Audit and Governance Committee updates.
- We hold annual financial reporting workshops for our audited bodies to access the latest technical guidance and interpretations, to discuss issues with our experts and to facilitate networking links with other audited bodies to support consistent and accurate financial reporting across the sector.

Key matters - continued



Our Responses (continued)

- With the ongoing financial pressures being faced by local authorities, in planning this audit we have considered the financial viability of the Council. We are satisfied that the going concern basis remains the correct basis behind the preparation of the accounts. We will keep this under review throughout the duration of our appointment as auditors of the Council.
- There is an increased incentive and opportunity for organisations in the public sector to manipulate their financial statements due to ongoing financial pressures. We are required to identify a significant risk with regard to management override of controls.
- There is a rebuttable presumed risk that revenue may be misstated due to the improper recognition of revenue – please refer to page 8.

Introduction and headlines

Purpose

This document provides an overview of the planned scope and timing of the statutory audit of Plymouth City 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. The NAO has updated the Code. This audit plan sets out the implications of the revised code on this audit. 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 Plymouth City Council. We draw your attention to this document.

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's financial statements that have been prepared by management with the oversight of those charged with governance (the Audit and Governance 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 in order to maximise the outcomes that can be achieved.

The audit of the financial statements does not relieve management or the Audit and Governance 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.



Introduction and headlines

Significant risks

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

- management override of controls;
- valuation of land and buildings;
- valuation of investment property; and
- valuation of the pension fund net liability.

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 £7,700k (2020/21 £8,200k) for the Council, which equates to 1.3% of your prior year gross operating costs. 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 £385k (2020/21 £400k).

Value for Money arrangements

Our risk assessment regarding your arrangements to secure value for money is ongoing and we will report any identified risks of significant weakness in our update reports. In 2022/23 we identified the following significant weaknesses:

- financial sustainability and the achievement of savings programmes; and
- governance of and investment in children's services to meet Ofsted standards.

We will continue to update our risk assessment until we issue our Auditor's Annual Report.

Audit logistics

Our planning work took place in February 2024 and we expect our final accounts audit will take place between September and December 2024. Our key deliverables are this Audit Plan, our Audit Findings Report and our Auditor's Annual Report.

Our preference is for elements of our work to take place on site alongside your officers.

Our proposed fee for the audit will be £392,808, subject to the Council delivering a good set of financial statements and working papers and no significant new financial reporting matters arising that require additional time and/or specialist input.

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 for Council only)	<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 Council 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; and- The culture and ethical frameworks of local authorities, including Plymouth City Council, mean that all forms of fraud are seen as unacceptable.	We do not, therefore, consider this to be a significant risk for Plymouth City Council.
Risk of fraud related to expenditure recognition PAF Practice Note 10 (rebutted)	In line with the Public Audit Forum Practice Note 10, in the public sector, auditors must also consider the risk that material misstatements due to fraudulent financial reporting may arise from the manipulation of expenditure recognition (for instance by deferring expenditure to a later period).	We do not, therefore, consider this to be a significant risk for Plymouth City Council.

‘Significant risks often relate to significant non-routine transactions and judgmental matters. Non-routine transactions are transactions that are unusual, due to either size or nature, and that therefore occur infrequently. Judgmental matters may include the development of accounting estimates for which there is significant measurement uncertainty.’ (ISA (UK) 315)

Significant risks identified - continued

Risk	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Management over-ride of controls	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>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 recorded 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 with regard to corroborative evidence; and • evaluate the rationale for any changes in accounting policies, estimates or significant unusual transactions.
Valuation of land and buildings	<p>The Council 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 and the sensitivity of this estimate to changes in key assumptions.</p> <p>Where a rolling programme is used, management will need to ensure the carrying value in the Council financial statements is not materially different from the current value or the fair value (for surplus assets) at the financial statements date.</p> <p>We therefore identified valuation of land and buildings as a significant risk.</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; • write to the valuer to confirm 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, the Council's valuer's report and the assumptions that underpin the valuation; • use an auditor's expert to critically evaluate the valuation instructions and report; • test revaluations made during the year to see if they had been input correctly into the Council's asset register; and • evaluate 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.

Management should expect engagement teams to challenge areas that are complex, significant or highly judgmental. This may be the case for accounting estimates and similar areas. Management should also expect to provide to engagement teams with sufficient evidence to support their judgments and the approach they have adopted for key accounting policies, with reference to accounting standards or changes thereto.

Where estimates are used in the preparation of the financial statements management should expect teams to challenge management's assumptions and request evidence to support those assumptions.

Significant risks identified - continued

Risk	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Valuation of Investment Properties	<p>The Council revalue its investment property on an annual basis as required by the CIPFA Code. This valuation represents a significant estimate by management in the financial statements due to the size of the numbers involved (£238m at 31/03/23) and the sensitivity of this estimate to changes in key assumptions.</p> <p>Management have engaged the services of an external valuer to estimate the fair value as at 31 March 2024.</p> <p>We therefore identified valuation of investment property as a significant risk 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, with the assistance of an auditor's expert; • 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; and • test, on a sample basis, revaluations made during the year to ensure they have been input correctly into the Council's asset register.
Valuation of the pension fund net liability	<p>The Council's pension fund net liability, as reflected in the 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 (£27.5m at 31/03/23) and the sensitivity of the estimate to changes in key assumptions.</p> <p>We therefore identified valuation of the Council's pension fund net liability as a significant risk 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 Council'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 Council's pension fund valuation; • assess the accuracy and completeness of the information provided by the Council 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; • 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; and • obtain assurances from the auditor of Devon Pension Fund as to the controls surrounding the validity and accuracy of membership data; contributions data and benefits data sent to the actuary by the pension fund and the fund assets valuation in the pension fund financial statements.

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 and any other information published alongside your financial statements 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 financial statements, consider and decide upon any objections received in relation to the 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; and/or
 - 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.

Our approach to materiality

The concept of 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.

Matter	Description	Planned audit procedures
1	<p>Determination</p> <p>We have determined financial statement materiality based on a proportion of the gross expenditure of the Council for the financial year. Materiality at the planning stage of our audit is £7.700m, which equates to 1.3% of your draft gross expenditure for the period.</p>	<p>We determine planning materiality in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establish what level of misstatement could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements; • assist in establishing the scope of our audit engagement and audit tests; • determine sample sizes; and • assist in evaluating the effect of known and likely misstatements in the financial statements.
2	<p>Reassessment of materiality</p> <p>Our assessment of materiality is kept under review throughout the audit process.</p>	<p>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.</p>
3	<p>Other communications relating to materiality we will report to the Audit and Governance Committee</p> <p>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 and Governance 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.</p>	<p>We report to the Audit and Governance Committee any unadjusted misstatements of lesser amounts to the extent that these are identified by our audit work.</p> <p>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 £400k. 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 and Governance Committee to assist it in fulfilling its governance responsibilities.</p>

Our approach to materiality

The concept of 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.

Qualitative factors considered

Materiality for the financial statements	7,700,000	This is the equivalent to approximately 1.3% of the prior year gross expenditure of the Council. We have reduced this from 1.5% to recognise the two years of disclaimed opinions and the material adjustments made to the 2019/20 and 2020/21 financial statements
Performance Materiality	5,000,000	<p>We have determined performance materiality at 65% of headline materiality. Our rationale is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have reduced headline materiality to recognise errors and issues in prior years and note these are individual errors rather than an indication of pervasive control issues • We have identified a number of issues in relation to significant risk areas in prior year audits • Senior management and key reporting personnel in the finance function have remained stable from the prior year audit
Trivial Matters	385,000	Set at 5% of materiality



IT audit strategy

In accordance with ISA (UK) 315 Revised, we are required to obtain an understanding of the relevant IT and technical infrastructure and details of the processes that operate within the IT environment. We are also required to consider the information captured to identify any audit relevant risks and design appropriate audit procedures in response. 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 and implementation of relevant ITGCs.

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	Spend/Income	Planned level IT audit assessment
Civica Financials	Financial reporting	£256,872,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ITGC design assessment – IT Audit have completed a detailed review of IT systems in 2022-23 and will complete a follow up of prior year work and findings in 2023-24
Academy	Council Tax, Business Rates, Benefits, Grants	£(55,296,000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ITGC design assessment – IT Audit have completed a detailed review of IT systems in 2022-23 and will complete a follow up of prior year work and findings in 2023-24
Core HR	Payroll	£142,073,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ITGC design assessment – IT Audit have completed a detailed review of IT systems in 2022-23 and will complete a follow up of prior year work and findings in 2023-24
Active Directory	Domain Controller	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ITGC design assessment – IT Audit have completed a detailed review of IT systems in 2022-23 and will complete a follow up of prior year work and findings in 2023-24

Value for Money arrangements

Approach to Value for Money work for the period ended 31 March 2024.

The National Audit Office issued its latest Value for Money guidance to auditors in January 2023. The Code expects auditors to consider whether a body has put in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources. Auditors are expected to report any significant weaknesses in the body's arrangements, should they come to their attention. In undertaking their work, auditors are expected to have regard to three specified reporting criteria. These are as set out below:



Improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness

How the body uses information about its costs and performance to improve the way it manages and delivers its services.



Financial Sustainability

How the body plans and manages its resources to ensure it can continue to deliver its services.



Governance

How the body ensures that it makes informed decisions and properly manages its risks.

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. The risks we have identified are detailed in the first table below, along with the further procedures we will perform. 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.

Risks of significant weakness

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

At this stage, we have not identified any risks of significant weaknesses from our initial planning work. We will undertake more detailed planning work and continue our review of your arrangements until we sign the opinion on your financial statements before we issue our auditor's annual report

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.

Risks of significant VFM weaknesses - continued

The Audit Code sets out that the auditor's work is likely to fall into three broad areas:

- planning;
- additional risk-based procedures and evaluation; and
- reporting.

We undertake initial planning work to inform this Audit Plan and the assumptions used to derive our fee. A key part of this is the consideration of prior year significant weaknesses and known areas of risk which is a key part of the risk assessment for 2023/24. We set out our reported assessment below:

Criteria	2022/23 Auditor judgement on arrangements informing our initial risk assessment		Additional risk-based procedures planned
Financial sustainability	Red	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant weakness in arrangements identified • One key recommendation made • Three improvement recommendation made 	We will follow up progress against the significant weakness and ensure that our work assesses the current arrangements in place.
Governance	Amber	No risks of significant weakness identified	We will undertake sufficient work to ensure that we have documented our understanding of the arrangements in place as required by the Code of Audit Practice.
Improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness	Red	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant weaknesses as continuing risk in the delivery of children's services. • One key recommendation made; • One improvement recommendations made. 	We will follow up progress against the significant weakness and ensure that our work assesses the current arrangements in place.

G	No significant weaknesses in arrangements identified or improvement recommendation made.
A	No significant weaknesses in arrangements identified, but improvement recommendations made.
R	Significant weaknesses in arrangements identified and key recommendations made.

Audit logistics and team



Jackson Murray, Key Audit Partner

Provides oversight of the delivery of the audit including regular engagement with Governance Committees and senior officers



David Johnson, Audit Manager

Provides oversight of the delivery of the audit including regular engagement with Governance Committees and senior officers



Aman Gandhi, Audit In charge

Key audit contact responsible for the day to day management and delivery of the audit work

Audited Entity 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 audited bodies. Where the elapsed time to complete an audit exceeds that agreed due to an entity 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 an entity 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 deadline you have agreed with us, including all notes, 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 cleansed, are made 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; and
- respond promptly and adequately to audit queries.

Audit fees and updated Auditing Standards

Audit fees are set by PSAA as part of their national procurement exercise. In 2017, PSAA awarded a contract of audit for Plymouth City Council to begin with effect from 2018/19. This contract was re-tendered in 2023 and Grant Thornton have been re-appointed as your auditors. The scale fee set out in the PSAA contract for the 2023/24 audit is £375,258.

This contract sets out four contractual stage payments for this fee, with payment based on delivery of specified audit milestones:

- production of the final auditor's annual report for the previous Audit Year (exception for new clients in 2023/24 only);
- production of the draft audit planning report to Audited Body;
- 50% of planned hours of an audit have been completed; and
- 75% of planned hours of an audit have been completed.

Any variation to the scale fee will be determined by PSAA in accordance with their procedures as set out here <https://www.psaa.co.uk/appointing-auditors-and-fees/fee-variations-overview/>

Assumptions

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

- prepare a good quality set of accounts, 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; and
- maintain adequate business processes and IT controls, supported by an appropriate IT infrastructure and control environment.

Updated Auditing Standards

The FRC has issued updated Auditing Standards in respect of Quality Management (ISQM 1 and ISQM 2). It has also issued an updated Standard on quality management for an audit of financial statements (ISA 220). We confirm we will comply with these standards.

Audit fees

	Proposed fee 2023/24
Plymouth City Council audit scale fee	£375,258
ISA 315 (estimate)	£15,690
Auditor's Expert – PPE and Investment Property Valuations (estimate)	£5,000
Total audit fees (excluding VAT)	£395,948

Previous year

If the opinion on the 2022/23 (and 2021/22) audit is disclaimed due to the imposition of a backstop date, we may need to undertake further audit work in respect of opening balances. We will discuss the practical implications of this with you should this circumstance arise.

Relevant professional standards

In preparing our fees, 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.

IFRS 16 'Leases' and related disclosures

IFRS 16 will need to be implemented by local authorities from 1 April 2024. This Standard sets out the principles for the recognition, measurement, presentation and disclosure of leases and replaces IAS17. The objective is to ensure that lessees and lessors provide relevant information in a manner that faithfully represents those transactions. This information gives a basis for users of financial statements to assess the effect that leases have on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of an entity. As this is a shadow year for the implementation of IFRS 16, we will need to consider the work being undertaken by the Council to ensure a smooth adoption of the new standard.

Introduction

IFRS 16 updates the definition of a lease to:

“a contract, or part of a contract, that conveys the right to use an asset (the underlying asset) for a period of time in exchange for consideration.”

In the public sector the definition of a lease is expanded to include arrangements with nil consideration.

IFRS 16 requires all leases to be accounted for 'on balance sheet' by the lessee (subject to the exemptions below), a major departure from the requirements of IAS 17 in respect of operating leases.

IFRS 16 requires a lessee to recognise assets and liabilities for leases with a term of more than 12 months, unless the underlying asset is of low value. A lessee is required to recognise a right-of-use asset representing its right to use the underlying leased asset and a lease liability representing its obligation to make lease payments. There is a single accounting model for all leases (similar to that of finance leases under IAS 17), with the following exceptions:

- leases of low value assets
- short-term leases (less than 12 months).

Lessor accounting is substantially unchanged leading to asymmetry of approach for some leases (operating).

Council's systems and processes

We believe that most local authorities will need to reflect the effect of IFRS 16 changes in the following areas:

- accounting policies and disclosures;
- application of judgment and estimation;
- related internal controls that will require updating, if not overhauling, to reflect changes in accounting policies and processes; and
- systems to capture the process and maintain new lease data and for ongoing maintenance.

Planning enquiries

As part of our planning risk assessment procedures we have considered the implications of the updated standard and the impact on the Council's financial statement. We will continue to discuss this with management and consider as part of the 2023/24 audit.

Further information

Further details on the requirements of IFRS16 can be found in the HM Treasury Financial Reporting Manual. This is available on the following link.

[IFRS 16 Application Guidance December 2020.docx \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](#)

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 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.

Independence and non-audit services

Other services

The following other services provided by Grant Thornton were identified.

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			
Housing Benefit Certification	48,440 (2022/23)	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 £48,440 in comparison to the total fee for the audit of £375,258 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.
	48,440 (2023/24)		
Teacher's Pension return	22,000 (2022/23)	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 £25,000 in comparison to the total fee for the audit of £375,258 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.
	25,000 (2023/24)		

Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance

Our communication plan	Audit Plan	Audit Findings
Respective responsibilities of auditor and management/those charged with governance	•	
Overview of the planned scope and timing of the audit, form, timing and expected general content of communications including significant risks and Key Audit Matters	•	
Confirmation of independence and objectivity of the firm, the engagement team members and all other indirectly covered persons	•	•
A statement that we have complied with relevant ethical requirements regarding independence. Relationships and other matters which might be thought to bear on independence. Details of non-audit work performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP and network firms, together with fees charged. Details of safeguards applied to threats to independence	•	•
Significant matters in relation to going concern	•	•

ISA (UK) 260, as well as other ISAs (UK), prescribe matters which we are required to communicate with those charged with governance, and which we set out in the table here.

This document, the Audit Plan, outlines our audit strategy and plan to deliver the audit, while the Audit Findings will be issued prior to approval of the financial statements and will present key issues, findings and other matters arising from the audit, together with an explanation as to how these have been resolved.

We will communicate any adverse or unexpected findings affecting the audit on a timely basis, either informally or via an audit progress memorandum.

Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance

Our communication plan	Audit Plan	Audit Findings
Significant findings from the audit		•
Significant matters and issue arising during the audit and written representations that have been sought		•
Significant difficulties encountered during the audit		•
Significant deficiencies in internal control identified during the audit		•
Significant matters arising in connection with related parties		•
Identification or suspicion of fraud(deliberate manipulation) involving management and/or which results in material misstatement of the financial statements (not typically council tax fraud)		•
Non-compliance with laws and regulations		•
Unadjusted misstatements and material disclosure omissions		•
Expected modifications to the auditor's report, or emphasis of matter		•

Respective responsibilities

As auditor we are responsible for performing the audit in accordance with ISAs (UK), which is directed towards forming and expressing an opinion on the financial statements that have been prepared by management with the oversight of those charged with governance.

The audit of the financial statements does not relieve management or those charged with governance of their responsibilities.

Escalation policy

The Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities are proposing to introduce an audit backstop date on a rolling basis to encourage timelier completion of local government audits in the future.

As your statutory auditor, we understand the importance of appropriately resourcing audits with qualified staff to ensure high quality standards that meet regulatory expectations and national deadlines. It is the Authority's responsibility to produce true and fair accounts in accordance with the CIPFA Code by the 31 May 2024 and respond to audit information requests and queries in a timely manner.

To help ensure that accounts audits can be completed on time in the future, we have introduced an escalation policy. This policy outlines the steps we will take to address any delays in draft accounts or responding to queries and information requests. If there are any delays, the following steps should be followed:

Step 1 - Initial Communication with Finance Director (within one working day of statutory deadline for draft accounts or agreed deadline for working papers)

We will have a conversation with the Finance Director(s) to identify reasons for the delay and review the Council's plans to address it. We will set clear expectations for improvement.

Step 2 - Further Reminder (within two weeks of deadline)

If the initial conversation does not lead to improvement, we will send a reminder explaining outstanding queries and information requests, the deadline for responding, and the consequences of not responding by the deadline.

Step 3 - Escalation to Chief Executive (within one month of deadline)

If the delay persists, we will escalate the issue to the Chief Executive, including a detailed summary of the situation, steps taken to address the delay, and agreed deadline for responding.

Step 4 - Escalation to the Audit and Governance Committee (at next available Audit and Governance Committee meeting or in writing to Audit and Governance Committee Chair within 6 weeks of deadline)

If senior management is unable to resolve the delay, we will escalate the issue to the Audit and Governance Committee, including a detailed summary of the situation, steps taken to address the delay, and recommendations for next steps.

Step 5 – Consider use of wider powers (within two months of deadline)

If the delay persists despite all efforts, we will consider using wider powers, e.g. issuing a statutory recommendation. This decision will be made only after all other options have been exhausted. We will consult with an internal risk panel to ensure appropriateness.

By following these steps, we aim to ensure that delays in responding to queries and information requests are addressed in a timely and effective manner, and that we are able to provide timely assurance to key stakeholders including the public on the Council's financial statements.

