South Somerset District Council audit plan

Year ending 31 March 2022

South Somerset District Council

18 January 2023

Contents

Your key Grant Thornton team members are:

Barrie Morris
Key Audit Partner
T 0117 305 7708
E barrie.morris@uk.gt.com

Beth Bowers
Senior Manager
T 0117 305 7726
E beth.ac.bowers@uk.gt.com

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.

Key matters

Factors	Our response
Local Government Reorganisation The financial year 2022/23 is the last as a sovereign council for South Somerset District Council (SSDC) as the Secretary of State approved the One Somerset business case for local government reorganisation and the creation of a new unitary council from 1 April 2023. The council has been working with other Somerset councils to prepare for arrangements to transfer to the new authority and for the demise of South Somerset District Council from 1 April 2023.	• As part of our Value for Money work, we will review the arrangements that have been put in place to support successful transition across key financial and governance workstreams and assess how the Council is working with partners to support the reorganisation.
Audit Quality On 28 October 2022, the FRC published its annual report setting out the findings of its and the Quality Assurance Department (QAD) of the ICAEWs reviews of the work of local auditors. The report summarises the results of the FRC's inspections of twenty audit files for the last financial year as well as the file reviews undertaken by QAD on non-major audits. Grant Thornton are one of seven firms which currently delivers local audit work. Of our 330 local government and NHS audits, 87 are currently defined as 'major audits' which fall within the scope of the AQR. This year, the FRC looked at nine of our audits.	• The results of the recent FRC and QAD reviews shows a continued improvement in the assessment of the quality of our audit work. • 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 further in our Audit Plan, will be agreed with the Chief Finance Officer.
Climate Change South Somerset District Council, along with the County Council and three district councils in Somerset, declared a climate change emergency in 2019. Working together, the councils have developed a strategy to address the challenge of climate change 'Towards a Climate Resilient Somerset – Somerset's Climate Emergency'. This sets out three key goals: • To decarbonise local authorities, the wider public sector estates and reduce our carbon footprint • To work towards making Somerset a Carbon Neutral County by 2030 • To have a Somerset which is prepared for, and resilient to, the impacts of Climate Change These are ambitious goals which are likely to have financial as well as operational impact upon the Council.	• We will review the Council plans for addressing the climate change emergency including its financial assumptions and commitments • We will assess whether the Council has appropriate arrangements in place for identifying the potential future costs to its operations as a result of climate change • We will monitor the Councils arrangements for implementing the actions within its joint strategy

Introduction and headlines

Purpose

This document provides an overview of the planned scope and timing of the statutory audit of South Somerset District 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 South Somerset District 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 committee); and we consider whether there are sufficient arrangements in place at the Council and group 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 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.

Group Audit

The Council is required to prepare group financial statements that consolidate the financial information of SSDC Opium Power Limited and Fareham Reserve Limited. SSDC Business Solutions Ltd. and Elleston Services Limited are excluded from consolidation on grounds of immateriality.

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 – Group and Council
- Valuation of land and buildings – Group and Council
- Valuation of Investment Properties – Council only
- Valuation of net pension fund liability - Council only

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 £1.6m (PY £1.9m) for the group and £1.5m (PY £1.8m) for the Council, which equates to 1.5% of your prior year gross expenditure for the year. This is a reduction on the materiality percentage used in the prior period as a result of the significant number of external audit findings in 2020-21. 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 £0.075m (PY £0.091m).

Value for Money arrangements

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

- Arrangements for transition to the new unitary authority

Introduction and headlines cont.



Audit logistics

Our interim visit will be completed in December and January 2023 and our final visit will take place between January and March 2023, assuming that a statement of accounts which is sufficiently complete and robust , incorporating the changes and addressing the issues identified in our 2020-21 audit which was concluded on 23 December 2022, have been addressed.. Our key deliverables are this Audit Plan, our Audit Findings Report and Auditor's Annual Report.

Our planned fee for the audit will be £86,943 (PY: £206,200) for the Council, subject to the Council delivering a good set of financial statements and working papers. This represents an increase on the scale fee published by PSAA to reflect the additional work that is required that has not been factored into that scale fee and the change in risk profile of the Council based on recent experience which necessitates additional work, including our use of valuation experts for the Group PPE.

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..

Group audit scope and risk assessment

In accordance with ISA (UK) 600, as group auditor we are required to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence regarding the financial information of the components and the consolidation process to express an opinion on whether the group financial statements are prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework.

Component	Individually Significant?	Level of response required under ISA (UK) 600	Risks identified	Planned audit approach
South Somerset District Council	Yes		Risks reported on pages 7 - 9	Full scope audit performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP
SSDC Opium Power Limited	Yes		Valuation of Property Plant & Equipment (as detailed on page 8)	Specific scope procedures on material group balances to be performed by Old Mill, as component auditor, with specific scope procedures to be performed by the Grant Thornton UK LLP audit team over the valuation of Property, Plant and Equipment. The nature, time and extent of our involvement in the work of Old Mill will begin with a discussion on risks, guidance on designing procedures, participation in meetings, followed by the review of relevant aspects of their audit documentation and meeting with appropriate members of management.
Fareham Energy Reserve Limited	Yes		Valuation of Property Plant & Equipment (as detailed on page 8)	
Fareham Energy Reserve 2 Limited	Yes		Valuation of Property Plant & Equipment (as detailed on page 8)	

Audit scope

- Audit of the financial information of the component using component materiality
- Audit of one more classes of transactions, account balances or disclosures relating to significant risks of material misstatement of the group financial statements
- Review of component's financial information
- Specified audit procedures relating to significant risks of material misstatement of the group financial statements
- Analytical procedures at group level

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	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
ISA240 revenue risk – the Council's reported revenue contains fraudulent transactions (rebutted)	Council & Group	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. For the group (excluding the Council), as revenue is immaterial, we have concluded we can rebut this risk, as group income is not material. For the Council we have concluded that the risk of material misstatement is low as income is primarily derived from grants or formula-based income from central government and taxpayers and opportunities to manipulate revenue recognition are very limited.	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: • 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 South Somerset District Council, mean that all forms of fraud are seen as unacceptable. Therefore we do not consider this to be a significant risk for South Somerset District Council.
Management over-ride of controls	Council & Group	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. 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.	We will: • 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.

Significant risks identified

Risk	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Valuation of land and buildings **(Rolling Revaluation)**	Council & Group	The Authority revalue 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 (£47m council and £59m group) 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 or the fair value (for surplus assets) at the financial statements date, where a rolling programme is used. We therefore identified valuation of land and buildings, particularly key underlying valuation inputs and assumptions, which have a material impact on the valuations, as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement.	We will: • 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; • 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; and • engage an auditors expert and undertake procedures to confirm that the group Property Plant & Equipment has been included in the group financial statements at an appropriate valuation.
Valuation of Investment Properties	Council	The Authority revalue Investment Properties annually. This valuation represents a significant estimate by management in the financial statements due to the size of the numbers involved (£72m) and the sensitivity of this estimate to changes in key assumptions. We therefore identified valuation of Investment Properties, particularly key underlying valuation inputs and assumptions, which have a material impact on the valuations, as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement.	We will: • 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; and • test, on a sample basis, revaluations made during the year to ensure they have been input correctly into the Authority's asset register

Significant risks identified

Risk	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Valuation of the pension fund net liability	Council	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. The pension fund net liability is considered a significant estimate due to the size of the numbers involved (£75.6m in the Authority's balance sheet) and the sensitivity of the estimate to changes in key assumptions. 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.	We will: • 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; • 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; • agree the advance payment made to the pension fund during the year to the expected accounting treatment and relevant financial disclosures; and • obtain assurances from the auditor of Somerset 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.

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. We identified recommendations in our 2020/21 audit in relation to the Council's estimation process for the valuation of land and buildings, and the valuation of group land and building assets.

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 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, group land and buildings council dwellings and investment properties
- Depreciation
- Year end provisions and accruals
- Credit loss and impairment allowances
- Valuation of defined benefit net pension fund liabilities

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, e.g. asset valuations (both for the council and the group) 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 sent letter of inquiry that was presented at the council's September 2022 Audit Committee, where members endorsed management's responses to our standard planning inquiries.

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

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 2021/22financial 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 group and Council for the financial year. In the prior year we used the same benchmark. Materiality at the planning stage of our audit is £1.6m (PY £1.9m) for the group and £1.5m (PY £1.8m) for the Council, which equates to 1.5% of your forecast gross expenditure for the year. This is a reduction on the materiality percentage used in the prior period as a result of the significant number of external audit findings in 2020-21. We design our procedures to detect errors in specific accounts at a lower level of precision which we have determined to be £10,000 for Senior officer remuneration.

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 group and Council, we propose that an individual difference could normally be considered to be clearly trivial if it is less than £0.080m (PY £0.091m) for the group and £0.075m (PY £0.090m) for the council.

If management have corrected material misstatements identified during the course of the audit, we will consider whether those corrections should be communicated to the Audit Committee to assist it in fulfilling its governance responsibilities.



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').

[We plan to rely on the operation of application controls whether automated / IT dependent and will therefore carry out an extended ITGC assessment on the IT systems that support the operation of those controls. This is to gain assurance that the relevant controls have been operating effectively throughout the period.]

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
E-financials	**Financial reporting**	• Detailed ITGC assessment (design effectiveness only)
Northgate	**Council Tax, Business Rates, Benefits**	• Detailed ITGC assessment (design effectiveness only)
iTrent	**Payroll**	• Detailed ITGC assessment (design effectiveness only)

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 below:

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. 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.

Arrangements for transition to the new unitary authority

The arrangements that have been put in place to support successful transition across key financial and governance workstreams will be considered and an assessment of how the Council is working with partners to support the change undertaken.

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

Planning and risk assessment

Interim audit December – January 2023

Audit committee January 2023

Audit Plan

Year end audit January – March 2023

Audit committee March 2023

Audit Findings Report/Draft Auditor's Annual Report

Audit opinion

Audit committee March 2023

Auditor's Annual Report

Barrie Morris, Key Audit Partner

Barrie leads our relationship with you and is a key contact for the Chief Executive, Section 151 Officer and the Audit Committee. Barrie takes overall responsibility for the delivery of a high quality audit, meeting the highest professional standards and adding value to the Council.

Beth Bowers, Audit Manager

Beth's role involves overseeing the day to day planning and execution of the audit, ensuring the audit requirements are fully complied with and producing reports for the Audit Committee. She will respond to ad-hoc queries whenever raised and meet regularly with the Section 151 Officer and members of the finance team

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 items 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 2017, PSAA awarded a contract of audit for South Somerset District Council to begin with effect from 2018/19. The fee agreed in the contract was £37,943. 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 noted in the number of revised ISA's issued by the FRC that are applicable to audits of financial statements commencing on or after 15 December 2019, as detailed in Appendix 1.

As a firm, we are absolutely committed to meeting the expectations of the FRC with regard to audit quality and public sector financial reporting. Our proposed work and fee for 2021/22, as set out below, is detailed overleaf and has been discussed with the Section 151 Officer and is subject to PSAA agreement.

	Actual Fee 2020/21	Proposed fee 2021/22
South Somerset District Council Audit	£206,200	£91,443
Total audit fees (excluding VAT)	£206,200	£91,443

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.

Audit fees – detailed analysis

Scale fee published by PSAA	£37,943
Ongoing increases to scale fee first identified in 2019/20	
Raising the bar/regulatory factors	£2,500
Enhanced audit procedures for Property, Plant and Equipment	£1,750
Enhanced audit procedures for Pension Liabilities (IAS19)	£1,750
Brought forward ongoing fee from 2019/20	**£43,943**
New issues for 2020/21	
Additional work on Value for Money (VfM) under new NAO Code	**£9,000**
Increased audit requirements of revised ISAs 540 / 240 / 700	£6,500
Audit of Group Accounts (not included in the Scale Fee)	£4,000
Estimated cost of Group PPE Expert (review of three separate models)	£20,000
New issues for 2021/22	
Additional audit procedures arising from a lower materiality	£5,000
Additional procedures to address issues identified in the prior year	£3,000
Total proposed audit fees 2021/22 (excluding VAT)	**£91,443**

All variations to the scale fee will need to be approved by PSAA

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 and component audit firms providing services to the Council.

Other services

No other services provided by Grant Thornton were identified.

Service	Fees £	Threats	Safeguards
Audit related			
Certification of Housing Benefits claim 20-21	36,000	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, 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 mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level.
Certification of Housing Benefits claim 21-22	25,000*	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, 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 mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level.

* The 2021-22 Housing Benefit fee is to be confirmed on completion of audit work.

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.

Grant Thornton