

South Somerset District Council audit plan

Year ending 31 March 2023

South Somerset District Council

12 January 2024



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

Director

T 0117 305 7726

E beth.ac.bowers@uk.gt.com

Section	Page	
Key matters	3	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.
Introduction and headlines	5	
Significant risks identified	7	
Group audit scope and risk assessment	12	
Other matters	14	
Our approach to materiality	15	
IT Audit Strategy	18	
Value for Money Arrangements	19	
Risks of significant VFM weaknesses	20	
Audit logistics and team	21	
Audit fees	23	
Independence and non-audit services	25	
Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance	27	

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

For the general population, rising inflation rates, in particular for critical commodities such as energy, food and fuel, is pushing many households into poverty and financial hardship, including those in employment. At a national government level, recent political changes have seen an emphasis on controls on spending, which in turn is placing pressure on public services to manage within limited budgets.

Local Government funding continues to be stretched with increasing cost pressures due to the cost of living crisis, including higher energy costs, increasing pay demands, higher agency costs for temporary staff and increases in supplies and services. Local authority front-line services play a vital role in protecting residents from rising costs; preventing the most vulnerable from falling into poverty and helping to build households long-term financial resilience. At a local level, councils are also essential in driving strong and inclusive local economies, through their economic development functions and measures like increasing the supply of affordable housing, integrating skills and employment provision, and prioritising vulnerable households to benefit from energy saving initiatives. Access to these services remains a key priority across the country, but there are also pressures on the quality of services. These could include further unplanned reductions to services and the cancellation or delays to major construction projects such as new roads, amenities and infrastructure upgrades to schools, as well as pothole filling.

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

Audit Reporting Delays

In a report published in January 2023 the NAO have highlighted that since 2017-18 there has been a significant decline in the number of local government body accounts including an audit opinion published by the deadlines set by government. The NAO outline a number of reasons for this and proposed actions. In our view, it is critical to early sign off that draft local authority accounts are prepared to a high standard and supported by strong working papers.

Local Government Reorganisation

The financial year 2022/23 was 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 had 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. Since that date the assets and liabilities of South Somerset transferred into the new Somerset Council. The new council is therefore responsible for the conclusion of all legacy council audits.

Key matters



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 further in our Audit Plan, which will be agreed with the Executive Director - Resources & Corporate Services (Section 151 Officer) of Somerset Council.
- 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.
- We will continue to provide you and your Audit Committee with sector updates providing our insight on issues from a range of sources and other sector commentators via our Audit Committee updates.
- We hold annual financial reporting workshops for our audited bodies to access the latest technical guidance and interpretation, discuss issues with our experts and create networking links with other audited bodies to support consistent and accurate financial reporting across the sector.

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 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 in order 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.



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:

- PPE revaluations – valuation and allocation
- Group PPE – valuation and allocation
- Investment property – valuation and allocation
- Pension liabilities – valuation, allocation & completeness
- Management override of controls

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.

Group Audit

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

Value for Money arrangements

Our risk assessment regarding your arrangements to secure value for money has identified one risk of significant weakness relating to the arrangements for transitions to the new unitary authority. We will continue to update our risk assessment until we issue our Auditor's Annual Report and will report any necessary amendments to the Audit Committee.

Materiality

We have determined planning materiality to be £1.15m (PY £1.6m) for the group and £1.1m (PY £1.5m) for the Council, which equates to 1.5% of your draft financial statements gross operating costs for the year. We are obliged to report uncorrected omissions or misstatements other than those which are 'clearly trivial' to those charged with governance. Clearly trivial has been set at £55k for the Council (PY £75k) and £57k for the Group (PY £80k).

New Auditing Standards

There are two auditing standards which have been significantly updated this year. These are ISA 315 (Identifying and assessing the risks of material misstatement) and ISA 240 (the auditor's responsibilities relating to fraud in an audit of financial statements). We provide more detail on the work required later in this plan.

Audit logistics

Due to the late start of the audit, we will complete all of our work in a single period between January and March 2024. Our key deliverables are this Audit Plan, Audit Findings Report and Auditor's Annual Report.

Our proposed fee for the audit will be £111,918 (PY: £183,443) for the Council, subject to the Council delivering a good set of financial statements and working papers.

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

Significant risks identified

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

Risk	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
ISA240 revenue recognition risk – the Council’s reported revenue contains fraudulent transactions	Council & Group	<p>Under ISA (UK) 240 there is a rebuttable presumed risk that revenue may be misstated due to the improper recognition of revenue.</p> <p>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 at the Council 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 South Somerset District Council, mean that all forms of fraud are seen as unacceptable. <p>Therefore we do not consider this to be a significant risk for South Somerset District Council.</p> <p>We consider that the risk of fraudulent revenue recognition exists at the subsidiary companies due to the significance of the company’s turnover and the estimation required in recognising accrued income. We have therefore identified the occurrence and accuracy of the subsidiary companies’ income as a significant risk to the group.</p>

‘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

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
Management over-ride of controls	Council & Group	<p>Under ISA (UK) 240 there is a non-rebuttable presumed risk that the risk of management over-ride of controls is present in all entities.</p> <p>We therefore identified management override of control, in particular journals, management estimates and transactions outside the course of business as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement.</p>	<p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluate the design effectiveness of management controls over journals; • analyse the journals listing and determine the criteria for selecting high risk unusual journals; • test unusual journals 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.

Management should expect engagement teams to challenge management in areas that are complex, significant or highly judgmental which 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 referenced 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

Risk	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Valuation of land and buildings	Council & Group	<p>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 (£55.9m council and an additional £63.2m of group assets) 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluate management's processes and assumptions for the calculation of the estimate, the instructions issued to the valuation experts and the scope of their work; • evaluate the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the valuation expert; • write to the valuer to confirm the basis on which the valuations were carried out; • challenge the information and assumptions used by the valuer to assess completeness and consistency with our understanding; • 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.

Significant risks identified

Risk	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Valuation of Investment Properties	Council	<p>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 (£102.4m) and the sensitivity of this estimate to changes in key assumptions.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluate management's processes and assumptions for the calculation of the estimate, the instructions issued to the valuation experts and the scope of their work; • evaluate the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the valuation expert; • write to the valuer to confirm the basis on which the valuations were carried out; • challenge the information and assumptions used by the valuer to assess completeness and consistency with our understanding; 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	<p>The Authority's pension fund net liability, as reflected in its balance sheet as the net defined benefit liability, represents a significant estimate in the financial statements.</p> <p>The pension fund net liability is considered a significant estimate due to the size of the numbers involved (£17.9m in the Authority's balance sheet) and the sensitivity of the estimate to changes in key assumptions.</p> <p>We therefore identified valuation of the Authority's pension fund net liability as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement.</p>	<p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • update our understanding of the processes and controls put in place by management to ensure that the Authority's pension fund net liability is not materially misstated and evaluate the design of the associated controls; • evaluate the instructions issued by management to their management expert (an actuary) for this estimate and the scope of the actuary's work; • assess the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the actuary who carried out the Authority's pension fund valuation; • assess the accuracy and completeness of the information provided by the Authority to the actuary to estimate the liability; • test the consistency of the pension fund asset and liability and disclosures in the notes to the core financial statements with the actuarial report from the actuary; • 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.

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.

Key changes within the group:

We have confirmed that there are no key changes within the group and its components.



Group audit scope and risk assessment

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) Revenue recognition (as detailed on page 7)	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 the Old Mill audit documentation and meeting with appropriate members of management.
Fareham Energy Reserve Limited	Yes		Valuation of Property, Plant & Equipment (as detailed on page 8) Revenue recognition (as detailed on page 7)	
Fareham Energy Reserve 2 Limited	Yes		Valuation of Property, Plant & Equipment (as detailed on page 8) Revenue recognition (as detailed on page 7)	

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 risks of material misstatement of the group financial statements
- Analytical procedures at group level

Other matters

Other work

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

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

Other material balances and transactions

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

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 group and Council for the financial year. Materiality at the planning stage of our audit is £1.1m for the Council (£1.15m for the Group), which equates to 1.5% 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>Other factors</p> <p>An item does not necessarily have to be large to be considered to have a material effect on the financial statements.</p>	<p>An item may be considered to be material by nature where it may affect instances when greater precision is required.</p> <p>Whilst we have considered other factors, such as senior officer remuneration or audit fees, appropriately, we have not set any lower specific materialities.</p> <p>Due to heightened public interest, specific procedures will be undertaken on the accuracy of these disclosures.</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.

Matter	Description	Planned audit procedures
3	<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>
4	<p>Other communications relating to materiality we will report to the Audit 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 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 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 Group and Council, we propose that an individual difference could normally be considered to be clearly trivial if it is less than £55k for the Council (PY £75k) and £57km for the Group (PY £80k).</p> <p>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.</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.

	Group Amount (£)	Council Amount (£)	Qualitative factors considered
Materiality for the financial statements	1,150,000	1,100,000	<p>We considered materiality from the perspective of the users of the financial statements. The Council prepares an expenditure based budget for the financial year with the primary objective to provide services for the local community and therefore gross expenditure at the Net Cost of Services level was deemed as the most appropriate benchmark. This benchmark was used in the prior year. We deemed that 1.5% was an appropriate rate to apply to the expenditure benchmark.</p> <p>We have used total assets as benchmark for the Group financial statements, as this is the benchmark with additional group items. Considering that this is the first year that the component auditors undertake work on the components financial statements. We deemed that 1.5% was an appropriate rate to apply to the total asset benchmark.</p>
Performance materiality	700,000	650,000	<p>We considered factors such as control environment, prior year experience, other sensitivities and the nature of significant estimates included in the financial statements. We determined 60% of materiality as an appropriate threshold for the council and group.</p>
Trivial matters	57,000	55,000	<p>5% of materiality was determined as an appropriate level for triviality.</p>

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. We say more about ISA 315 Revised on slide 21.

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 the period ended 31 March 2023

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.

Our 2022-23 Value for Money assessment was undertaken in conjunction with assessment of other legacy Somerset Council bodies. The Auditor's Annual Report was presented in draft format to the Audit Committee on 25th January 2024. This report will be finalised once the financial statements audits for 2022-23 have concluded at each of the legacy Somerset organisations.

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



Alex J Griffiths, Audit Incharge

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



Beth AC Bowers, Audit Director

Plans, manages and leads the delivery of the audit – the key point of contact for the finance team and for discussing any issues.



Barrie Morris, Key Audit Partner

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

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

Audit fees and updated Auditing Standards including ISA 315 Revised

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 2022/23 audit. For details of the changes which impacted on years up to 2021/22 please see our prior year Audit Plans.

The major change impacting on our audit for 2022/23 is the introduction of ISA (UK) 315 (Revised) - Identifying and assessing the risks of material misstatement ('ISA 315'). There are a number of significant changes that will impact the nature and extent of our risk assessment procedures and the work we perform to respond to these identified risks. Key changes include:

- Enhanced requirements around understanding the Council's IT infrastructure and environment. From this we will then identify any risks arising from the use of IT. We are then required to identify the IT General Controls ('ITGCs') that address those risks and test the design and implementation of ITGCs that address the risks arising from the use of IT.
- Additional documentation of our understanding of the Council's business model, which may result in us needing to perform additional inquiries to understand the Council's end-to-end processes over more classes of transactions, balances and disclosures.
- We are required to identify controls within a business process and identify which of those controls are controls relevant to the audit. These include, but are not limited to, controls over significant risks and journal entries. We will need to identify the risks arising from the use of IT and the general IT controls (ITGCs) as part of obtaining an understanding of relevant controls.
- Where we do not test the operating effectiveness of controls, the assessment of risk will be the inherent risk, this means that our sample sizes may be larger than in previous years.

These are significant changes which will require us to increase the scope, nature and extent of our audit documentation, particularly in respect of your business processes, and your IT controls. We will be unable to determine the full fee impact until we have undertaken further work in respect of the above areas. However, for an authority of your size, we estimate an initial increase of £3,000. We will let you know if our work in respect of business processes and IT controls identifies any issues requiring further audit testing. There is likely to be an ongoing requirement for a fee increase in future years, although we are unable yet to quantify that.

The other major change to Auditing Standards in 2022/23 is in respect of ISA 240 which deals with the auditor's responsibilities relating to fraud in an audit of financial statements. This Standard gives more prominence to the risk of fraud in the audit planning process. We will let you know during the course of the audit should we be required to undertake any additional work in this area which will impact on your fee.

Taking into account the above, our proposed work and fee for 2022/23, as set out below, is detailed overleaf, and will be agreed with the Executive Director - Resources & Corporate Services (Section 151 Officer).

Audit fees

	Actual Fee 2020/21	Final Fee 2021/22	Proposed Fee 2022/23
South Somerset Council Audit	£206,200	£183,443*	£111,918

* Subject to PSAA approval

Assumptions

In setting the above 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.

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.

D. Fees

Fee analysis

Audit fees	Estimated fee
Scale fee per PSAA for 2022-23	53,568
Use of expert for Council	5,000
Use of expert for Group PPE (specialist energy storage valuers)	20,000
Additional Requirements – Payroll Change of Circumstances (Information Provided by the Entity) IPE Testing	500
Additional Requirements – Collection Fund Reliefs (Information Provided by the Entity) IPE Testing	750
Value for Money audit – new NAO requirements	9,000
ISA 540	2,100
ISA 315	3,000
Additional journals testing	3,000
Additional audit work on Group Accounts	5,000
Additional audit testing following previous audit findings in connection with poor quality accounts	10,000
Reduced materiality	5,000
Estimated fee	116,918

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.

Barrie Morris is currently serving his 7th year on the engagement. As discussed and agreed with Public Sector Audit Appointments Limited (PSAA), Barrie will remain in post until the conclusion of the 2022-23 audit period because after that date the council will cease to exist.

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.

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 group and Council's policy on the allotment of non-audit work to your auditors. Any changes and full details of all fees charged for audit related and non-audit related services by Grant Thornton UK LLP and by Grant Thornton International Limited network member Firms will be included in our Audit Findings report at the conclusion of the audit.

None of the services provided are subject to contingent fees.

Service	Fees £	Threats	Safeguards
Audit related			
Certification of Housing Benefits claim 21-22	28,150	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 22-23	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 2022-23 Housing Benefit fee is to be confirmed on completion of audit work.

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	•		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.
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	•	•	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.
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	•	•	We will communicate any adverse or unexpected findings affecting the audit on a timely basis, either informally or via an audit progress memorandum.
Matters in relation to the group audit, including: Scope of work on components, involvement of group auditors in component audits, concerns over quality of component auditors' work, limitations of scope on the group audit, fraud or suspected fraud	•	•	
Views about the qualitative aspects of the Group's accounting and financial reporting practices including accounting policies, accounting estimates and financial statement disclosures		n/a	Respective responsibilities
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		•	



© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

'Grant Thornton' refers to the brand under which the Grant Thornton member firms provide assurance, tax and advisory services to their audited entities and/or refers to one or more member firms, as the context requires. Grant Thornton UK LLP is a member firm of Grant Thornton International Ltd (GTIL). GTIL and the member firms are not a worldwide partnership. GTIL and each member firm is a separate legal entity. Services are delivered by the member firms. GTIL does not provide services to . 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.