

Opinion audit plan

London Borough of Brent

Audit 2010/11

The Audit Commission is an independent watchdog, driving economy, efficiency and effectiveness in local public services to deliver better outcomes for everyone.

Our work across local government, health, housing, community safety and fire and rescue services means that we have a unique perspective. We promote value for money for taxpayers, auditing the £200 billion spent by 11,000 local public bodies.

As a force for improvement, we work in partnership to assess local public services and make practical recommendations for promoting a better quality of life for local people.

Contents

Introduction	2
Responsibilities	3
Fee for the audit	4
Specific actions London Borough of Brent could take to reduce its audit fees	4
Auditors report on the financial statements	5
Materiality	5
Identifying opinion audit risks	5
Identification of specific risks	6
Value for money risks	7
Testing strategy	8
Value for money conclusion	9
Key milestones and deadlines	10
The audit team	11
Independence and objectivity	11
Meetings	11
Quality of service	11
Planned outputs	12
Appendix 1 Basis for fee	13
Assumptions	13
Appendix 2 Independence and objectivity	14
Appendix 3 Working together	16
Meetings	16
Sustainability	16
Appendix 4 Glossary	17

Introduction

This plan sets out the audit work that I propose to undertake for the audit of financial statements and the value for money conclusion 2010/11.

1 The plan is based on the Audit Commission's risk-based approach to audit planning. It reflects:

- audit work specified by the Audit Commission for 2010/11;
- current national risks relevant to your local circumstances; and
- your local risks.

2 I will share this plan with officers and update it as necessary during the planning process.

Responsibilities

The Audit Commission's Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and of Audited Bodies sets out the respective responsibilities of the auditor and the audited body. The Audit Commission has issued a copy of the Statement to every audited body.

3 The Statement summarises where the different responsibilities of auditors and of the audited body begin and end and I undertake my audit work to meet these responsibilities.

4 I comply with the statutory requirements governing our audit work, in particular:

- the Audit Commission Act 1998; and
- the Code of Audit Practice.

Fee for the audit

The fee for the audit is £488,000 as indicated in my letter of 20 April 2010.

5 The Audit Commission scale fee for a Council is £451,600. The fee proposed for 2010/11 is 8 per cent above the scale fee and is within the normal level of variation specified by the Commission.

6 However, the Commission wrote to all audited bodies, on 9 August, about its proposed new arrangements for local value for money audit work. This indicated the impact on audit fees for 2010/11 would be considered as part of the Commission's consultation on its work programme and scales of fees for 2011/12. This consultation was launched on 10 December 2010 and proposed a rebate of 3.5 per cent of the scale fee for London boroughs. The closing date of the consultation was 7 January 2011.

7 In setting the fee, I have assumed that:

- the level of risk in relation to the audit of accounts is consistent with that for 2009/10;
- good quality, accurate working papers are available at the start of the financial statements audit;
- The Council will supply good quality working papers to support the restatement of 2009/10 balances to comply with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS); and
- Internal Audit undertakes appropriate work on all material systems, that I will be able to rely on their work and it is available for our review by 30 April 2011.

8 Where these assumptions are not met, I will be required to undertake additional work which is likely to result in an increased audit fee. Where this is the case, I will discuss this first with the Director of Finance and Corporate Services and I will issue supplements to the plan to record any revisions to the risk and the impact on the fee.

9 Further information on the basis for the fee is set out in Appendix 1.

Specific actions London Borough of Brent could take to reduce its audit fees

10 The Audit Commission requires its auditors to inform audited bodies of specific actions it could take to reduce its audit fees. As in previous years, I will work with staff to identify any specific actions that the Council could take and to provide ongoing audit support.

Auditors report on the financial statements

I will carry out the audit of the financial statements in accordance with International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland) issued by the Auditing Practices Board (APB).

11 I am required to issue an audit report giving my opinion on whether the accounts give a true and fair view of the financial position of the Council as at 31 March 2011.

Materiality

12 I will apply the concept of materiality in both planning and performing the audit, in evaluating the effect of any identified misstatements, and in forming my opinion.

Identifying opinion audit risks

13 I need to understand fully the audited body to identify any risk of material misstatement (whether due to fraud or error) in the financial statements. I do this by:

- identifying the business risks facing the Council, including assessing your own risk management arrangements;
- considering the financial performance of the Council;
- assessing internal control - including reviewing the control environment, the IT control environment and Internal Audit; and
- assessing the risk of material misstatement arising from the activities and controls within the Council information systems.

Identification of specific risks

I have considered the additional risks that are appropriate to the current opinion audit and have set these out below.

Table 1: **Specific risks**

Specific opinion risks identified

Risk area	Audit response
<p>The Council is required to prepare the 2010/11 accounts according to International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) (including a full re-statement of 2009/10 balances).</p>	<p>In 2009/10, I carried out a review of the council's restated PFI schemes against IFRIC 12 requirements; no significant issues were identified.</p>
<p>This poses a significant risk of material misstatement to the accounts.</p>	<p>In 2010/11, my audit team will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ monitor implementation of IFRS at key stages; and■ review restated 2009/10 balances.
<p>The Council has made significant changes to its financial IT systems. Separate departmental arrangements and systems have been consolidated into one Oracle system used throughout the Council, including the general ledger, accounts payable and accounts receivable. There have been associated staff losses and some staff have very different roles within finance, as part of modernising the service. These changes took place effective 1 September 2010. This is part of the 'One Council' Improvement and Efficiency strategy.</p>	<p>My audit team will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ consider reviews performed by Internal audit on the system changes;■ review the migration of data from existing systems to the new financial system;■ review controls over the new financial IT systems;■ document and test the new financial systems;■ perform controls testing, taking consideration of Internal audits work; and■ substantively test the output during our final accounts audit.

Risk area	Audit response
<p>The Comprehensive Spending Review has put significant pressure on the Council to reduce costs. This may result in reductions to staff. The Council will need to assess the impact on the finance process and whether accounting is required for redundancy provisions.</p>	<p>My audit team will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ monitor changes to the finance team and review the closedown plan; and ■ review accounting arrangements and year end balances to account for redundancies in accordance with International Accounting Standard 37: Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets (IAS37).
<p>The Council has five arrangements accounted for under International Financial Reporting Interpretation Committee 12: Service Concession Arrangements (IFRIC12). The Council will need to continue to account for these appropriately, and consider any changes e.g. new asset transfers or variations to the original agreement.</p>	<p>My audit team will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ review arrangements to ensure any changes are identified and accounted for; and ■ audit year end balances.

Value for money risks

14 I will undertake my risk assessment for the vfm conclusion later in the year and communicate with you further then.

Testing strategy

On the basis of risks identified above I will produce a testing strategy which will consist of testing key controls and/or substantive tests of transaction streams and material account balances at year end.

15 I can carry out the testing both before and after the draft financial statements have been produced (pre- and post-statement testing).

16 Wherever possible, I will complete some substantive testing earlier in the year before the financial statements are available for audit. I have identified the following areas where substantive testing could be carried out early.

- review of changes to material financial systems and walkthrough tests to confirm our understanding of material financial systems;
- testing controls over journals, accounts payable and accounts receivable;
- year-end feeder system reconciliations.
- review of accounting policies under IFRS;
- review of working papers and changes already complete for IFRS;
- substantive testing of the first nine months income and expenditure;
- collation of information to issue our audit letters to experts, service organisations and auditors relied upon by the Council.

Where I identify other possible early testing, I will discuss it with officers.

17 Wherever possible, I will seek to rely on the work of Internal Audit to help meet my responsibilities. For 2010/11, I expect to be able to use the results of the following pieces of work.

- Journals;
- Accounts payable; and
- Accounts receivable

18 I will also seek to rely on the work of other auditors and experts, as appropriate, to meet my responsibilities. For 2010/11, I plan to rely on the work of other auditors in the following area:

- Brent Housing Partnership (PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PWC))

19 I also plan to rely on the work of experts in the following areas:

- Valuation of property, plant and equipment (Internal and External valuers);
- Valuation of pension fund assets and liabilities (Hewitts Actuaries);
- Provisions and contingent liabilities (Borough Solicitor); and
- Fair value disclosure of financial instruments (Arlingclose).

Value for money conclusion

I am required to give a statutory VFM conclusion on the Council's arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

20 This is based on two criteria, specified by the Commission, related to your arrangements for:

- securing financial resilience – focusing on whether the Council is managing its financial risks to secure a stable financial position for the foreseeable future; and
- challenging how the Council secures economy, efficiency and effectiveness – focusing on whether the Council is prioritising its resources within tighter budgets and improving productivity and efficiency.

21 I will plan a programme of VFM audit work based on my risk assessment.

22 I will plan a programme of VFM audit work based on my risk assessment.

Key milestones and deadlines

The Council is required to prepare the financial statements by 30 June 2011. I am required to complete the audit and issue the opinion and value for money conclusion by 30 September 2011.

23 The key stages in producing and auditing the financial statements are in table 2.

24 I will agree with you a schedule of working papers required to support the entries in the financial statements. The agreed fee is dependent on the timely receipt of accurate working papers.

25 Every week, during the audit, the audit team will meet with the key contact and review the status of all queries. I can arrange meetings at a different frequency depending on the need and the number of issues arising.

Table 2: **Proposed timetable**

Activity	Date
Control and early substantive testing	January 2011
Receipt of accounts	30 June 2011
Sending audit working papers to the auditor	30 June 2011
Start of detailed testing	14 June 2011
Progress meetings	Weekly
Present report to those charged with governance at the audit committee	September 2011 (to be confirmed)
Issue opinion and value for money conclusion	By 30 September 2011

The audit team

Table 3 shows the key members of the audit team for the 2010/11 audit.

Table 3: **Audit team**

Name	Contact details	Responsibilities
Andrea White District Auditor	a-white@audit-commission.gov.uk 0844 798 5784	Responsible for the overall delivery of the audit including the quality of outputs, signing the opinion and conclusion, and liaison with the Chief Executive.
Paul Viljoen Audit Manager	p-viljoen@audit-commission.gov.uk 0844 798 2688	Manages and coordinates the different elements of the audit work. Key point of contact for the Director of Finance.

Independence and objectivity

26 I am not aware of any relationships that may affect the independence and objectivity of the District Auditor and the audit staff, which I am required by auditing and ethical standards to communicate to you.

27 I comply with the ethical standards issued by the APB and with the Commission's requirements in respect of independence and objectivity as summarised in appendix 2.

Meetings

28 The audit team will ensure we have knowledge of your issues to inform our risk-based audit through regular liaison with key officers. Our proposals are set out in appendix 3.

Quality of service

29 I aim to provide you with a fully satisfactory audit service. If, however, you are unable to deal with any difficulty through me and my team please contact Chris Westwood, Director of Professional Practice, Audit Practice, Audit Commission, 1st Floor, Millbank Tower, Millbank, London SW1P 4HQ (c-westwood@audit-commission.gov.uk) who will look into any complaint promptly and to do what he can to resolve the position.

30 If you are still not satisfied you may of course take up the matter with the Audit Commission's Complaints Investigation Officer (The Audit Commission, Westward House, Lime Kiln Close, Stoke Gifford, Bristol BS34 8SR).

Planned outputs

31 My team will discuss and agree reports with the right officers before issuing them to the Audit Committee.

Table 4: **Planned outputs**

Planned output	Indicative date
Annual governance report	September 2011 (day to be confirmed)
Auditor's report giving an opinion on the financial statements	September 2011 (day to be confirmed)
Final accounts memorandum	December 2011
Annual audit letter	November 2011

Appendix 1 Basis for fee

The Audit Commission is committed to targeting its work where it will have the greatest effect, based upon assessments of risk and performance. This means planning work to address areas of risk relevant to our audit responsibilities and reflecting this in the audit fees.

The risk assessment process starts with the identification of the significant financial and operational risks applying to the Council with reference to:

- my cumulative knowledge of the Council:
 - planning guidance issued by the Audit Commission;
 - the specific results of previous and ongoing audit work;
- interviews with Council officers; and
- liaison with Internal Audit.

Assumptions

In setting the fee, I have assumed that:

- the level of risk in relation to the audit of the financial statements is not significantly different from that identified for 2009/10;
- the fee for the value for money conclusion is the same as for 2009/10
- you will inform me of significant developments impacting on the audit;
- Internal Audit meets the appropriate professional standards;
- Internal Audit undertakes appropriate work on all systems that provide material figures in the financial statements sufficient that I can place reliance for the purposes of our audit;
- you provide:
 - good quality working papers and records to support the financial statements by 30 June 2011;
 - information asked for within agreed timescales;
 - prompt responses to draft reports; and
- there is no allowance for extra work needed to address questions or objections raised by local government electors.

Where these assumptions are not met, I will be required to undertake additional work which is likely to result in an increased audit fee.

Appendix 2 Independence and objectivity

Auditors appointed by the Audit Commission are required to comply with the Commission's Code of Audit Practice and Standing Guidance for Auditors, which defines the terms of the appointment. When auditing the financial statements, auditors are also required to comply with auditing standards and ethical standards issued by the Auditing Practices Board (APB).

The main requirements of the Code of Audit Practice, Standing Guidance for Auditors and the standards are summarised below.

International Standard on Auditing (UK and Ireland) 260 (Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance) requires that the appointed auditor:

- discloses in writing all relationships that may bear on the auditor's objectivity and independence, the related safeguards put in place to protect against these threats and the total amount of fee that the auditor has charged the client; and
- confirms in writing that the APB's ethical standards are complied with and that, in the auditor's professional judgement, they are independent and their objectivity is not compromised.

The standard defines 'those charged with governance' as 'those persons entrusted with the supervision, control and direction of an entity'. In your case, the appropriate addressee of communications from the auditor to those charged with governance is the Audit Committee. The auditor reserves the right, however, to communicate directly with the Council on matters which are considered to be of sufficient importance.

The Commission's Code of Audit Practice has an overriding general requirement that appointed auditors carry out their work independently and objectively, and ensure that they do not act in any way that might give rise to, or could reasonably be perceived to give rise to, a conflict of interest. In particular, appointed auditors and their staff should avoid entering into any official, professional or personal relationships which may, or could reasonably be perceived to, cause them inappropriately or unjustifiably to limit the scope, extent or rigour of their work or impair the objectivity of their judgement.

The Standing Guidance for Auditors includes a number of specific rules.

The key rules relevant to this audit appointment are as follows.

- Appointed auditors should not perform additional work for an audited body (ie work over and above the minimum required to meet their statutory responsibilities) if it would compromise their independence or might give rise to a reasonable perception that their independence could be compromised. Where the audited body invites the auditor to carry out risk-based work in a particular area that cannot otherwise be justified as necessary to support the auditor's opinion and conclusions, it should be clearly differentiated within the Audit and Inspection Plan as being 'additional work' and charged for separately from the normal audit fee.
- Auditors should not accept engagements that involve commenting on the performance of other auditors appointed by the Commission on Commission work without first consulting the Commission.
- The District Auditor responsible for the audit should, in all but the most exceptional circumstances, be changed at least once every seven years, with additional safeguards in the last two years.
- The District Auditor and senior members of the audit team are prevented from taking part in political activity on behalf of a political party, or special interest group, whose activities relate directly to the functions of local government or NHS bodies in general, or to a particular local government or NHS body.

The District Auditor and members of the audit team must abide by the Commission's policy on gifts, hospitality and entertainment.

Appendix 3 Working together

Meetings

The audit team will ensure we have knowledge of your issues to inform our risk-based audit through regular liaison with key officers.

My proposal for the meetings is as follows.

Table 5: **Proposed meetings with officers**

Council officers	Audit Commission staff	Timing	Purpose
Director of Finance & Corporate Resources	AM and Team Leader (TL)	February, July, September	General update plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ February - audit plan;■ July - accounts progress; and■ September - annual governance report.
Deputy Director of Finance & Corporate Resources and Head of Financial Management	AM and TL	Quarterly	Update on audit issues.
Audit Committee	DA and AM, with TL as appropriate	As determined by the Committee	Formal reporting of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Audit Plan;■ Annual governance report; and■ Other issues as appropriate.

Sustainability

The Audit Commission is committed to promoting sustainability in our working practices and I will actively consider opportunities to reduce our impact on the environment. This will include:

- reducing paper flow by encouraging you to submit documentation and working papers electronically;
- use of video and telephone conferencing for meetings as appropriate; and
- reducing travel.

Appendix 4 Glossary

Annual audit letter

Report issued by the auditor to an audited body that summarises the audit work carried out in the period, auditors' opinions or conclusions (where appropriate) and significant issues arising from auditors' work.

Audit of the accounts

The audit of the accounts of an audited body comprises all work carried out by auditors in accordance with the Code to meet their statutory responsibilities under the Audit Commission Act 1998.

Audited body

A body to which the Audit Commission is responsible for appointing the external auditor, comprising both the members of the body and its management (the senior officers of the body). Those charged with governance are the members of the audited body. (See also 'Members' and 'Those charged with governance'.)

Auditing Practices Board (APB)

The body responsible in the UK for issuing auditing standards, ethical standards and other guidance to auditors. Its objectives are to establish high standards of auditing that meet the developing needs of users of financial information and to ensure public confidence in the auditing process.

Auditing standards

Pronouncements of the APB, which contain basic principles and essential procedures with which auditors are required to comply, except where otherwise stated in the auditing standard concerned.

Auditor(s)

Auditors appointed by the Audit Commission.

Code (the)

The Code of Audit Practice.

Commission (the)

The Audit Commission for Local Authorities and the National Health Service in England.

Directors

Members of the board who are collectively and individually responsible for the overall direction and control of the audited body. In NHS bodies there is a unitary board, consisting of executive members and part-time non-executive members, chaired by a non-executive member. The chief executive is responsible to the board for the day-to-day management of the organisation but, as accountable officer, is also responsible to the Department of Health for the proper stewardship of public money and assets. (See also 'Those charged with governance' and 'Audited body').

Ethical Standards

Pronouncements of the APB that contain basic principles that apply to the conduct of audits and with which auditors are required to comply, except where otherwise stated in the standard concerned.

Financial statements

The annual statement of accounts or accounting statements that audited bodies are required to prepare, which summarise the accounts of the audited body, in accordance with regulations and proper practices in relation to accounts.

Internal control

The whole system of controls, financial and otherwise, that is established in order to provide reasonable assurance of effective and efficient operations, internal financial control and compliance with laws and regulations.

Materiality (and significance)

The APB defines this concept as 'an expression of the relative significance or importance of a particular matter in the context of the financial statements as a whole. A matter is material if its omission would reasonably influence the decisions of an addressee of the auditor's report; likewise a misstatement is material if it would have a similar influence. Materiality may also be considered in the context of any individual primary statement within the financial statements or of individual items included in them. Materiality is not capable of general mathematical definition, as it has both qualitative and quantitative aspects'.

The term 'materiality' applies only in relation to the financial statements. Auditors appointed by the Commission have responsibilities and duties under statute, in addition to their responsibility to give an opinion on the financial statements, which do not necessarily affect their opinion on the financial statements.

The concept of 'significance' applies to these wider responsibilities and auditors adopt a level of significance that may differ from the materiality level applied to their audit in relation to the financial statements. Significance has both qualitative and quantitative aspects.

Members

The elected, or appointed, members of local government bodies who are responsible for the overall direction and control of the audited body. (See also 'Those charged with governance' and 'Audited body'.)

Regularity (of expenditure and income)

Whether, subject to the concept of materiality, the expenditure and income of the audited body have been applied for the purposes intended by parliament, and whether they conform with the authorities that govern them.

Remuneration report

Audited bodies are required to produce, and publish with the financial statements, a remuneration report that discloses the salary and pension entitlements of senior managers.

Statement on internal control/Annual Governance Statement

Local government bodies are required to publish a statement on internal control (SIC) with their financial statements (or with their accounting statements in the case of small bodies). The disclosures in the SIC are supported and evidenced by the body's assurance framework. At local authorities the SIC is known as the Annual Governance Statement and is prepared in accordance with guidance issued by CIPFA. Police authorities also produce a SIC in accordance with relevant CIPFA guidance. Local probation trusts are required to prepare a SIC in accordance with the requirements specified by HM Treasury in Managing Public Money.

Those charged with governance

Those charged with governance are defined in auditing standards as 'those persons entrusted with the supervision, control and direction of an entity'.

In local government bodies, those charged with governance, for the purpose of complying with auditing standards, are:

- for local authorities – the full council, audit committee (where established) or any other committee with delegated responsibility for approval of the financial statements;
- for police or fire authorities – the full authority, audit committee (where established) or other committee with delegated responsibility for approval of the financial statements;
- for local probation boards and trusts – the board or audit committee; and
- for other local government bodies – the full authority or board or council, audit committee (where established) or any other committee with delegated responsibility for approval of the financial statements

Audit committees are not mandatory for local government bodies, other than police authorities and local probation trusts. Other bodies are expected to put in place proper arrangements to allow those charged with governance to discuss audit matters with both internal and external auditors. Auditors should satisfy themselves that these matters, and auditors' reports, are considered at the level within the audited body that they consider to be most appropriate.

In NHS bodies, those charged with governance, for the purpose of complying with auditing standards, are the board of directors and, in respect of certain responsibilities, the audit committee on behalf of the board. Audit committees are mandatory in NHS bodies and are non-executive committees of the board. The main objective of the audit committee is to contribute independently to the board's overall process for ensuring that an effective internal control and risk management system is maintained.

Whole of Government Accounts

The Whole of Government Accounts initiative is to produce a set of consolidated financial accounts for the entire UK public sector on commercial accounting principles. Local government bodies, other than probation boards and trusts, are required to submit a consolidation pack to the department for Communities and Local Government which is based on, but separate from, their statutory accounts.

If you require a copy of this document in an alternative format or in a language other than English, please call:
0844 798 7070

© Audit Commission 2011.

Design and production by the Audit Commission Publishing Team.

Image copyright © Audit Commission.

The Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and Audited Bodies issued by the Audit Commission explains the respective responsibilities of auditors and of the audited body. Reports prepared by appointed auditors are addressed to non-executive directors, members or officers. They are prepared for the sole use of the audited body. Auditors accept no responsibility to:

- any director/member or officer in their individual capacity; or
- any third party.



Audit Commission

1st Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4HQ

Telephone: 0844 798 3131

Fax: 0844 798 2945

Textphone (minicom): 0844 798 2946