

# **The Indicative Audit Plan for Epsom and Ewell Borough Council**

Year ending 31 March 2025

July 2025



# Contents

Section	Page
Key developments impacting our audit approach	03
Introduction and headlines	10
Identified risks	13
Group audit	19
Our approach to materiality	21
IT audit strategy	24
Value for money arrangements	26
Logistics	30
Fees and related matters	33
Independence considerations	35
Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance	38
Delivering audit quality	40
Appendices	42

# 01 Key developments impacting our audit approach

# Local Government Reorganisation

## External factors

---

### English Devolution White Paper

On 16 December 2024, the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, Angela Rayner, Presented to Parliament the English Devolution White Paper.

The White Paper sets out the direction of travel for the devolution of power across England. Devolution is seen by the government as being fundamental in achieving the change the public expect and deserve. The government's aim is for devolution to promote growth, a joined-up delivery of public services, and politics being done with communities, not to them. England is one of the most centralised countries in the developed world. The goal is universal coverage of strategic authorities in England.

Strategic authorities will be a combination of pre-existing Combined Authorities and Mayoral Strategic Authorities (MSAs). They will be funded through an integrated settlement which can be used by the Authority across housing, regeneration, local growth, local transport, retrofit, skills and employment support. This removes the complexity of numerous grants, conditions and reporting requirements, simplifying it into a single mutually agreed outcomes framework monitored over a supply review period. In combination with this Mayors will be given more control over the devolution of transport, skills & employment support, housing and planning, environment and climate change, supporting business and research, reforming and joining up public services.

The government plans to facilitate a programme of local government reorganisation for 2-tier areas across England. It will also facilitate the reorganisation of unitary councils where there is evidence of failure, or where their size and/or boundaries are a hinderance to local decision making. This will be done in a phased approach and for most will mean creating councils serving a population of 500 000 or more. Along with devolution government wants to reset its relationship with local government, end micro-management and enable local governments through multi-year settlements.

The next steps are:

- A widening and deepening of devolution, expanding on the 2 new Mayors and 6 non-mayoral devolutions already noted in the white paper, with a priority programme for those with plans ready for action;
- An invitation from all remaining 2-tier areas and unitary councils where appropriate, to submit proposals for local reorganisation;
- And re-committing to the English Devolution Bill by putting the devolution framework into statute and moving to a systematic approach that ensures local leaders have the powers they need.

### Update

Surrey was not named by the government on 5 February 2025 as one of the six areas accepted onto the Devolution Priority Programme, however the government have stressed the 'urgency of creating sustainable unitary local government in Surrey', postponing the planned county elections in May 2025 to help 'speed up reorganisation and deliver the local ambitions for devolution with the benefits it will bring.'

Across Surrey all services would still be provided, but by newly formed unitary authorities, rather than the 11 district and borough councils and the county council. The details of this are yet to be determined. The new boundaries in Surrey are still to be agreed between the current county and district/borough councils and central government. The geographical split of the areas served by the new unitary authorities, along with how many there will be, remains to be confirmed - however it is likely to be made up of two or three unitary authorities.

The reorganisation process is expected to progress quickly. The next key milestone is the submission of an interim plan by 21 March 2025, outlining the nature and geography of any proposed devolved area, after which officials will provide feedback to support the development of the final proposals. The full and final proposal is set to be submitted by 9 May 2025. If approved, elections for the new unitary councils will be held in 2026 with new unitary authorities established by April 2027.

---

# Local Audit Reform

## External factors

### Proposals for an overhaul of the local audit system

On 18 December 2024, the Minister of State for Local Government and English Devolution, Jim McMahon OBE, wrote to local authority leaders and local audit firms to announce the launch of a strategy to overhaul the local audit system in England. The proposals were also laid in Parliament via a Written Ministerial Statement.

The government's strategy paper sets out its intention to streamline and simplify the local audit system, bringing as many audit functions as possible into one place and also offering insights drawn from audits. A new Local Audit Office will be established, with responsibilities for:

- Coordinating the system – including leading the local audit system and championing auditors' statutory reporting powers;
- Contract management, procurement, commissioning and appointment of auditors to all eligible bodies;
- Setting the Code of Audit Practice;
- Oversight of the quality regulatory framework (inspection, enforcement and supervision) and professional bodies;
- Reporting, insights and guidance including the collation of reports made by auditors, national insights of local audit issues and guidance on the eligibility of auditors.

The Minister also advised that, building on the recommendations of Redmond, Kingman and others, the government will ensure the core underpinnings of the local audit system are fit for purpose. The strategy therefore includes a range of other measures, including:

- setting out the vision and key principles for the local audit system;
- committing to a review of the purpose and users of local accounts and audit and ensuring local accounts are fit for purpose, proportionate and relevant to account users;
- enhancing capacity and capability in the sector;
- strengthening relationships at all levels between local bodies and auditors to aid early warning system; and
- increased focus on the support auditors and local bodies need to rebuild assurance following the clearing of the local audit backlog.

### Our Response

Grant Thornton welcomes the proposals, which we believe are much needed, and are essential to restore trust and credibility to the sector. For our part, we are proud to have signed 83% of our 2022/23 local government audit opinions without having to apply the local authority backstop. This compares with an average of less than 30% sign off for other firms in the market. We will be keen to work with the MHCLG, with existing sector leaders and with the Local Audit Office as it is established to support a smooth transition to the new arrangements.

# Key developments impacting our audit approach

## National Position

Local governments face many challenges, the pandemic along with the cost of living crisis has left local governments with economic, social, and health challenges to address:

**Staffing:** A key challenge facing councils in maintaining service sustainability is the growing difficulties in relation to workforce recruitment and retention. Councils struggle to attract and retain qualified staff, especially younger talent. Many councils have outdated recruitment processes and are heavily reliant on agency staff.

**Climate change:** As the impacts of climate change become increasingly evident, local government plays a pivotal role in mitigating and adapting to these changes. The UK’s targets for achieving net zero carbon emissions and local authority pledges must align into cohesive policies with common goals. This includes ongoing local economy investment in renewable energy, promoting sustainable transportation and implementing measures to enhance resilience against extreme weather events.

**Housing crisis:** The shortage of affordable housing continues to be an issue. There aren't enough social rented homes to meet demand and it’s difficult to find land for new housing developments. New requirements around net zero and other environmental considerations make it more complex to get planning permission. Local authorities therefore face the challenge of providing adequate housing while balancing environmental sustainability and statutory planning requirements.

**Funding :** Local governments face many challenges in securing funding, including declining grant income, slow tax revenue growth, and rising demand for services. These challenges can make it difficult for local government to balance their budgets, assess their revenue base, enforce taxes, and prevent tax evasion. Social care costs, maintaining aging infrastructure, SEND and homelessness are driving up council spending and cuts to discretionary services impact local communities. Strained budgets are making it challenging to fund essential services, infrastructure projects and the ongoing stream of section 114 notices will not come as a surprise this year.

**Digital Transformation :** The fast pace of technological advancement poses both opportunities and challenges for local government. The adoption of digital tools and platforms is crucial for improving service delivery, enhancing communication and streamlining administrative processes. However, many communities still lack access or ability to navigate essential technology which creates a digital divide. Local government needs to ensure inclusivity in its digital strategies, addressing disparities and ensuring all residents can benefit from the opportunities technology offers.

**Cybersecurity:** Local government needs to protect against malware and ransomware attacks. They also need to navigate central government policy shifts and constraints. With increased reliance on digital platforms, they become more vulnerable to cyber threats. Safeguarding sensitive data and ensuring the integrity of critical systems are paramount and local authorities must invest in robust cybersecurity measures, employee training and contingency plans to protect themselves.

## Our Response

Building and maintaining public trust is arguably the cornerstone of effective governance. Local government must prioritise transparency, open communication and meaningful public engagement to foster positivity within communities.

Despite councils’ best efforts, financial pressures are affecting the scale, range and quality of council services provided to local residents. Ultimately spending is increasingly concentrated on fewer people, so councils are less able to support local and national agendas on key issues such as housing, economic growth, and climate change.

Sound strategic financial management, collaboration with other levels of government and exploring alternative funding sources are vital for local authorities to overcome financial constraints and deliver quality services.

Our value for money audit work continues to identify significant weaknesses in all criteria of the Code of Audit Practice. This shows that local authorities are facing increasing pressure to provide services while managing change and reducing costs. We understand that the environment in which our audited bodies operate is dynamic and challenging and this understanding allows us to have insightful conversations and adapt our approach to delivering our audit work accordingly.

We know the difficulties and challenges faced within our Local Authority bodies and know there is a focus on improving quality and reducing costs. We will work with you as you strive to deliver these aims.

# Key developments impacting our audit approach

## Local Context

### Challenges of Local Government Reorganisation (LGR)

Although the development of reorganisation proposals are strategic, they may impact local decision-making before the formal reorganisation. Concerns arise regarding existing bodies potentially repurposing reserves, built up for specific projects, to cover overspending by successor entities. This creates an incentive for these bodies to deplete reserves before the merger to ensure funds are used as originally intended. Similarly, balances like the Community Infrastructure Levy may also be at risk of being redirected to unintended purposes in successor bodies.

To ensure appropriate decision-making during this period; councils should consider the following questions: Are earmarked reserves being used as intended? For projects extending beyond the Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) timeframe, can decision-making withstand scrutiny? Have local residents been consulted to align development plans with local needs? Are reserve balances maintained at a prudent level, considering that LGR does not exempt key staff from their statutory responsibilities?

### New accounting standards and reporting developments

- Local authorities will need to implement IFRS 16 Leases from 1 April 2024. The main difference from IAS 17 will be that leases previously assessed as operating leases by lessees will need to be accounted for on balance sheet as a liability and associated right of use asset. More information can be found on page 10.
- The FRC issued revisions to ISA (UK) 600 ‘Audits of group financial statements (including the work of component auditors)’. The revised standard includes new and revised requirements that better aligns the standard with recently revised standards such as ISQM 1, ISA 220 (Revised) and ISA 315 (Revised 2019). The new and revised requirements strengthen the auditor’s responsibilities related to professional scepticism, planning and performing a group audit, two-way communications between the group auditor and component auditor, and documentation.

## Our Response

Auditors will scrutinize key decisions to identify any potential misuse of funds as part of their Value for Money assessments and may use statutory powers if warranted.

We will perform a detailed review of the Authority's implementation of IFRS 16 including procedures to ensure the completeness of its consideration of leases.

We will carry out additional procedures to comply with the revised standards in respect of our Group audit work.



# Key developments impacting our audit approach (continued)

## Our commitments

---

- As a firm, we are absolutely committed to audit quality and financial reporting in local government. Our proposed work and fee, as set out further in this Audit Plan, is that set out by the PSAA contracted scale fees for 2024/25,
  - We would like to offer a formal meeting with the Chief Executive twice a year, and with the Director of Finance quarterly as part of our commitment to keep you fully informed on the progress of the audit.
  - At an appropriate point within the audit, we would also like to meet informally with the Chair of your Audit and Scrutiny Committee, to brief them on the status and progress of the audit work to date.
  - Our Value for Money work will continue to consider the arrangements in place for you to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of your resources.
  - We will continue to provide you and your Audit and Scrutiny Committee with sector updates providing our insight on issues from a range of sources via our Audit and Scrutiny Committee updates.
  - We hold annual free 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 clients to support consistent and accurate financial reporting across the sector. This took place in March and we are pleased to confirm the Council's finance team attended the session.
- 





# IFRS 16 Leases



## Summary

IFRS 16 Leases is now mandatory for all Local Government (LG) bodies from 1 April 2024. The standard sets out the principles for the recognition, measurement, presentation and disclosure of leases and replaces IAS 17. The objective is to ensure that lessees and lessors provide relevant information in a manner that faithfully represents those transactions. This information gives a basis for users of financial statements to assess the effect that leases have on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of an entity.

## Introduction

IFRS 16 updates the definition of a lease to:

- “a contract, or part of a contract, that conveys the right to use an asset (the underlying asset) for a period of time in exchange for consideration.” In the public sector the definition of a lease is expanded to include arrangements with nil consideration.

This means that arrangements for the use of assets for little or no consideration (sometimes referred to as peppercorn rentals) are now included within the definition of a lease.

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

There are however the following exceptions:

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

Lessor accounting is substantially unchanged leading to asymmetry of approach for some leases (operating). However, if an LG body is an intermediary lessor, there is a change in that the judgement, as to whether the lease out is an operating or finance lease, is made with reference to the right of use asset rather than the underlying asset. The principles of IFRS 16 will also apply to the accounting for PFI assets and liabilities.

## Systems and processes

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

- accounting policies and disclosures
- application of judgment and estimation
- related internal controls that will require updating, if not overhauling, to reflect changes in accounting policies and processes
- systems to capture the process and maintain new lease data and for ongoing maintenance
- accounting for what were operating leases
- identification of peppercorn rentals and recognising these as leases under IFRS 16 as appropriate

## Planning enquiries

We will review the impact of IFRS 16 implementation during our final stage of the audit and design procedures as necessary to assess the risk.

# 02 Introduction and Headlines

# Introduction and headlines



## Purpose

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

## Respective responsibilities

- The National Audit Office ('the NAO') has issued the 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 Epsom and Ewell Borough Council. We draw your attention to these documents.

## Indicative Audit Plan

This Plan is an Indicative Audit plan which reflects not all planning procedures have been completed. The incomplete procedures that we are currently addressing include:

- Final reviews of our assessment and the consideration of how ISA 600 affects our audit strategy for the Council's Group accounts.
- Our review of the planning inquiry responses received from management and confirming these responses with Those Charged with Governance.
- Although we have conducted an initial review of the Council's arrangements for implementing IFRS 16, we are currently unable to fully assess the Council's readiness for the new standard or the expected impact on the Opening Balances. As a result, we cannot yet conclude our assessment of whether this new standard poses a significant risk of material misstatement to the financial statements.

We also are awaiting information from management in the following areas:

- Information regarding the IT controls and the completion of our cyber security queries for the year.
- We are awaiting responses from legal officers regarding standard queries we raise regarding potential provisions and other legal matters that could impact our audit approach.

The work we have completed has allowed us to finish the majority of our planning activities earlier than in the previous year. This will position us more strongly to begin the year-end audit. Moving forward, we will aim to initiate our planning work earlier to ensure that all planning procedures are completed by the end of March.


## Scope of our Audit

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

The audit of the financial statements does not relieve management or the Audit and Scrutiny 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 (continued)



## 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 control
- Valuation of Property Assets including Other land and Buildings and investment property
- Valuation of Defined Benefit Pensions Liability

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

## Group Audit

The Council is required to prepare group financial statements that consolidate the financial information of Epsom and Ewell Property Investment Company (EEPIC) which is 100% owned by the Council. The company was primarily established to invest in high-quality commercial properties located outside of the Borough, with the goal of generating rental yields for the Council.

## Materiality

We have determined planning materiality to be £1,300k (PY £1,040k for the Group, which equates to 2.5% of your prior year gross operating costs for the year. For the Council we have determined the planning materiality to be £1,235k (PY 975k).

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 £62k for the Group and the Council (PY £52k).

## Value for Money arrangements

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

- Our 2023/24 Annual Audit Report raised the following Key Recommendation. "The Council should develop a clear approach towards transparency. The Council should be mindful of requirements to be open and accountable." The need for action in relation to transparency was also highlighted the LGA Peer Review of March 2024. To assess the Council's arrangements to strengthen transparency in decision making, we will follow up with a review of documentation and discussion with key officers. We will continue to monitor and update our risk assessment and responses until we issue our Auditor's Annual Report. We will continue to monitor and update our risk assessment and responses until we issue our Auditor's Annual Report.

## Audit logistics

Our planning audit has taken place in March and April our planning work is substantially complete subject to the satisfactory conclusion of the ongoing matters referred to on slide 11. Our final visit will take place between September to December 2025. We will also undertake early sample selection in July/August. Our key deliverables are this Audit Plan, our Audit Findings Report, our Auditor's Report and Auditor's Annual Report.

Our proposed fee for the audit is £169,922 (PY: £152,455) for the Council, this does not include the impact of additional work required on IFRS 16 and is subject to the Council delivering a good set of financial statements and working papers and no significant new financial reporting matters arising that require additional time and/or specialist input.

We have complied with the Financial Reporting Council's Ethical Standard (revised 2024) 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


# 03 Identified risks



# 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.

Significant risk	Risk relates to	Audit team’s assessment	Planned audit procedures
Management override of controls	Council	<p>Under ISA 240 there is a non-rebuttable presumed risk that the risk of management override of controls is present in all entities. The Authority faces external scrutiny of its spending, and this could potentially place management under undue pressure in terms of how they report performance.</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.</p>	<p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evaluate the design effectiveness of management controls over journals;</li><li>• Analyse the journals listing and determine the criteria for selecting high risk unusual journals;</li><li>• Test unusual journals recorded during the year and after the draft accounts stage for appropriateness and corroboration;</li><li>• Gain an understanding of the accounting estimates and critical judgements applied made by management and consider their reasonableness with regard to corroborative evidence; and</li><li>• Evaluate the rationale for any changes in accounting policies, estimates or significant unusual transactions.</li></ul>



“In determining significant risks, the auditor may first identify those assessed risks of material misstatement that have been assessed higher on the spectrum of inherent risk to form the basis for considering which risks may be close to the upper end. Being close to the upper end of the spectrum of inherent risk will differ from entity to entity and will not necessarily be the same for an entity period on period. It may depend on the nature and circumstances of the entity for which the risk is being assessed. The determination of which of the assessed risks of material misstatement are close to the upper end of the spectrum of inherent risk, and are therefore significant risks, is a matter of professional judgment, unless the risk is of a type specified to be treated as a significant risk in accordance with the requirements of another ISA (UK).” (ISA (UK) 315).

In making the review of unusual significant transactions “the auditor shall treat identified significant related party transactions outside the entity’s normal course of business as giving rise to significant risks.” (ISA (UK) 550).



Management should expect engagement teams to challenge them in areas that are complex, significant or highly judgmental which may be the case for accounting estimates, going concern, related parties and similar areas. Management should also expect to provide 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 (continued)

Significant risk	Risk relates to	Audit team's assessment	Planned audit procedures
Valuation of Property assets including – Other Land and Buildings- £62 million and Investment Properties- Group- £115 million Council- £64 million	Group and Council	<p>The Council revalues high value Other Land and buildings on an annual basis and the remainder of assets on a rolling five-yearly basis. The Council as required by the Code has all Investment properties revalued on an annual basis.</p> <p>The valuation represents a significant estimate by management in the financial statements due to the size of the numbers involved and the sensitivity of this estimate to changes in key assumptions.</p> <p>We therefore identified valuation Property assets including Investment Properties and Other Land and buildings, particularly revaluations and impairments, as a significant risk.</p> <p>The significant risk relates to the complexity of the valuation and is pinpointed to the key inputs and assumptions underlying the valuations including land values, build cost indices, gross internal areas, obsolescence, rental values, vacancy rates and yields.</p>	<p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate management's processes and assumptions for the calculation of the estimate, the instructions issued to valuation experts and the scope of their work;</li> <li>Evaluate the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the valuation expert;</li> <li>Write to the valuer to confirm the basis on which the valuation was carried out to ensure that the requirement of the Code are met and discuss this basis where there are any departures from the Code;</li> <li>Challenge the information and assumptions used by the valuer to assess completeness and consistency with our understanding;</li> <li>Complete analytical procedures on the valuation report, with reference to external market data, to identify those assets at greater risk of material misstatement.</li> <li>Assess how management have challenged the valuations produced by the professional valuer to assure themselves that these represent the materially correct current value;</li> <li>Test revaluations made during the year to see if they are input correctly into the Authority's asset register; and</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
Valuation of the pension fund net liability - assumptions applied by the professional actuary in their calculation	Council	<p>The Council's pension fund net liability, as reflected in its balance sheet as the net liability on defined pension scheme, represents a significant estimate in the financial statements.</p> <p>The pension fund net liability is considered a significant estimate due to its value in the Authority's balance sheet and the sensitivity of the estimates to changes in key assumptions.</p> <p>We therefore identified valuation of the Council's pension fund net liability as a significant risk. We have pinpointed this significant risk to the assumptions applied by the professional actuary in their calculation of the net liability.</p>	<p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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;</li> <li>Assess the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the actuary who carried out the Authority's pension fund valuation;</li> <li>Assess the accuracy and completeness of the information provided by the Authority to the actuary to estimate the liability;</li> <li>Test the consistency of pension fund asset and liability and disclosures in the notes to the core financial statements with the actuarial report from the actuary;</li> <li>Review the Council and the actuary's assessment of IFRIC 14 and test its reasonableness in relation to if any adjustments are required.</li> <li>Undertake procedures to confirm the reasonableness of the actuarial assumptions made by reviewing the report of the consulting actuary ( as auditor's expert) and performing any additional procedures suggested within the report; and</li> <li>Obtain assurances from the auditor of Surrey 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.</li> </ul>


# Significant risks identified (continued)

Significant risk	Risk relates to	Audit team's assessment	Planned audit procedures
The revenue cycle includes fraudulent transactions	Group and Council	<p>Under ISA (UK) 240 there is a rebuttable presumed risk that revenue may be misstated due to the improper recognition of revenue. We have considered all revenue streams of the Council, and we have rebutted this risk for all revenue streams.</p> <p>For revenue streams that are derived from Council Tax, Business Rates and Grants we have rebutted this risk on the basis that they are income streams primarily derived from grants or formula-based income from central government and taxpayers and that opportunities to manipulate the recognition of these income streams is very limited.</p> <p>For other revenue streams, we have identified from our experiences as your auditor and through our understanding of your business processed around revenue recognition that the risk of fraud arising from revenue recognition could be rebutted, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is little incentive to manipulate revenue recognition;</li> <li>- Opportunities to manipulate revenue recognition are very limited;</li> <li>- The culture and ethical frameworks of local authorities, including Epsom and Ewell Borough Council, mean that all forms of fraud are seen as unacceptable.</li> </ul> <p>We do not consider this to be a significant risk for the Group and Council.</p>	<p>We do not consider this to be a significant risk and standard audit procedures will be carried out. We will keep this rebuttal under review throughout the audit to ensure this judgement remains appropriate. We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate the Council's accounting policy for recognition of income for appropriateness and compliance with the Code;</li> <li>• Update our understanding of the system for accounting for the income and evaluate the design of associated processes and controls;</li> <li>• Agree on a sample basis relevant income and year end receivable/income accruals to invoices, loans and lease agreements and cash payment or other supporting evidence; and</li> <li>• We will carry out testing on sample basis of invoices issued and cash received in the period prior to and following 31 March 2025 to determine whether income is recognised in the correct accounting period, in accordance with the amounts billed to the corresponding parties.</li> </ul>
The expenditure cycle includes fraudulent transactions	Group and Council	<p>Practice Note 10 (PN10) states that as most public bodies are net spending bodies, then the risk of material misstatements due to fraud related to expenditure may be greater than the risk of material misstatements due to fraud related to revenue recognition. As a result under PN10, there is a requirement to consider the risk that expenditure may be misstated due to the improper recognition of expenditure.</p> <p>We have completed a risk assessment of all expenditure streams for the Group. We have considered each material expenditure area, and the control environment. We have concluded that there is no significant risk as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The control environment around expenditure recognition (understood through our documented risk assessment and understanding of your business processes) is considered to be strong; and</li> <li>• We have not found significant issues, errors or fraud in expenditure recognition in the prior year audits.</li> </ul>	<p>We do not consider this to be a significant risk and standard audit procedures will be carried out. We will keep this rebuttal under review throughout the audit to ensure this judgement remains appropriate. We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate the Council's accounting policy for recognition of expenditure for appropriateness and compliance with the Code;</li> <li>• Update our understanding of the system for accounting for the expenditure and evaluate the design of associated processes and controls;</li> <li>• Agree on a sample basis relevant expenditure and year end payables and accruals to invoices or other supporting evidence; and</li> <li>• We will carry out testing on a sample basis of invoices received and cash paid in the period prior to and following 31 March 2025 to determine whether expenditure is recognised in the correct accounting period, in accordance with the amounts billed to the corresponding parties.</li> </ul>

# Other risks identified

Other risks are, in the auditor’s judgement, those where the likelihood of material misstatement cannot be reduced to remote, without the need for gaining an understanding of the associated control environment, along with the performance of an appropriate level of substantive work. The risk of misstatement for another risk is lower than that for a significant risk, and they are not considered to be areas that are highly judgemental, or unusual in relation to the day-to-day activities of the business.

Risk	Description	Planned audit procedures
Implementation of IFRS 16	<p>The CIFPA Code of practice on Local Government Accounting requires authorities to apply the new leasing standard IFRS 16 from 1 April 2024.</p> <p>Under the new standard the current distinction between operating and finance leases is removed for lessees and, subject to certain exceptions, lessees will recognise all leases on their balance sheet as a right of use asset and a liability to make the lease payments.</p> <p>There is a risk that the Council’s processes do not capture all the arrangements that convey the right to use an asset, resulting in a failure to correctly account for the new leasing standard IFRS16.</p> <p>Until we see the full impact of this new standard on the financial statements and the complexity of the judgements made in the standards implementation we are not able to determine if this is a significant risk. Presently based on our review of the prior year lease disclosure we consider it most likely this will be an “other risk” and does not pose a significant risk of misstatement to the financial statements. We will keep this assessment under review throughout the audit to ensure this judgement remains appropriate.</p>	<p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evaluate the Council’s processes to identify all arrangements conveying the use of an asset to assess the impact of IFRS16 on the 2024/25 financial statements.</li><li>• Check that the impact on assets, liabilities, reserves and income and expenditure has been appropriately recorded within the financial statements.</li><li>• Assess the completeness of the disclosures made in the 2024/25 financial statements with reference to the 2024/25 CIFPA Code of practice on Local Government Accounting.</li></ul>



“The auditor determines whether there are any risks of material misstatement at the assertion level for which it is not possible to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence through substantive procedures alone. The auditor is required, in accordance with ISA (UK) 330 (Revised July 2017), to design and perform tests of controls that address such risks of material misstatement when substantive procedures alone do not provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence at the assertion level. As a result, when such controls exist that address these risks, they are required to be identified and evaluated.” (ISA (UK) 315)

# 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 financial statements, consider and decide upon any objections received in relation to the financial statements;
  - issuing a report in the public interest or written recommendations to the Council under section 24 of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 (the Act);
  - application to the court for a declaration that an item of account is contrary to law under section 28 or a judicial review under section 31 of the Act;
  - 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.



# 04 Group Audit

# Group audit scope and risk assessment

In accordance with ISA (UK) 600 Revised, 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	Risk of material misstatement to the group	Planned audit approach and level of response required under ISA (UK) 600 Revised	Response performed by	Risks identified
Epsom and Ewell Borough Council	Yes	Full audit procedures of Council financial statements.	Group auditor- Grant Thornton	See risks noted slides 14-18.
Epsom and Ewell Property Investment Company (EPPIC).	Yes	Specific audit procedures and Analytical procedures at group level	Group auditor- Grant Thornton	Significant risk – Investment properties. Other areas of focus- Cash and cash equivalents, Investment property trading account, Debtors and Creditors.

## Involvement in the work of component auditors

In relation to our work, we do not plan to place reliance on the Component auditor’s work. We will therefore seek to undertake specific procedures on the balances mentioned above.

## Fraud and litigation


We have not been made aware of any actual or attempted frauds in the year during our planning procedures performed to date. Should any factors arise in relation to fraud risk or actual or attempted fraud we ask that you inform us of this at the earliest possible opportunity.

# 05 Our approach to materiality

# 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
01	<b>Determination</b> We have determined planning materiality (financial statement materiality for the planning stage of the audit) based on professional judgement in the context of our knowledge of the Council and Group, including consideration of factors such as stakeholder expectations, industry developments, financial stability and reporting requirements for the financial statements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We determine planning materiality in order to:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>establish what level of misstatement could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements</li> <li>assist in establishing the scope of our audit engagement and audit tests</li> <li>determine sample sizes and</li> <li>assist in evaluating the effect of known and likely misstatements in the financial statements</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
02	<b>Other factors</b> An item does not necessarily have to be large to be considered to have a material effect on the financial statements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An item may be considered to be material by nature when it relates to:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>instances where greater precision is required</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
03	<b>Reassessment of materiality</b> Our assessment of materiality is kept under review throughout the audit process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>
04	<b>Matters we will report to the Audit and Scrutiny Committee</b> Whilst our audit procedures are designed to identify misstatements which are material to our opinion on the financial statements as a whole, we nevertheless report to the Audit and Scrutiny 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We report to the Audit and Scrutiny Committee any unadjusted misstatements of lesser amounts to the extent that these are identified by our audit work.</li> <li>In the context of the Council and Group, we propose that an individual difference could normally be considered to be clearly trivial if it is less than £62,000.</li> <li>If management have corrected material misstatements identified during the course of the audit, we will consider whether those corrections should be communicated to the Audit and Scrutiny Committee to assist it in fulfilling its governance responsibilities.</li> </ul>



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; Judgments about materiality are made in light of surrounding circumstances, and are affected by the size or nature of a misstatement, or a combination of both; and Judgments about matters that are material to users of the financial statements are based on a consideration of the common financial information needs of users as a group. The possible effect of misstatements on specific individual users, whose needs may vary widely, is not considered. (ISA (UK) 320)

# 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.

	Amount (£)	Qualitative factors considered
Materiality for the group entity financial statements	1,300,000	Materiality has been set at 2.5% of the Group’s gross expenditure.
Performance Materiality for Group entity Financial statements	975,000	Set at 70% of materiality, this is the same as in the prior year.
Materiality for the Council financial statements	1,235,000	Materiality has been set at 2.2% of the Council’s gross expenditure.
Council performance Materiality	926,000	Set at 70% of materiality, this is the same as in the prior year.
Performance materiality for EEPIC will be applied when we test the subsidiary balances on a disaggregated basis. This approach ensures that these balances, when examined individually, undergo a review with adequate detail. The establishment of this separate performance materiality is mandated by the updated revisions to ISA 600.	536,000	Per ISA 600 separate performance materialities is required for Epsom and Ewell Property Investment Company (EEPIC). This has been set at 55% of Group materiality for these bodies.
Triviality	65,000	This is set at 5% of materiality.





# 06 IT audit strategy

# IT audit strategy

In accordance with ISA (UK) 315, we are required to obtain an understanding of the IT environment related to all key business processes, identify all risks from the use of IT related to those business process controls judged relevant to our audit and assess the relevant IT general controls (ITGCs) in place to mitigate them. Our audit will include completing an assessment of the design and implementation of ITGCs related to security management; technology acquisition, development and maintenance; and technology infrastructure.

The following IT applications are in scope for IT controls assessment based on the planned financial statement audit approach, we will perform the indicated level of assessment:

IT application	Audit area	Planned level IT audit assessment
Civica Financials	General ledger and Financial reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>ITGC assessment design and implementation</li></ul>
ITrent	Payroll	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>ITGC assessment design and implementation</li></ul>

To date we have not been made of any new system implementation or Cyber security incident which would require additional audit procedures for the 2024-25 financial year’s audit.

# **07 Value for Money Arrangements**

# Value for Money Arrangements

## Approach to Value for Money work for the period ended 31 March 2025

The National Audit Office issued its latest Value for Money guidance to auditors in November 2024. 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:



### 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.




### 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.



# Risks of significant VFM weaknesses



As part of our initial 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 on the table overleaf along with the further procedures we will perform. We will continue to review the body's arrangements and report any further risks of significant weaknesses we identify to those charged with governance. 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.

## 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

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



### Key recommendation

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



### Improvement recommendation

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



# Risks of significant weakness in VFM arrangements (continued)

## Initial Risk assessment of the Council’s VFM arrangements

The Code of Audit Practice 2024 (the Code) sets out that the auditor’s work is likely to fall into three broad areas: planning; additional risk-based procedures and evaluation; and reporting. We undertake initial planning work to inform this Audit Plan and the assumptions used to derive our fee. Consideration of prior year significant weakness and known areas of risk is a key part of the risk assessment for 2024/25. We will continue to evaluate risks of significant weakness and if further risks are identified, we will report these to those charged with governance. We set out our reported assessment below:

Criteria	2023/24 Auditor judgement on arrangements		2024/25 risk assessment	2024/25 risk-based procedures
Financial sustainability	A	No risks of significant weakness reported; improvement recommendations made	No risks of significant weakness identified	We will undertake sufficient work to document our understanding of your arrangements as required by the Code and follow up improvement recommendations made in 2023/24.
Governance	G	One Key recommendation reported which will require us to follow up in the 2024-25 audit year.	Our 2023/24 Annual Audit Report raised the following Key Recommendation. The Council should develop a clear approach towards transparency. The Council should be mindful of requirements to be open and accountable." The need for action in relation to transparency was also highlighted the LGA Peer Review of March 2024".	To assess the Council's arrangements to strengthen transparency in decision making, we will follow up with a review of documentation and discussion with key officers.
Improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness	A	No risks of significant weakness reported; improvement recommendations made	No risks of significant weakness identified	We will undertake sufficient work to document our understanding of your arrangements as required by the Code and follow up improvement recommendations made in 2023/24.

We will continue our review of your arrangements until we sign the opinion on your financial statements before we issue our auditor's annual report. Should any further risks of significant weakness be identified, we will report this to those charged with governance as soon as practically possible. We report our value for money work in our Auditor's Annual Report. Any significant weaknesses identified once we have completed our work will be reflected in your Auditor's Report and included within our audit opinion.

- G


No significant weaknesses in arrangements identified or improvement recommendation made.
- A

No significant weaknesses in arrangements identified, but improvement recommendations made.
- R

Significant weaknesses in arrangements identified and key recommendations made.

# 08 Logistics

# Logistics



# Our team and communications

## Grant Thornton core team

<b>Ade Oyerinde</b> Engagement Lead/ Key Audit Partner	<b>Usman Rasheed</b> Audit Manager	<b>Justine Thorpe</b> Value for Money Manager	<b>Amrita Sekhon</b> Audit Senior
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key contact for senior management and Audit and Scrutiny Committee</li><li>• Overall quality assurance</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Audit planning</li><li>• Resource management</li><li>• Performance management reporting</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Planning the Value for Money audit</li><li>• Drafting and agreeing the Annual Audit report with management.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Audit team management</li><li>• Day-to-day point of contact</li><li>• Audit fieldwork</li></ul>

Pool of specialists including IT and financial modelling

	Service delivery	Audit reporting	Audit progress	Technical support
Formal communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Annual client service review</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Audit Plan</li><li>• Audit Progress and Sector Update Reports</li><li>• The Audit Findings Report</li><li>• Auditor’s Annual Report</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Audit planning meetings</li><li>• Audit clearance meetings</li><li>• Communication of issues log</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Technical updates</li></ul>
Informal communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Open channel for discussion</li></ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Communication of audit issues as they arise</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Notification of up-coming issues</li></ul>

As part of our overall service delivery we may utilise colleagues who are based overseas, primarily in India and the Philippines. Those colleagues work on a fully integrated basis with our team members based in the UK and receive the same training and professional development programmes as our UK based team. They work as part of the engagement team, reporting directly to the Audit Senior and Manager and will interact with you in the same way as our UK based team albeit on a remote basis. Our overseas team members use a remote working platform which is based in the UK. The remote working platform (or Virtual Desktop Interface) does not allow the user to move files from the remote platform to their local desktop meaning all audit related data is retained within the UK.

# 09 Fees and related matters



# Our fee estimate

Our estimate of the audit fees is set out in the table across, along with the fees billed in the prior year

### 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 \(revised 2024\)](#) 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.

### PSAA

Local Government Audit fees are set by PSAA as part of their national procurement exercise. In 2023 PSAA awarded a contract of audit for Epsom and Ewell Borough Council to begin with effect from 2023/24. The scale fee set out in the PSAA contract for the 2024/25 audit is £x.

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

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

Any variation to the scale fee will be determined by PSAA in accordance with their procedures as set out here [Fee Variations Overview – PSAA](#)

### Updated Auditing Standards

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

Company	Audit Fee for 2023/24 (£)	Proposed fee for 2024/25 (£)
Council Audit	152,455	169,922
Additional work related to the implementation of IFRS 16 (estimate)	N/A	9,000
<b>Total (Exc. VAT)</b>	<b>152,455</b>	<b>178,922</b>

### Our fee estimate:

- We have set out below our specific assumptions made in arriving at our estimated audit 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
  - maintain adequate business processes and IT controls, supported by an appropriate IT infrastructure and control environment.
  - the implementation of ISA 600 to our Group audit approach for the Council and the new accounting standard of IFRS 16 are both new to the 2024/25 year. Therefore, at this stage we are not able to identify if additional costs will be incurred in relation to our work on these areas.

# 10 Independence considerations

# Independence considerations

As part of our assessment of our independence at planning we note the following matters:

Matter	Conclusions
Relationships with Grant Thornton	We are not aware of any relationships between Grant Thornton and the Council/Group that may reasonably be thought to bear on our integrity, independence and objectivity.
Relationships and Investments held by individuals	We have not identified any potential issues in respect of personal relationships with the Council/Group or investments in the Group held by individuals.
Employment of Grant Thornton staff	We are not aware of any former Grant Thornton partners or staff being employed, or holding discussions in respect of employment, by the Council/Group as a director or in a senior management role covering financial, accounting or control related areas.
Business relationships	We have not identified any business relationships between Grant Thornton and the Council and Group .
Contingent fees in relation to non-audit services	No contingent fee arrangements are in place for non-audit services provided.
Gifts and hospitality	We have not identified any gifts or hospitality provided to, or received from, a member of the Council and Group’s board, senior management or staff (that would exceed the threshold set in the Ethical Standard).

We confirm that there are no significant facts or matters that impact on our independence at planning as auditors that we are required or wish to draw to your attention and consider that an objective reasonable and informed third party would take the same view. The firm and each covered person have complied with the Financial Reporting Council’s Ethical Standard and confirm that we are independent and are able to express an objective opinion on the financial statements.

# Fees and non-audit services

The following tables below sets out the non-audit services charged from the beginning of the financial year to the current date, as well as the threats to our independence and safeguards have been applied to mitigate these threats.

The below non-audit services are consistent with the group’s policy on the allotment of non-audit work to your auditor

None of the below services were provided on a contingent fee basis

For the purposes of our audit, we have made enquiries of all Grant Thornton teams within the Grant Thornton International Limited network member firms providing services to Epsom and Ewell Borough Council. The table summarises all non-audit services which were identified. We have adequate safeguards in place to mitigate the perceived self-interest threat from these fees that is detailed in the table below.

Assurance Service Fees

Service	Fees £	Threats Identified	Safeguards applied
Certification of Housing Benefits (HB) Grant return	<p>For the 2022-23 audit the Core Fee was £45,450, with £45,000 of additional fees identified, due to additional testing as required by the DWP instructions. With a total of £90,450. The 2022-23 audit was certified on the 7 April 2025.</p> <p>At the time of writing, there is on-going discussion over appointment to audit both 2023-24 and 2024-25 HB claims. We anticipate the fees will be comparable to the above assuming similar levels of additional testing as in 2022-23.</p>	<p>Self-Interest (because this is a recurring fee)</p> <p>Self-review (because Grant Thornton provides audit services)</p>	<p>The level of this recurring fee taken on its own is not considered a significant threat to independence as the fee for this work is small in comparison to the total fee for the audit and in particular relative to Grant Thornton UK LLP’s turnover overall. Further, it is a fixed fee and there is no contingent element to it. These factors all mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level.</p> <p>To mitigate against the self-review threat , the timing of certification work is done after the audit has completed. Based on past experience, it is not expected that there will be material changes to housing benefit subsidy payable or receivable and PHR in future years. Any changes to the form will be agreed with the council before we conclude our report to any reporting body. Any changes to subsidy payable will be determined by DWP and we will have no involvement in the decision.</p> <p>The scope of the work does not include making decisions on behalf of management or recommending or suggesting a particular course of action for management to follow. We will perform the proposed service in line with the instructions and reporting framework issued by the reporting body.</p>

There are no other non audit services.

This covers all services provided by us and our network to the group, its directors and senior management and its affiliates, and other services provided to other known connected parties that may reasonably be thought to bear on our integrity, objectivity or independence.

# **11 Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance**



# Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance

Our communication plan	Audit Plan	Audit Findings
Respective responsibilities of auditor and management/those charged with governance	●	
Overview of the planned scope and timing of the audit, form, timing and expected general content of communications including significant risks and Key Audit Matters	●	
Planned use of internal audit	●	
Confirmation of independence and objectivity	●	●
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	●	●
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 Council and Group's accounting and financial reporting practices including accounting policies, accounting estimates and financial statement disclosures		●
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 involving management and/or which results in material misstatement of the financial statements		●
Non-compliance with laws and regulations		●
Unadjusted misstatements and material disclosure omissions		●

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

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

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

## Respective responsibilities

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

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

# 12 Delivering audit quality

# Delivering audit quality

## Our quality strategy

We deliver the highest standards of audit quality by focusing our investment on:

### Creating the right environment

Our audit practice is built around the markets it faces. Your audit team are focused on the Public Sector audit market and work with clients like you day in, day out. Their specialism brings experience, efficiency and quality.

### Building our talent, technology and infrastructure

We've invested in digital tools and methodologies that bring insight and efficiency and invested in senior talent that works directly with clients to deploy bespoke digital audit solutions.

### Working with premium clients

We work with great public sector clients that, like you, value audit, value the challenge a robust audit provides, and demonstrate the strongest levels of corporate governance. We're aligned with our clients on what right looks like.

Our objective is to be the best audit firm in the UK for the quality of our work and our client service, because we believe the two are intrinsically linked.

## How our strategy differentiates our service

Our investment in a specialist team, and leading tools and methodologies to deliver their work, has set us apart from our competitors in the quality of what we do.

The FRC highlighted the following as areas of particularly good practice in its recent inspections of our work:

- use of specialists, including at planning phases, to enhance our fraud risk assessment
- effective deployment of data analytical tools, particularly in the audit of journals

## The right people at the right time

We are clear that a focus on quality, effectiveness and efficiency is the foundation of great client service. By doing the right audit work, at the right time, with the right people, we maximise the value of your time and ours, while maintaining our second-to-none quality record.

Bringing you the right people means that we bring our specialists to the table early, resolving the key judgements before they impact the timeline of your financial reporting. The audit partner always retains the final call on the critical decisions; we use our experts when forming our opinions, but we don't hide behind them.

## Digital differentiation

We're a digital-first audit practice, and our investment in data analytics solutions has given our clients better assurance by focusing our work on transactions that carry the most risk. With digital specialists working directly with your teams, we make the most of the data that powers your business when forming our audit strategy.

## Oversight and control


Wherever your audit work is happening, we make sure that its quality meets your exacting requirements, and we emphasise communication to identify and resolve potential challenges early, wherever and however they arise. By getting matters on the table before they become "issues", we give our clients the time and space to deal with them effectively.

Quality underpins everything at Grant Thornton, as our FRC inspection results in the chart below attest to. We're growing our practice sustainably, and that means focusing where we know we can excel without compromising our strong track record or our ability to deliver great audits. It's why we will only commit to auditing clients where we're certain we have the time and resource, but, most importantly, capabilities and specialist expertise to deliver. You're in safe hands with the team; they bring the right blend of experience, energy and enthusiasm to work with you and are fully supported by myself and the rest of our firm.

Wendy Russell  
Partner, UK Head of Audit



FRC's Audit Quality Inspection and Supervision Inspection  
(% of files awarded in each grading, in the most recent report for each firm)



# 13 Appendices

# Escalation Policy



## The Backstop

The Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities have introduced an audit backstop date on a rolling basis to encourage timelier completion of local government audits.

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

## Escalation Process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Aim

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



# IFRS reporters New or revised accounting standards that are in effect

## First time adoption of IFRS 16

Lease liability in a sale and leaseback

- IFRS 16 was implemented by LG bodies from 1 April 2024, with early adoption possible from 1 April 2022. The standard sets out the principles for the recognition, measurement, presentation and disclosure of leases and replaces IAS17. The objective is to ensure that lessees and lessors provide relevant information in a manner that faithfully represents those transactions. This information gives a basis for users of financial statements to assess the effect that leases have on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of an entity.
- This year will be the first year IFRS 16 is adopted fully within Local Government.

## IAS 1 amendments

Non-current liabilities with covenants

- These amendments clarify how conditions with which an entity must comply within twelve months after the reporting period affect the classification of a liability. The amendments also aim to improve information an entity provides related to liabilities subject to these conditions.

## Amendment to IAS 7 and IFRS 7

Supplier finance arrangements

- These amendments require disclosures to enhance the transparency of supplier finance arrangements and their effects on an entity's liabilities, cash flows and exposure to liquidity risk. The disclosure requirements are the IASB's response to investors' concerns that some companies' supplier finance arrangements are not sufficiently visible, hindering investors' analysis.

# IFRS reporters Future financial reporting changes

## IFRS reporters future financial reporting changes

These changes will apply to local government once adopted by the Code of practice on local authority accounting (the Code).

## Amendments to IAS 21 – Lack of exchangeability

IAS 21 has been amended by the IASB to specify how an entity should assess whether a currency is exchangeable and how it should determine a spot exchange rate when exchangeability is lacking. The amendments are expected to be adopted by the Code from **1 April 2025**.

## Amendments to IFRS 9 and IFRS 7 – Classification and measurement of financial instruments

These amendments clarify the requirements for the timing of recognition and derecognition of some financial assets and liabilities, adds guidance on the SPPI criteria, and includes updated disclosures for certain instruments. The amendments are expected to be adopted by the Code **in future years**.

## IFRS 19 Subsidiaries without Public Accountability: Disclosures

IFRS 19 provides reduced disclosure requirements for eligible subsidiaries. A subsidiary is eligible if it does not have public accountability and has an ultimate or intermediate parent that produces consolidated financial statements available for public use that comply with IFRS Accounting Standards. IFRS 19 is a voluntary standard for eligible subsidiaries and is expected to be adopted by the Code **in future years**.

## IFRS 18 Presentation and Disclosure in the Financial Statements

IFRS 18 will replace IAS 1 Presentation of Financial Statements. All entities reporting under IFRS Accounting Standards will be impacted.

The new standard will impact the structure and presentation of the statement of profit or loss as well as introduce specific disclosure requirements. Some of the key changes are:

- Introducing new defined categories for the presentation of income and expenses in the income statement
- Introducing specified totals and subtotals, for example the mandatory inclusion of 'Operating profit or loss' subtotal.
- Disclosure of management defined performance measures
- Enhanced principles on aggregation and disaggregation which apply to the primary financial statements and notes.

IFRS 18 is expected to be adopted by the CIPFA Code **in future years**.

# The Grant Thornton Digital Audit – Inflo

A suite of tools utilised throughout the audit process

## 01 Collaborate

Information requests are uploaded by the engagement team and directed to the right member of your team, giving a clear place for files and comments to be uploaded and viewed by all parties.

### What you'll see

- Individual requests for all information required during the audit
- Details regarding who is responsible, what the deadline is, and a description of what is required
- Graphs and charts to give a clear overview of the status of requests on the engagement




## 02 Ingest

The general ledger and trial balance are uploaded from the finance system directly into Inflo. This enables samples, analytical procedures, and advance data analytics techniques to be performed on the information directly from your accounting records.

### What you'll see

- A step by step guide regarding what information to upload
- Tailored instructions to ensure the steps follow your finance system




## 03 Detect

Journals interrogation software which puts every transaction in the general ledger through a series of automated tests. From this, transactions are selected which display several potential unusual or higher risk characteristics.

### What you'll see

- Journals samples selected based on the specific characteristics of your business
- A focussed approach to journals testing, seeking to only test and analyse transactions where there is the potential for risk or misstatement





© 2025 Grant Thornton. All rights reserved.

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