


External Audit Plan

Year ending 31 March 2018

Herefordshire Council

26 January 2018



Contents



Your key Grant Thornton team members are:

Jon Roberts

Partner

T: 0117 305 7699

E: jon.roberts@uk.gt.com

Zoe Thomas

Engagement Manager

T: 0121 232 5 277

E: zoe.thomas@uk.gt.com

Zak Francis

Engagement In-Charge

T: 0121 232 5164

E: zak.francis@uk.gt.com

Section

1. Introduction & headlines
2. Deep business understanding
3. Significant risks identified
4. Reasonably possible risks identified
5. Other matters
6. Materiality
7. Value for Money arrangements
8. Audit logistics, team & audit fees
9. Early close
10. Independence & non-audit services

Page

- 3
- 4
- 5
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13

Appendices

- A. Revised ISAs

16

The contents of this report relate only to the matters which have come to our attention, which we believe need to be reported to you as part of our audit planning process. It is not a comprehensive record of all the relevant matters, which may be subject to change, and in particular we cannot be held responsible to you for reporting all of the risks which may affect the Council or any weaknesses in your internal controls. This report has been prepared solely for your benefit and should not be quoted in whole or in part without our prior written consent. We do not accept any responsibility for any loss occasioned to any third party acting, or refraining from acting on the basis of the content of this report, as this report was not prepared for, nor intended for, any other purpose.

Grant Thornton UK LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales: No.OC307742. Registered office: 30 Finsbury Square, London, EC2A 1AG. A list of members is available from our registered office. Grant Thornton UK LLP is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority. Grant Thornton UK LLP is a member firm of Grant Thornton International Ltd (GTIL). GTIL and the member firms are not a worldwide partnership. Services are delivered by the member firms. GTIL and its member firms are not agents of, and do not obligate, one another and are not liable for one another's acts or omissions.

Introduction & headlines

Purpose

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

Respective responsibilities

The National Audit Office ('the NAO') has issued a document entitled Code of Audit Practice ('the Code'). This summarises where the responsibilities of auditors begin and end and what is expected from the audited body. Our respective responsibilities are also set 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 the Council. We draw your attention to both of these documents on the [PSAA website](#).

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:

- financial statements (including the Annual Governance Statement) that have been prepared by management with the oversight of those charged with governance (the Audit and Governance Committee); and
- Value for Money arrangements in place at the Council for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in your use of resources.

The audit of the financial statements does not relieve management or the Audit and Governance Committee of your responsibilities. It is the responsibility of the Council to ensure that proper arrangements are in place for the conduct of its business, and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for. We have considered how the Council is fulfilling these responsibilities.

Our audit approach is based on a thorough understanding of the Council's business and is risk based.

Significant risks

Those risks requiring specific 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 plant and equipment
- Pension liability

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

Materiality

We have determined planning materiality to be £5.9m, which equates to 1.8% of your gross expenditure for 2016/17. We are obliged to report uncorrected omissions or misstatements other than those which are 'clearly trivial' to those charged with governance. Clearly trivial has been set at £0.295m.

Value for Money arrangements

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

- Financial sustainability
- Management of the capital programme

Audit logistics

Our interim visits will take place in January and March and our final visit will take place in June and July. Our key deliverables are this Audit Plan and our Audit Findings Report.

Our fee for the audit will be no less than £124,405. (PY: £124,405 plus a fee variation yet to be finalised with PSAA).

Independence

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

Deep business understanding

Changes to service delivery

Commercialisation

The scale of investment activity, primarily in commercial property, has increased as local authorities seek to maximise income generation. These investments are often discharged through a company, partnership or other investment vehicle. Local authorities need to ensure that their commercial activities are presented appropriately, in compliance with the CIPFA Code of Practice and statutory framework, such as the Capital Finance Regulations. Where borrowing to finance these activities, local authorities need to comply with CIPFA's Prudential Code. A new version is due to be published in December 2017.

Devolution

The Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016 provides the legal framework for the implementation of devolution deals with combined authorities and other areas.

Both Herefordshire Council and the Marches LEP are 'observer' authorities in the West Midlands Combined Authority.

Changes to the CIPFA 2017/18 Accounting Code

CIPFA have introduced other minor changes to the 2017/18 Code which confirm the going concern basis for local authorities, and updates for Leases, Service Concession arrangements and financial instruments.

Changes to financial reporting requirements

Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 (the Regulations)

The Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) is currently undertaking a review of the Regulations, which may be subject to change. The date for any proposed changes has yet to be confirmed, so it is not yet clear or whether they will apply to the 2017/18 financial statements.

Under the 2015 Regulations local authorities are required to publish their accounts along with the auditors opinion by 31 July 2018.

Changes to the prudential code coming into force in 2018/19:

Following consultation it is likely that there will be changes to the Local authorities Investment code. The changes are aimed at providing more transparency and openness in Investment activity.

There are also changes proposed to the determination of the minimum revenue provision (MRP). This could impact on the assumptions made in the recent changes to the basis of MRP undertaken during 2017/18 in Herefordshire.

Key challenges

Financial pressures

Herefordshire Council has a significant savings programme. Good progress has been made towards targets and there is now a focus on building reserves.

In common with many other Councils, Herefordshire continues to face particular financial pressures around both children's and adults' services. Overspends in these areas are being forecast for 2017/18.

The Council has a number of ongoing capital schemes, in particular investment in the local roads network. The adequacy of the management of capital projects and reporting has come under some increased challenge recently in the Council.

Education

The population of Herefordshire is relatively elderly. The county has struggled with poor school attainment. Young people have tended to move out of the area for both further education and employment. This is exacerbated by relatively low salaries in the county.

Development of a university in the city is seen as a way of improving the diversity of the population and to encourage economic development, in particular in new small and medium sized businesses in the area.

The development of a university is supported by both the Council and the LEP. It is intended that there will be significant investment by the private sector in the project.

Our response

- We will consider your arrangements for managing and reporting your financial resources, including your progress on devolution and/or use of investment vehicles, as part of our work in reaching our Value for Money conclusion.
- We will consider whether your financial position leads to uncertainty about the going concern assumption and will review any related disclosures in the financial statements.
- We will keep you informed of changes to the Regulations and any associated changes to financial reporting or public inspection requirements for 2017/18 through on-going discussions and invitations to our technical update workshops.
- As part of our opinion on your financial statements, we will consider whether your financial statements reflect the financial reporting changes in the 2017/18 CIPFA Code.
- We will continue to consider the progress the Council is making against the matters raised in the 2016/17 audit findings report aimed at improving the quality of the draft financial statements.

Significant risks identified

Significant risks are defined by professional standards as risks that, in the judgement of the auditor, require special audit consideration because they have a higher risk of material misstatement. Such risks often relate to significant non-routine transactions and judgmental matters. In identifying risks, audit teams consider the nature of the risk, the potential magnitude of misstatement, and its likelihood.

Risk	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
The revenue cycle includes fraudulent transactions	Under ISA (UK) 240 there is a rebuttable presumed risk that revenue may be misstated due to the improper recognition of revenue. This presumption can be rebutted if the auditor concludes that there is no risk of material misstatement due to fraud relating to revenue recognition.	Having considered the risk factors set out in ISA 240 and the nature of the revenue streams at the Council, we have determined that the risk of fraud arising from revenue recognition can be rebutted, because: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• there is little incentive to manipulate revenue recognition• opportunities to manipulate revenue recognition are very limited• The culture and ethical frameworks of local authorities, including Herefordshire Council, mean that all forms of fraud are seen as unacceptable Therefore we do not consider this to be a significant risk for Herefordshire Council.
Management over-ride of controls	Under ISA (UK) 240 there is a non-rebuttable presumed risk that the risk of management over-ride of controls is present in all entities. The Council faces external scrutiny of its spending, and this could potentially place management under undue pressure in terms of how they report performance. Management over-ride of controls is a risk requiring special audit consideration.	We will: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• gain an understanding of the accounting estimates, judgements applied and decisions made by management and consider their reasonableness• obtain a full listing of journal entries, identify and test unusual journal entries for appropriateness• evaluate the rationale for any changes in accounting policies or significant unusual transactions.

Significant risks identified

Risk	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Valuation of property, plant and equipment	<p>The Council revalues its land and buildings on a quinquennial basis to ensure that carrying value is not materially different from fair value. This represents a significant estimate by management in the financial statements.</p> <p>The 2016/17 audit identified some weakness in the Council's arrangements for valuation of PPE.</p> <p>The Council is currently out to tender to appoint new valuers in 2017/18 to inform the final accounts.</p> <p>The Council will also be using another external valuer and an internal valuer to value different aspects of PPE.</p> <p>We consider the valuation of land and buildings revaluations and impairments as a risk requiring special audit consideration.</p>	<p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review management's processes and assumptions for the calculation of the estimate, the instructions issued to valuation experts and the scope of their work; • consider the competence, expertise and objectivity of management experts used (valuers); • review the basis on which the valuation is carried out and challenge key assumptions; • review and challenge the information used by the valuer to ensure it is robust and consistent with our understanding; • test a sample of valuations made during the year to ensure they are input correctly into the Council's asset register and are reasonable; and • evaluate the assumptions made by management for those assets not revalued during the year and how management has been satisfied that these assets are not materially different to current value.
Valuation of pension fund net liability	<p>The Council's pension fund asset and liability as reflected in its balance sheet represent a significant estimate in the financial statements.</p> <p>We identified the valuation of the pension fund net liability as a risk requiring special audit consideration.</p> <p>The Council is a statutory member of the Hereford and Worcestershire Local Government Pension Scheme administered by Worcestershire County Council. Herefordshire Council remain responsible for the accuracy of disclosures within the accounts, and this will include having a clear understanding of key assumptions within the estimate.</p>	<p>We will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify the controls put in place by management to ensure that the pension fund liability is not materially misstated. We will also assess whether these controls were implemented as expected and whether they are sufficient to mitigate the risk of material misstatement; • evaluate the competence, expertise and objectivity of the actuary who carried out the pension fund valuation. We will gain an understanding of the basis on which the valuation is carried out; • undertake procedures to confirm the reasonableness of the actuarial assumptions made; and • check the consistency of the pension fund asset and liability and disclosures in notes to the financial statements with the actuarial report from the actuary.

Reasonably possible risks identified

Reasonably possible risks (RPRs) are, in the auditor's judgment, other risk areas which the auditor has identified as an area 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 an RPR is lower than that for a significant risk, and they are not considered to be areas that are highly judgmental, or unusual in relation to the day to day activities of the business.

Risk	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
<p>Employee remuneration</p>	<p>Payroll expenditure represents a significant percentage (26%) of the Council's operating expenses.</p> <p>As the payroll expenditure comes from a significant number of individual transactions throughout the year, including transactions involving new-starters, grade changes and leavers, there is a risk that payroll expenditure in the accounts could be understated. We therefore identified completeness of payroll expenses as a risk requiring particular audit attention</p>	<p>We will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluate the Council's accounting policy for recognition of payroll expenditure for appropriateness; • gain an understanding of the Council's system for accounting for payroll expenditure and evaluate the design of the associated controls; • obtain the year-end payroll reconciliation and ensure the amount in the accounts can be reconciled to ledger and through to payroll reports. We will investigate significant adjusting items; • agree payroll related accruals (e.g. unpaid leave accrual) to supporting documents and review any estimates for reasonableness; and • perform substantive analytical procedure for M1 to M9 (at interim) and M10 to M12 (at final) disaggregated by month.
<p>Operating expenses</p>	<p>Non-pay expenses on other goods and services also represents a significant percentage (55%) of the Council's operating expenses. Management uses judgement to estimate accruals of non-invoiced costs.</p> <p>We identified completeness of non- pay expenses as a risk requiring particular audit attention:</p>	<p>We will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluate the Council's accounting policy for recognition of non-pay expenditure for appropriateness; • gain an understanding of the Council's system for accounting for non-pay expenditure and evaluate the design of the associated controls; • document the accruals process and the controls management have put in place. Challenge any key underlying assumptions, the appropriateness of the source of data used and the basis for calculations; • obtain a listing from the cash book of non-pay payments made in April and test to ensure that they have been charged to the appropriate year; and • Obtain a listing of non-pay expenditure and agree a sample to supporting documentation (invoice or equivalent) to confirm accuracy (correct amount charged), occurrence (payment properly incurred), classification (coded correctly as expenditure in CIES or as capital) and cut-off (charged to right year).

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 carry out work to satisfy ourselves that disclosures made in your Annual Governance Statement are in line with the guidance issued and consistent with our knowledge of the Council.
- We will read your Narrative Statement and check that it is consistent with the financial statements on which we give an opinion and that the disclosures included in it are in line with the requirements of the CIPFA Code of Practice.
- 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 the Act and the Code, as and when required, including:
 - giving electors the opportunity to raise questions about your 2017/18 financial statements, consider and decide upon any objections received in relation to the 2017/18 financial statements;
 - issue of a report in the public interest; and
 - making a written recommendation to the Council, copied to the Secretary of State.
- 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.

Going concern

As auditors, we are required to "obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence about the appropriateness of management's use of the going concern assumption in the preparation and presentation of the financial statements and to conclude whether there is a material uncertainty about the entity's ability to continue as a going concern" (ISA (UK) 570). We will review management's assessment of the going concern assumption and evaluate the disclosures in the financial statements.

Materiality

The concept of 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. Misstatements, including omissions, are considered to be material if they, individually or in the aggregate, could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements

Materiality for planning purposes

We propose to calculate financial statement materiality based on a proportion of the gross expenditure of the Council for the financial year. In the prior year we used the same benchmark. We have determined planning materiality (the financial statements materiality determined at the planning stage of the audit) to be £5.9m, which equates to 1.8% of gross expenditure reported in the 2016/17 audited financial statements. We design our procedures to detect errors in specific accounts at a lower level of precision.


ISA 320 also requires auditors to determine separate, lower, materiality levels where there are 'particular classes of transactions, account balances or disclosures for which misstatements of lesser amounts than materiality for the financial statements as a whole could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users'. We have identified that due to public interest, separate materiality levels are appropriate for disclosures of officers' remuneration.

We reconsider planning materiality if, during the course of our audit engagement, we become aware of facts and circumstances that would have caused us to make a different determination of planning materiality

Matters we will report to the Audit and Governance Committee

Whilst our audit procedures are designed to identify misstatements which are material to our opinion on the financial statements as a whole, we nevertheless report to the Audit and Governance Committee any unadjusted misstatements of lesser amounts to the extent that these are identified by our audit work. Under ISA 260 (UK) 'Communication with those charged with governance', we are obliged to report uncorrected omissions or misstatements other than those which are 'clearly trivial' to those charged with governance. ISA 260 (UK) defines 'clearly trivial' as matters that are clearly inconsequential, whether taken individually or in aggregate and whether judged by any quantitative or qualitative criteria. In the context of the Council, we propose that an individual difference could normally be considered to be clearly trivial if it is less than £0.295m.

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



Value for Money arrangements


Background to our VFM approach

The NAO issued its guidance for auditors on Value for Money work for 2017/18 in November 2017. The guidance states that for local government bodies, auditors are required to give a conclusion on whether the Council has proper arrangements in place.

The guidance identifies one single criterion for auditors to evaluate:

“In all significant respects, the audited body takes properly informed decisions and deploys resources to achieve planned and sustainable outcomes for taxpayers and local people.”

This is supported by three sub-criteria, as set out below:



Significant VFM risks

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



Financial sustainability

If the key assumptions within the medium-term financial plan are not reasonably based then the future financial position of the Council could be at risk.

We will discuss with officers the key assumptions in the medium term financial plan and consider supporting evidence.



Capital programme and governance

There has been recent high profile budget overspend on a capital project. The quality of capital reporting has also been under some scrutiny. The Council is currently reviewing the governance arrangements around on-going schemes. Whilst the Council is responding to the weakness in this area we consider that this represents a significant risk.

We will consider the actions that the Council is taking to respond to concerns raised around the governance of the capital programme.

Audit logistics, team & audit fees



Jon Roberts, Partner

Jon's role will be to lead our relationship with you. He will take overall responsibility for the delivery of a high quality audit, meeting the highest professional standards and adding value to the Council. Jon is an experienced engagement lead and is one of Grant Thornton's Regional Lead Public Sector Partners. This will be Jon's first year as your engagement lead.



Zoe Thomas, Audit Manager

Zoe's role will be to be a key contact with the Chief Finance Officer and the Audit Committee.



Zak Francis, Audit In-charge

Zak's role will be to be the day to day contact for Council finance staff. He will take responsibility for ensuring there is effective communication and understanding by the finance team of audit requirements.

Audit fees

The planned audit fees are no less than £124,405 for the financial statements audit and £5,806 for grant claims. Our fees for grant certification cover only housing benefit subsidy certification, which falls under the remit of Public Sector Audit Appointments Limited. Fees in respect of other grant work, such as reasonable assurance reports, are shown under 'Fees for other services'.

In setting your fee, we have assumed that the scope of the audit, and the Council and its activities, do not significantly change.

Our requirements

To ensure the audit is delivered on time and to avoid any additional fees, we have detailed our expectations and requirements in the following section 'Early Close'. If the requirements detailed overleaf are not met, we reserve the right to postpone our audit visit and charge fees to reimburse us for any additional costs incurred.

Early close

Meeting the early close timeframe

Bringing forward the statutory date for publication of audited local government accounts to 31 July this year, across the whole sector, is a significant challenge for local authorities and auditors alike. For authorities, the time available to prepare the accounts is curtailed, while, as auditors we have a shorter period to complete our work and face an even more significant peak in our workload than previously.

We have carefully planned how we can make the best use of the resources available to us during the final accounts period. As well as increasing the overall level of resources available to deliver audits, we have focused on:

- bringing forward as much work as possible to interim audits
- starting work on final accounts audits as early as possible, by agreeing which authorities will have accounts prepared significantly before the end of May
- seeking further efficiencies in the way we carry out our audits
- working with you to agree detailed plans to make the audits run smoothly, including early agreement of audit dates, working paper and data requirements and early discussions on potentially contentious items.

We are satisfied that, if all these plans are implemented, we will be able to complete your audit and those of our other local government clients in sufficient time to meet the earlier deadline.

Client responsibilities

Where individual clients do not deliver to the timetable agreed, we need to ensure that this does not impact on audit quality or absorb a disproportionate amount of time, thereby disadvantaging other clients. We will therefore conduct audits in line with the timetable set out in audit plans (as detailed on page 11). Where the elapsed time to complete an audit exceeds that agreed due to a client not meeting its obligations we will not be able to maintain a team on site. Similarly, where additional resources are needed to complete the audit due to a client not meeting their obligations we are not able to guarantee the delivery of the audit by the statutory deadline. Such audits are unlikely to be re-started until very close to, or after the statutory deadline. In addition, it is highly likely that these audits will incur additional audit fees.

Our requirements

To minimise the risk of a delayed audit or additional audit fees being incurred, you need to ensure that you:

- produce draft financial statements of good quality by the deadline you have agreed with us, including all notes, the narrative report and the Annual Governance Statement
- ensure that good quality working papers are available at the start of the audit, in accordance with the working paper requirements schedule that we plan to share with you early in the new year
- ensure that the agreed data reports are available to us at the start of the audit and are reconciled to the values in the accounts, in order to facilitate our selection of samples
- ensure that all appropriate staff are available on site throughout (or as otherwise agreed) the planned period of the audit
- respond promptly and adequately to audit queries.

In return, we will ensure that:

- the audit runs smoothly with the minimum disruption to your staff
- you are kept informed of progress through the use of an issues tracker and weekly meetings during the audit
- we are available to discuss issues with you prior to and during your preparation of the financial statements.

Independence & non-audit services

Auditor independence

Ethical Standards and ISA (UK) 260 require us to give you timely disclosure of all significant facts and matters that may bear upon the integrity, objectivity and independence of the firm or covered persons, relating to our independence. We encourage you to contact us to discuss these or any other independence issues with us. We will also discuss with you if we make additional significant judgements surrounding independence matters.

We confirm that there are no significant facts or matters that impact on our independence as auditors that we are required or wish to draw to your attention. We have complied with the Financial Reporting Council's Ethical Standard and we as a firm, and each covered person, confirm that we are independent and are able to express an objective opinion on the financial statements. Further, we have complied with the requirements of the National Audit Office's Auditor Guidance Note 01 issued in December 2016 which sets out supplementary guidance on ethical requirements for auditors of local public bodies.

We confirm that we have implemented policies and procedures to meet the requirements of the Ethical Standard. For the purposes of our audit we have made enquiries of all Grant Thornton UK LLP teams providing services to the Council.

Non-audit services

The following non-audit services were identified

Service	Fees £	Threats	Safeguards
Audit related			
Certification of teachers pension return	6,000	Self-Interest (because this is a recurring fee)	The level of this recurring fee taken on its own is not considered a significant threat to independence as the fee for this work is £6,000 in comparison to the total fee for the audit of £124,405 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 mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level.
Audit of Hoople Ltd	14,780	Self-Interest (because this is a recurring fee) Self-review	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 £14,780 in comparison to the total fee for the audit of £124,405 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 mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level. Group accounts are not prepared due to the Council's assessment of materiality. The turnover of Hoople is not significant relative to that of Herefordshire Council.
Audit of West Mercia Energy	3,250 (pro-rata)	Self-Interest (because this is a recurring fee) Self-review	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 £13,000 in comparison to the total fee for the audit of £124,405 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 mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level. Group accounts are not prepared due to the Council's assessment of materiality. West Mercia Energy has equal shareholding across Shropshire Council, Herefordshire Council, Telford & Wrekin Council and Worcestershire County Council.

Independence & non-audit services

Non-audit services (continued)

Service	Fees £	Threats	Safeguards
Non-audit related			
Provision of advice to support procurement of a development partner	12,000	Management threat	The proposed work is an objective analysis and any decisions will be made by management.

The amounts detailed are fees agreed to-date for audit related and non-audit services to be undertaken by Grant Thornton UK LLP in the current financial year. These services are consistent with the Council's policy on the allotment of non-audit work to your auditors. Any changes and full details of all fees charged for audit related and non-audit related services by Grant Thornton UK LLP and by Grant Thornton International Limited network member Firms will be included in our Audit Findings report at the conclusion of the audit.

None of the services provided are subject to contingent fees.

Appendices

A. Revised ISAs

Appendix A: Revised ISAs

Detailed below is a summary of the key changes impacting the auditor's report for audits of financial statement for periods commencing on or after 17 June 2016.

Section of the auditor's report	Description of the requirements
Conclusions relating to going concern	We will be required to conclude and report whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The directors use of the going concern basis of accounting is appropriate• The directors have disclosed identified material uncertainties that may cast significant doubt about the Council's ability to continue as a going concern.
Material uncertainty related to going concern	We will need to include a brief description of the events or conditions identified that may cast significant doubt on the Council's ability to continue as a going concern when a material uncertainty has been identified and adequately disclosed in the financial statements. Going concern material uncertainties are no longer reported in an Emphasis of Matter section in our audit report.
Other information	We will be required to include a section on other information which includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Responsibilities of management and auditors regarding other information• A statement that the opinion on the financial statements does not cover the other information unless required by law or regulation• Reporting inconsistencies or misstatements where identified
Additional responsibilities for directors and the auditor	We will be required to include the respective responsibilities for directors and us, as auditors, regarding going concern.
Format of the report	The opinion section appears first followed by the basis of opinion section.



© 2017 Grant Thornton UK LLP. 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 UK LLP is a member firm of Grant Thornton International Ltd (GTIL). GTIL and the member firms are not a worldwide partnership. GTIL and each member firm is a separate legal entity. Services are delivered by the member firms. GTIL does not provide services to 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.