External Audit Plan

Year ending 31 March 2019

Wirral Council

February 2019

Contents

Your key Grant Thornton team members are:

Robin Baker
Director
T: 0161 214 6399
E: Robin.J.Baker@uk.gt.com

Shahed Alam
Manager
T: 0151 224 0890
E: Shahedul.Alam@uk.gt.com

Stuart Basnett
Assistant Manager
T: 0151 224 7232
E: Stuart.H.Basnett@uk.gt.com

Introduction & headlines

Purpose

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

Respective responsibilities

The National Audit Office ('the NAO') has issued a document entitled Code of Audit Practice ('the Code'). The Code 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 Terms of Appointment and Statement of Responsibilities issued by Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA), the body responsible for appointing us as auditor of Wirral Council. We draw your attention to both of these documents on the* [PSAA website]. *We draw your attention to both of these documents.*

Scope of our audit

The scope of our audit is set in accordance with the Code and International Standards on Auditing (ISAs) (UK). We are responsible for forming and expressing an opinion on the:

- Authority's financial statements that have been prepared by management with the oversight of those charged with governance (the Audit and Risk Management Committee); and
- Value for Money arrangements in place at the Authority 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 Risk Management Committee of your responsibilities. It is the responsibility of the Authority 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 Authority is fulfilling these responsibilities.

Our audit approach is based on a thorough understanding of the Authority's business and is risk based. We will be using our new audit methodology and tool, LEAP, for the 2018/19 audit. It will enable us to be more responsive to changes that may occur in your organisation.

Significant risks	Those risks requiring special audit consideration and procedures to address the likelihood of a material financial statement error have been identified as: • Management override of controls • Valuation of property, plant and equipment • Valuation of Pension net 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 £12.986m (PY £13.026m) for the Authority, which equates to 1.8% of your prior year gross expenditure for the year. We are obliged to report uncorrected omissions or misstatements other than those which are 'clearly trivial' to those charged with governance. Clearly trivial has been set at £0.649m (PY £0.651m).
Value for Money arrangements	Our risk assessment regarding your arrangements to secure value for money has identified the following VFM significant risks: • Financial planning & sustainability • Ofsted inspection of children's services
Audit logistics	Our interim visit will take place in 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 audit approach is detailed in Appendix A. Our fee for the audit will be £123,095 (PY: £159,863) for the Authority, subject to the Authority meeting our requirements set out on page 11.
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..

Key matters impacting our audit

Factors

The wider economy and political uncertainty

Local Government funding continues to be stretched with increasing cost pressures and demands from residents. For Wirral a budget was set for 2018/19 which utilised £26m of one-off funding. The Council is committed to reducing its reliance on one-offs and in the budget for 2019/10 one-offs have been agreed at £9m. In February 2019 the Cabinet agreed a revised Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for 2019-2023. The MTFS highlights a sizeable budget gap for each of the next four financial periods, with government grant funding planned to end by 2020. The commercial strategy and establishment of the Wirral Growth Company are seen as key drivers for income generation over the next four years.

At a national level, the government continues its negotiation with the EU over Brexit, and future arrangements remain clouded in uncertainty. The Authority will need to ensure that it is prepared for all outcomes, including in terms of any impact on contracts, on service delivery and on its support for local people and businesses.

Changes to the CIPFA 2018/19 Accounting Code

The most significant changes relate to the adoption of:

- IFRS 9 Financial Instruments which impacts on the classification and measurement of financial assets and introduces a new impairment model.
- IFRS 15 Revenue from Contracts with Customers which introduces a five step approach to revenue recognition.

The Wirral Growth Company

The Council are in the progress of establishing the Wirral Growth Company, a joint venture public/private partnership with the aim of utilising the Council's assets, skills and other resources to generate sustainable new revenue streams for the Council.

The Council has identified its joint venture partner which will be Muse Developments Limited. Over the coming months progress is expected in the development of the growth company's activities. With the establishment of the Growth Company the Council will need to consider whether it is required to prepare group accounts.

Our response

- We will consider your arrangements for managing and reporting your financial resources as part of our work in reaching our Value for Money conclusion.
- We will consider whether your financial position leads to material uncertainty about the going concern of the Authority and will review related disclosures in the financial statements.
- We will update our understanding of the Council's arrangements for Brexit.

- We will keep you informed of changes to the financial reporting requirements for 2018/19 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 2018/19 CIPFA Code.

- We will continue to have discussions with officers to track progress which the Growth Company.
- We will review senior officers assessment of the requirement for the production of group accounts. Should group accounts be required we will update our Audit Plan.

Significant risks identified

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

Risk	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
The revenue cycle includes fraudulent transactions (rebutted)	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 ISA240 and the nature of the revenue streams at the Authority, we have determined that the risk of fraud arising from revenue recognition can be rebutted, because: • there is little incentive to manipulate revenue recognition • opportunities to manipulate revenue recognition are very limited • the culture and ethical frameworks of local authorities, including Wirral Council, mean that all forms of fraud are seen as unacceptable Therefore we do not consider this to be a significant risk for Wirral 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 Authority faces external scrutiny of its spending and this could potentially place management under undue pressure in terms of how they report performance. We therefore identified management override of control, in particular journals, management estimates and transactions outside the course of business as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement.	We will: • evaluate the design effectiveness of management controls over journals • analyse the journals listing and determine the criteria for selecting high risk unusual journals • test unusual journals recorded during the year and after the draft accounts stage for appropriateness and corroboration • gain an understanding of the accounting estimates and critical judgements applied made by management and consider their reasonableness with regard to corroborative evidence • evaluate the rationale for any changes in accounting policies, estimates or significant unusual transactions.

Significant risks identified

Risk	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Valuation of land and buildings	The Authority revalues its land and buildings on a rolling five-yearly basis. This valuation represents a significant estimate by management in the financial statements due to the size of the numbers involved (£608m) and the sensitivity of this estimate to changes in key assumptions. Additionally, management will need to ensure the carrying value in the Authority financial statements is not materially different from the current value or the fair value (for surplus assets) at the financial statements date, where a rolling programme is used We therefore identified valuation of land and buildings, particularly revaluations and impairments, as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement, and a key audit matter.	We will: • evaluate management's processes and assumptions for the calculation of the estimate, the instructions issued to valuation experts and the scope of their work • evaluate the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the valuation expert • write to the valuer to confirm the basis on which the valuation was carried out • challenge the information and assumptions used by the valuer to assess completeness and consistency with our understanding • test revaluations made during the year to see if they had been input correctly into the Authority's asset register, and • evaluate the assumptions made by management for those assets not revalued during the year and how management has satisfied themselves that these are not materially different to current value at year end.

Significant risks identified

Risk	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Valuation of the pension fund net liability	The Authority's pension fund net liability, as reflected in its balance sheet as the net defined benefit liability, represents a significant estimate in the financial statements. The pension fund net liability is considered a significant estimate due to the size of the numbers involved (£457 million in the Authority's balance sheet) and the sensitivity of the estimate to changes in key assumptions. We therefore identified valuation of the Authority's pension fund net liability as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement, and a key audit matter.	We will: • update our understanding of the processes and controls put in place by management to ensure that the Authority's pension fund net liability is not materially misstated and evaluate the design of the associated controls • evaluate the instructions issued by management to their management expert (an actuary) for this estimate and the scope of the actuary's work • assess the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the actuary who carried out the Authority's pension fund valuation • assess the accuracy and completeness of the information provided by the Authority to the actuary to estimate the liability • test the consistency of the pension fund asset and liability and disclosures in the notes to the core financial statements with the actuarial report from the actuary • undertake procedures to confirm the reasonableness of the actuarial assumptions made by reviewing the report of the consulting actuary (as auditor's expert) and performing any additional procedures suggested within the report, and • obtain assurances from the auditor of Merseyside 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.

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 Report in July 2019.

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 and any other information published alongside your financial statements to check that they are consistent with the financial statements on which we give an opinion and consistent with our knowledge of the Authority.
- We carry out work to satisfy ourselves that disclosures made in your Annual Governance Statement are in line with the guidance issued 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 2018/19 financial statements, consider and decide upon any objections received in relation to the 2018/19 financial statements;
    - issue of a report in the public interest or written recommendations to the Authority under section 24 of the Act, copied to the Secretary of State.
    - Application to the court for a declaration that an item of account is contrary to law under Section 28 or for a judicial review under Section 31 of the Act; or
    - 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.

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 Authority'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 have determined financial statement materiality based on a proportion of the gross expenditure of the Authority for the financial year. In the prior year we used the same benchmark. Materiality at the planning stage of our audit is £12.986m (PY £13.026m) for the Authority, which equates to 1.8% of your prior year gross expenditure for the year. We design our procedures to detect errors in specific accounts at a lower level of precision which we have determined to be £0.023m for Senior Officer Remuneration.

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

Matters we will report to the Audit Committee

Whilst our audit procedures are designed to identify misstatements which are material to our opinion on the financial statements as a whole, we nevertheless report to the Audit Committee any unadjusted misstatements of lesser amounts to the extent that these are identified by our audit work. Under ISA 260 (UK) 'Communication with those charged with governance', we are obliged to report uncorrected omissions or misstatements other than those which are 'clearly trivial' to those charged with governance. ISA 260 (UK) defines 'clearly trivial' as matters that are clearly inconsequential, whether taken individually or in aggregate and whether judged by any quantitative or qualitative criteria. In the context of the Authority, we propose that an individual difference could normally be considered to be clearly trivial if it is less than £0.649m (PY £0.651m).

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 Risk Management 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 in November 2017. The guidance states that for Local Government bodies, auditors are required to give a conclusion on whether the Authority has proper arrangements in place to secure value for money.

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 audit consideration and procedures to address the likelihood that proper arrangements are not in place at the Authority to deliver value for money.

Financial planning and sustainability

The Council continues to face an increasingly difficult financial position. The Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017-2021 set out a £132m budget gap and In July 2018 Cabinet agreed MTFS with a budget gap of £45m for 2019/20 and £22m to be identified for 2020/21 to 2022/23.. The Council recognises that the balanced position in 2017/18 and 2018/19 have been achieved, in part, through the use of "one-off" options including the use of balances and reserves.

We will review the Council's arrangements for updating, agreeing and monitoring its financial plans including the assumptions within them. We will also consider the arrangements in place to monitor the identification, pace, delivery and reporting of savings. This work is part of the sustainable resource deployment sub-criteria.

Ofsted Inspection of Children's Services

Ofsted issued a report on the Council's children's services in September 2016 which rated the service as 'inadequate'. Subsequently, the Council has undertaken a range of actions, significantly increased funding to the service and worked toward securing the required service improvement. Ofsted completed regular follow up reviews and the December 2017 review concluded that "there is still a great deal of work to be done".

A further review was carried out by Ofsted in December 2018, which stated "The local authority is making progress in improving social work support and services for children in care and care leavers. However, work to ensure timely permanence planning has not developed quickly enough, with insufficient focus by managers on ensuring improvement for all children.."

Until such time as Ofsted has confirmed that adequate arrangements are in place this remains a significant risk to the Council's arrangements.

We will continue to track progress with the Council's response to this key area.

Audit logistics, team & fees



Robin Baker, Engagement Lead

Robin leads our relationship with you and takes overall responsibility for the delivery of a high quality audit, meaning the highest professional standards and adding value to the Authority.

Shahed Alam, Audit Manager

Shahed plans, manages and leads the delivery of the audit, is your key point of contact for your Finance team and is your first point of contact for discussing any issues.

Stuart Basnett, Audit Incharge

Stuart's role is to assist in planning, managing and delivering the audit fieldwork, ensuring the audit is delivered effectively and efficiently and supervises and co-ordinates the on site audit team.

Audit fees

The planned audit fees are £123,095 (PY: £159,863) for the financial statements audit completed under the Code, which are in line with the scale fee published by PSAA. Other fees charged for the certification of grants are outlined on page 13. In setting your fee, we have assumed that the scope of the audit, and the Authority and its activities, do not significantly change.

Where additional audit work is required to address risks relating to additional work such as the application of changes to International Financial Reporting Standards, we will consider the need to charge fees in addition to the audit fee on a case by case basis. Any additional fees will be discussed and agreed with management and require PSAA approval.

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 31 July audit timeframe

In the prior year, the statutory date for publication of audited local government accounts was brought forward to 31 July, across the whole sector. This was a significant challenge for local authorities and auditors alike. For authorities, the time available to prepare the accounts was curtailed, while, as auditors we had a shorter period to complete our work and faced 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. Where the elapsed time to complete an audit exceeds that agreed due to a client not meetings 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 have shared with you
- ensure that the agreed data reports are available to us at the start of the audit and are reconciled to the values in the accounts, in order to facilitate our selection of samples
- 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.

We confirm that we have implemented policies and procedures to meet the requirements of 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 2017 and PSAA's Terms of Appointment which set out supplementary guidance on ethical requirements for auditors of local public bodies.

Other services provided by Grant Thornton

For the purposes of our audit we have made enquiries of all Grant Thornton UK LLP teams providing services to the Authority. The following other services were identified:

Service	£	Threats	Safeguards
Audit related			
Certification of Housing benefits claim	17,500 +£870 for any additional 40+ Workbooks	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 £17,500 in comparison to the total fee for the audit of £123,095 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.
Certification of Teachers' Pension return	4,200	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 £4,200 in comparison to the total fee for the audit of £123,095 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.
Non-audit related			
CFO Insights	12,500	Self Interest (as this is a recurring fee)	This is an online software subscription service that enable users to rapidly analyse data sets. CFO Insights is a Grant Thornton & CIPFA collaboration giving instant access to financial performance, service outcomes and socio-economic indicators for local authorities. It is the responsibility of management to interpret the information. The scope of our service does not include making decisions on behalf of management or recommending or suggesting a particular course of action. These factors mitigate the perceived self-interest threat. The fee for the work is negligible in comparison to the total fee for the audit.

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 Authority's policy on the allotment of non-audit work to your auditors. All services have been approved by the Audit and Risk Management Committee. 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

Audit approach

Use of audit, data interrogation and analytics software

LEAP

Audit software

- A globally developed ISA-aligned methodology and software tool that aims to re-engineer our audit approach to fundamentally improve quality and efficiency
- LEAP empowers our engagement teams to deliver even higher quality audits, enables our teams to perform cost effective audits which are scalable to any client, enhances the work experience for our people and develops further insights into our clients' businesses
- A cloud-based industry-leading audit tool developed in partnership with Microsoft



Inflo

Cloud based software which uses data analytics to identify trends and high risk transactions, generating insights to focus audit work and share with clients.

REQUEST & SHARE

- Communicate & transfer documents securely
- Extract data directly from client systems
- Work flow assignment & progress monitoring

ASSESS & SCOPE

- Compare balances & visualise trends
- Understand trends and perform more granular risk assessment

VERIFY & REVIEW

- Automate sampling requests
- Download automated work papers

INTERROGATE & EVALUATE

- Analyse 100% of transactions quickly & easily
- Identify high risk transactions for investigation & testing
- Provide client reports & relevant benchmarking KPIs

FOCUS & ASSURE

- Visualise relationships impacting core business cycles
- Analyse 100% of transactions to focus audit on unusual items
- Combine business process analytics with related testing to provide greater audit and process assurance

INSIGHTS

- Detailed visualisations to add value to meetings and reports
- Demonstrates own performance and benchmark comparisons

IDEA

- We use one of the world's leading data interrogation software tools, called 'IDEA' which integrates the latest data analytics techniques into our audit approach
- We have used IDEA since its inception in the 1980's and we were part of the original development team. We still have heavy involvement in both its development and delivery which is further enforced through our chairmanship of the UK IDEA User Group
- In addition to IDEA, we also other tools like ACL and Microsoft SQL server
- Analysing large volumes of data very quickly and easily enables us to identify exceptions which potentially highlight business controls that are not operating effectively

Appian

Business process management

- Clear timeline for account review:
  - disclosure dealing
  - analytical review
- Simple version control
- Allow content team to identify potential risk areas for auditors to focus on