

Audit Plan

April 2007



Audit and Inspection Plan

Hart District Council

Audit 2007/08

External audit is an essential element in the process of accountability for public money and makes an important contribution to the stewardship of public resources and the corporate governance of public services.

Audit in the public sector is underpinned by three fundamental principles:

- auditors are appointed independently from the bodies being audited;
- the scope of auditors' work is extended to cover not only the audit of financial statements but also value for money and the conduct of public business; and
- auditors may report aspects of their work widely to the public and other key stakeholders.

The duties and powers of auditors appointed by the Audit Commission are set out in the Audit Commission Act 1998 and the Local Government Act 1999 and the Commission's statutory Code of Audit Practice. Under the Code of Audit Practice, appointed auditors are also required to comply with the current professional standards issued by the independent Auditing Practices Board.

Appointed auditors act quite separately from the Commission and in meeting their statutory responsibilities are required to exercise their professional judgement independently of both the Commission and the audited body.

Status of our reports

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

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

Copies of this report

If you require further copies of this report, or a copy in large print, in Braille, on tape, or in a language other than English, please call 0845 056 0566.

© Audit Commission 2007

For further information on the work of the Commission please contact:

Audit Commission, 1st Floor, Millbank Tower, Millbank, London SW1P 4HQ

Tel: 020 7828 1212 Fax: 020 7976 6187 Textphone (minicom): 020 7630 0421

www.audit-commission.gov.uk

Contents

Introduction	4
Responsibilities	4
CPA and Inspection	5
Work under the Code of Audit Practice	7
Financial statements	7
Use of resources	7
Data quality	8
Best Value Performance Plan	9
Assessing risks	10
Work specified by the Audit Commission	10
Voluntary improvement work	11
Certification of grant claims and returns	12
The audit and inspection fee	13
Other information	14
The audit and inspection team	14
Independence and objectivity	15
Quality of service	15
Planned outputs	15
Appendix 1 – Initial risk assessment – use of resources	16
Appendix 2 – Audit and inspection fee	17
Specific audit risk factors	18
Assumptions	18
Specific actions Hart District Council could take to reduce its audit and inspection fees	19
Process for agreeing any changes in audit fees	20
Appendix 3 – Independence and objectivity	21

Introduction

- 1 This plan has been developed by the Relationship Manager and the Appointed Auditor. It sets out the audit and inspection work that we propose to undertake for the 2007/08 financial year. The plan is based on the Audit Commission's risk-based approach to audit planning and the requirements of Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA). It reflects:
 - audit and inspection work specified by the Audit Commission for 2007/08;
 - current national risks relevant to your local circumstances; and
 - your local risks and improvement priorities.
- 2 Your Relationship Manager will continue to help ensure further integration and co-ordination with the work of other inspectorates.
- 3 As we have not yet completed our audit for 2006/07, the audit planning process for 2007/08, including the risk assessment, will continue as the year progresses, and the information and fees in this plan will be kept under review and updated as necessary.

Responsibilities

- 4 We comply with the statutory requirements governing our audit and inspection work, in particular:
 - the Audit Commission Act 1998;
 - the Local Government Act 1999 (best value inspection and audit); and
 - the Code of Audit Practice.
- 5 The Code of Audit Practice (the Code) defines auditors' responsibilities in relation to:
 - the financial statements (including the statement on internal control (SIC)); and
 - the audited body's arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources.
- 6 The Audit Commission's Statement of responsibilities of auditors and of audited bodies sets out the respective responsibilities of the auditor and the Council. The Audit Commission has issued a copy of the Statement to every audited body.
- 7 The Statement summarises where the different responsibilities of auditors and of the audited body begin and end, and our audit work is undertaken in the context of these responsibilities.

CPA and Inspection

- 8 The Audit Commission's CPA and inspection activity is underpinned by the principle of targeting our work where it will have the greatest effect, based upon assessments of risk and performance.
- 9 The Council's CPA category of 'fair' is therefore a key driver in the Commission's inspection planning process.
- 10 We have applied the principles set out in the CPA framework, *CPA – district council framework from 2006*, recognising the key strengths and areas for improvement in the Council's performance.
- 11 Strengths in the Council's performance include:
 - significant progress over last six months in strengthening short and medium term improvement planning; and
 - recent progress in improving some services.
- 12 Areas for improvement in the Council's performance include:
 - developing clear outcomes for the newly established priorities;
 - implementing a programme for improving and sustaining service performance;
 - demonstrating value for money from the use of resources;
 - improving systems and processes for managing financial resources;
 - improving customer satisfaction; and
 - strengthening the Councils community leadership role.
- 13 On the basis of our planning process we have identified where our inspection activity will be focused for 2007/08 as follows.

Table 1 Summary of inspection activity

Inspection activity	Reason/impact
Relationship Manager (RM) role	To act as the Commission's primary point of contact with the Council and the interface at the local level between the Commission and the other inspectorates, government offices and other key stakeholders.
Direction of travel (DoT) assessment	An annual assessment, carried out by the RM, of how well the Council is securing continuous improvement. The DoT statement will be reported in the annual audit and inspection letter. The DoT assessment summary will be published on the Commission's website.

Inspection activity	Reason/impact
Service inspection	Environment inspection focusing on the refuse service will be undertaken in June 2007. In the early summer, following the Hampshire County Corporate assessment, we will consider the potential for a community safety inspection. We will also continue to consider the appropriateness of an inspection of the planning service and a refresh of our earlier inspection of 'access to services'.

Work under the Code of Audit Practice

Financial statements

- 14 We will carry out our audit of the financial statements in accordance with International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland) issued by the Auditing Practices Board (APB).
- 15 We are required to issue an opinion on whether the financial statements present fairly, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and the Statement of Recommended Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the United Kingdom 2007, the financial position of the Council as at 31 March 2008 and its income and expenditure for the year.
- 16 We are also required to review whether the Statement of Internal Control (SIC) has been presented in accordance with relevant requirements, and to report if it does not meet these requirements or if it is misleading or inconsistent with our knowledge of the Council.

Use of resources

Value for money conclusion

- 17 The Code requires us to issue a conclusion on whether the Council has put in place proper arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources. This is known as the value for money conclusion. The Code also requires auditors to have regard to a standard set of relevant criteria, issued by the Audit Commission, in arriving at their conclusion.
- 18 In meeting this responsibility, we will review evidence that is relevant to the Council's corporate performance management and financial management arrangements. Where relevant work has been undertaken by other regulators we will normally place reliance on their reported results to inform our work.
- 19 We will also follow up our work from previous years to assess progress in implementing agreed recommendations.

Use of resources assessment

- 20 The Audit Commission has specified that auditors will complete a use of resources assessment for 2007/08. The assessment focuses on the importance of having sound and strategic financial management to ensure that resources are available to support the Council's priorities and to improve services.
- 21 The work required to arrive at the use of resources assessment is fully aligned with that required to arrive at the auditor's value for money conclusion.

- 22 We will arrive at a score of 1 to 4, based on underlying key lines of enquiry, for each of the following themes:

Theme	Description
Financial reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of financial statements. • External reporting.
Financial management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium-term financial strategy. • Budget monitoring. • Asset management.
Financial standing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing spending within available resources.
Internal control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk management. • System of internal control. • Probity and propriety.
Value for money	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieving value for money. • Managing and improving value for money.

- 23 We will report details of the scores and judgements made to the Council. The scores will be accompanied, where appropriate, by recommendations of what the Council needs to do to progress to a higher score.
- 24 The auditor’s scores are reported to the Commission and are used as the basis for its overall use of resources judgement for the purposes of CPA.

Data quality

- 25 The Audit Commission has specified that auditors will be required to undertake audit work in relation to data quality. This is based on a three-stage approach covering:
- stage 1 - management arrangements;
 - stage 2 - completeness check; and
 - stage 3 - risk-based data quality spot checks of a sample of performance indicators.
- 26 The work at stage 1 will link to our review of the Council’s arrangements to secure data quality as required for our value for money conclusion and, together with the results of stage 2, will inform the risk assessment for the detailed spot check work to be undertaken at stage 3. The results of the work at stage 3 will inform the Commission’s CPA assessment.

- 27 Our fee estimate reflects an assessment of risk in relation to the Council's performance indicators. This risk assessment may change depending on our assessment of your overall management arrangements at stage 1 and we will update our plan accordingly, including any impact on the fee.

Best Value Performance Plan

- 28 We are required to carry out an audit of your best value performance plan (BVPP) and report on whether it has been prepared and published in accordance with legislation and statutory guidance.

Assessing risks

- 29 The Audit Commission is committed to targeting its work where it will have the greatest effect, based upon assessments of risk and performance. This means planning our audit work to address areas of risk relevant to our audit responsibilities and reflecting this in the audit fees. It also means making sure that our work is co-ordinated with the work of other regulators, and that our work helps you to improve.
- 30 Our risk assessment process starts with the identification of the significant financial and operational risks applying at the Council with reference to:
- our cumulative knowledge of the Council;
 - planning guidance issued by the Audit Commission;
 - the specific results of previous and ongoing audit work;
 - interviews with Council officers;
 - liaison with internal audit; and
 - the results of other review agencies' work where relevant.
- 31 We have not included a risk assessment for our audit of the financial statements as many of the specific risks may not become apparent until after we have completed our 2006/07 audit. We will issue a separate opinion audit plan for our audit of the financial statements.
- 32 For each of the significant risks identified in relation to our use of resources work, we consider the arrangements put in place by the Council to mitigate the risk, and plan our work accordingly.
- 33 Our initial risk assessment for use of resources work is provided in Appendix 1. This will be updated through our continuous planning process as the year progresses.

Work specified by the Audit Commission

Whole of government accounts (WGA)

- 34 We will be required to review and report on your WGA consolidation pack in accordance with the approach agreed with HM Treasury and the National Audit Office which is proportionate to risk.

National Fraud Initiative

- 35 The Council participates in the National Fraud Initiative which is the Audit Commission's computerised data matching exercise designed to detect fraud perpetrated on public bodies. This work will be carried out by an individual appointed to assist in the audit of the Council's accounts (in accordance with section 3(9) of the Audit Commission Act 1998).

Voluntary improvement work

- 36** Additional support can be provided by the Relationship Management Team to help the Council outside the scope of the audit and inspection plan. For example by:
- acting as a sounding board while the Council develops its performance management reports and process;
 - supporting the Council as it develops its consultation processes, including the establishment of a citizens panel and measures aimed at consulting with hard to reach groups; and
 - reviewing the effectiveness of the Local Strategic Partnership and identifying opportunities for improvement.
- 37** If extended support is requested this can be provided as voluntary improvement work at appropriate grade-related fees.

Certification of grant claims and returns

38 We will continue to certify the Council's claims and returns on the following basis:

- claims below £100,000 will not be subject to certification;
- claims between £100,000 and £500,000 will be subject to a reduced, light-touch certification; and
- claims over £500,000 will be subject to a certification approach relevant to the auditor's assessment of the control environment and management preparation of claims. A robust control environment would lead to a reduced certification approach for these claims.

The audit and inspection fee

- 39 Details of the structure of scale fees are set out in the Audit Commission's work programme and fee scales 2007/08. Scale fees are based on a number of variables, including the type, size and location of the audited body although the fee for any individual audited and inspected body will be based on our assessment of the work required to fulfil our Code objectives.
- 40 The total indicative fee for audit and inspection work included in this audit and inspection plan for 2007/08 is £124,393 which compares with the planned fee of £130,286 for 2006/07, which includes the additional charge raised for last year.
- 41 Further details are provided in Appendix 2 which includes a breakdown of the fee; specific audit risk factors; the assumptions made when determining the audit fee, for example, the timeliness and quality of draft accounts presented for audit and the supporting working papers; specific actions Hart District Council could take to reduce its audit and inspection fees in the future; and the process for agreeing any changes to the fee. The fee includes all work identified in this plan unless specifically excluded.
- 42 In addition we estimate that we will charge approximately £27,500 for the certification of claims and returns.
- 43 As indicated in paragraphs 3 and 31, the audit planning process will continue as the year progresses and it is likely that there will be some changes to our planned work and hence to the indicative fee quoted in paragraph 40 above. Any changes to the fee will be agreed with you.

Other information

The audit and inspection team

- 44 The key members of the audit and inspection team for the 2007/08 audit are shown in the table below.

Table 2

Name	Contact details	Responsibilities
Neil Childs Relationship Manager	n-childs@audit-commission.gov.uk Tel: 0844 798 1728	The primary point of contact with the authority and the interface at the local level between the Commission and the other inspectorates, government offices and other key stakeholders.
Martin Robinson District Auditor	m-robinson@audit-commission.gov.uk Tel: 01305 363709	Responsible for the overall delivery of the audit including the quality of outputs, signing the opinion and conclusion, and liaison with the Chief Executive and (audit) committee.
Russell Reeve* Audit Manager	r-reeve@audit-commission.gov.uk Tel: 07966 402387	Manages and co-ordinates the different elements of the audit work. Key point of contact for the Head of Finance.
Angela Blowman Local Performance Lead	a-blownan@audit-commission.gov.uk Tel: 07789 033767	Responsible for the delivery of elements of the use of resources work including the value for money (vfm) theme of the use of resources assessment.
Sara Rowntree Regularity Team Leader	s-rowntree@audit-commission.gov.uk Tel: 07779 573133	Responsible for the delivery of elements of the regularity audit including the opinion audit, the non-vfm elements of the use of resources assessment, and grant claims.
Mike Bowers* Temporary Audit Manager	m-bowers@audit-commission.gov.uk Tel: 07881 518961	Will continue to manage the audit during 2006/07. Key point of contact for the Head of Finance.

Independence and objectivity

- 45 We are not aware of any relationships that may affect the independence and objectivity of the District Auditor and the audit staff, which we are required by auditing and ethical standards to communicate to you. We comply with the ethical standards issued by the APB and with the Commission's requirements in respect of independence and objectivity as summarised at Appendix 3.

Quality of service

- 46 We are committed to providing you with a high quality service. If you are in any way dissatisfied, or would like to discuss how we can improve our service, please contact the Relationship Manager Neil Childs, who is also our South Central Head of Operations, or Martin Robinson the District Auditor.
- 47 If we are unable to satisfy your concerns, you have the right to make a formal complaint to the Audit Commission. The complaints procedure is set out in the leaflet *Something to Complain About* which is available from the Commission's website or on request.

Planned outputs

- 48 Our reports will be discussed and agreed with the appropriate officers before being issued to the (audit) committee.

Table 3

Planned output	Indicative date
Opinion audit plan	November 2007
Data quality report	October 2007
Interim audit memorandum (if required)	June 2008
Annual governance report	September 2008
Opinion on the financial statements and value for money conclusion	September 2008
Final accounts memorandum (to the Head of Finance)	October 2008
Use of resources report	December 2008
Inspection outputs	TBC
Annual audit and inspection letter	December 2008
BVPP report	December 2007

Appendix 1 – Initial risk assessment – use of resources

These are the high level risks that have been identified in relation to the Use of Resources.

Significant risks identified	Mitigating action by audited body	Residual audit risk	Action in response to residual audit risk	Link to auditor's responsibilities
The Council has not scored well within the Use of Resources (UoR) judgement in previous years, which makes it a risk for the audit.	Improvements are being implemented in each of the Key Lines of Enquiry (KLOE) areas that are expected by the Council to lead to marked improvements in the arrangements that are in place.	Yes	Our UoR refresh in October 2007 will focus on the improvement areas, assuming that no deterioration is evident in current arrangements.	UoR KLOE and judgement
We provided an adverse vfm conclusion in 2006	The Council has an improvement plan in place which should start to address many of the areas that needed further improvement.	Yes	We will place reliance on our UoR assessment in reaching our vfm conclusion, and supplement this with additional work as required.	Value for money conclusion
The Council has a finely balanced budget for 2007/08. This has a number of key elements that will need to be delivered if the budget is to be achieved.	Difficult decisions are being taken by the Council that should enable it to implement its budget proposals.	Yes	A specific review of the robustness of the budget setting process and proposals will be carried out.	UoR KLOE re financial Management and Financial Standing, the vfm conclusion and our opinion.

Appendix 2 – Audit and inspection fee

- 1 Table 4 provides details of the planned audit and inspection fee for 2007/08 with a comparison to the planned fee for 2006/07.

Table 4

Audit area	Planned fee 2007/08 £	Planned fee 2006/07 £
Audit		
Financial statements	61,835	52,621
Use of resources (including BVPP)	34,100	34,520
Data quality	11,520	10,562
Whole of government accounts	2,960	2870
National Fraud Initiative (NFI)	525	500
Additional fee charged last year	-	13,678
Total audit fee	110,940	114,751
Inspection		
Relationship management	3,245	3,127
Direction of Travel	3,245	3,147
Recovery support	-	2,050
Service inspection	6,963	7,211
Corporate inspection	-	-
Total inspection fee	13,453	15,535
Total audit and inspection fee	124,393	130,286
Certification of claims and returns	27,500	25,500
Voluntary improvement work	0	0

- 2 The Audit Commission scale fee for Hart District Council is £84,706, in relation to audit, performance and NFI. The fee proposed for 2007/08 is + 31 per cent compared to the scale fee and reflects the risk assessment. This is marginally above the normal level of variation specified by the Commission.

- 3 The Audit Commission has the power to determine the fee above or below the scale fee where it considers that substantially more or less work is required than envisaged by the scale fee. The Audit Commission may, therefore, adjust the scale fee to reflect the actual work that needs to be carried out to meet the auditor's statutory responsibilities, on the basis of the auditor's assessment of risk and complexity at a particular body.
- 4 It is a matter for the auditor to determine the work necessary to complete the audit and, subject to approval by the Audit Commission, to seek to agree an appropriate variation to the scale fee with the Council. The Audit Commission expects normally to vary the scale fee by no more than 30 per cent (upwards or downwards). This fee then becomes payable.
- 5 The fee (plus VAT) will be charged in 12 equal instalments from April 2007 to March 2008.

Specific audit risk factors

- 6 In setting the audit fee we have taken into account the following specific risk factors:
 - the potential for the changes within the Council's senior management to have an impact on its corporate capacity and the impact this might have on the audit;
 - the need to seek assurance from officers that the revisions to the 2007 Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP) have been complied with;
 - our experience of auditing your performance indicators in 2006; and
 - the implementation of the new Financial Management System (FMS).

Assumptions

- 7 In setting the fee, we have assumed that:
 - the level of risk in relation to the audit of the financial statements is not significantly different from that identified for 2006/07 and that you will inform us of significant developments impacting on our audit;
 - internal audit meets the appropriate professional standards and undertakes appropriate work on all systems that provide material figures in the financial statements sufficient that we can place reliance for the purposes of our audit;
 - good quality working papers and records will be provided to support the financial statements at the start of the final accounts audit, at the start of the audit in July 2008;
 - the Council successfully implements its new Financial management System (FMS) and is able to produce its financial statements from the new system;

- requested information will be provided within agreed timescales;
 - prompt responses will be provided to draft reports; and
 - additional work will not be required to address questions or objections raised by local government electors.
- 8 Where these assumptions are not met, we may be required to undertake additional work which is likely to result in an increased audit fee. The fee for the audit of the financial statements will be re-visited when we issue the opinion audit plan.
- 9 Changes to the plan will be agreed with you. These may be required if:
- new residual audit risks emerge;
 - additional work is required of us by the Audit Commission or other regulators; and
 - additional work is required as a result of changes in legislation, professional standards or as a result of changes in financial reporting.

Specific actions Hart District Council could take to reduce its audit and inspection fees

- 10 The Audit Commission requires its auditors to inform a council of specific actions it could take to reduce its audit and inspection fees. We have identified the following actions the Council could take:
- the Head of Finance should review and sign off all working papers supporting the financial statements to ensure that they tie in to the approved draft accounts, and are clearly cross referenced to supporting evidence, before the audit commences;
 - the accounts should be fully completed and adopted by members before the 30 June 2007 deadline, prior to the financial statements audit commencing;
 - all grant claims should be completed and submitted to the relevant department and the auditor by the agreed date, and supported by detailed working papers that evidence each entry prior to the audit commencing;
 - provide an updated action plan, reporting how issues raised at audit (in annual audit and inspection letter, use of resources, opinion etc) have been addressed, with cross-references to evidence;
 - officers should respond to all requests for further information promptly, providing all details that are requested; and
 - senior managers should take responsibility for checking the accuracy of performance indicators and Internal Audit could usefully check that this had been done.

Process for agreeing any changes in audit fees

- 11 If we need to make any significant amendments to the audit fee during the course of this plan, we will firstly discuss this with the Chief Executive and Head of Finance. We will then prepare a report outlining the reasons why the fee needs to change for discussion with the Staff and General Purposes Committee.

Appendix 3 – Independence and objectivity

- 1 Auditors appointed by the Audit Commission are required to comply with the Commission's Code of Audit Practice and Standing Guidance for Auditors, which defines the terms of my appointment. When auditing the financial statements auditors are also required to comply with auditing standards and ethical standards issued by the Auditing Practices Board (APB).
- 2 The main requirements of the Code of Audit Practice, Standing Guidance for Auditors and the standards are summarised below.
- 3 International Standard on Auditing (UK and Ireland) 260 (Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance) requires that the appointed auditor:
 - discloses in writing all relationships that may bear on the auditor's objectivity and independence, the related safeguards put in place to protect against these threats and the total amount of fee that the auditor has charged the client; and
 - confirms in writing that the APB's ethical standards are complied with and that, in the auditor's professional judgement, they are independent and their objectivity is not compromised.
- 4 The standard defines 'those charged with governance' as 'those persons entrusted with the supervision, control and direction of an entity'. In your case, the appropriate addressee of communications from the auditor to those charged with governance is the Staff and General Purposes committee. The auditor reserves the right, however, to communicate directly with the authority on matters which are considered to be of sufficient importance.
- 5 The Commission's Code of Audit Practice has an overriding general requirement that appointed auditors carry out their work independently and objectively, and ensure that they do not act in any way that might give rise to, or could reasonably be perceived to give rise to, a conflict of interest. In particular, appointed auditors and their staff should avoid entering into any official, professional or personal relationships which may, or could reasonably be perceived to, cause them inappropriately or unjustifiably to limit the scope, extent or rigour of their work or impair the objectivity of their judgement.

6 The Standing Guidance for Auditors includes a number of specific rules. The key rules relevant to this audit appointment are as follows:

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