JAC72

Mid Suffolk District Council

Year ending 31 March 2016

Audit Plan

Building a better working world

Ernst & Young LLP
One Cambridge Business Park
Cambridge
CB4 0WZ

Tel: 01223 394400
Fax: 01223 394401
www.ey.com/uk

Audit Committee
Mid Suffolk District Council
131 High Street
Suffolk
IP6 8DL

15 March 2016

Dear Committee Members

Audit Plan

We are pleased to attach our Audit Plan which sets out how we intend to carry out our responsibilities as auditor. Its purpose is to provide the Audit Committee with a basis to review our proposed audit approach and scope for the 2015/16 audit, in accordance with the requirements of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014, the National Audit Office's 2015 Code of Audit Practice, the Statement of Responsibilities issued by Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA) Ltd, auditing standards and other professional requirements. It is also to ensure that our audit is aligned with the Audit Committee's service expectations.

This plan summarises our initial assessment of the key risks which drive the development of an effective audit for Mid Suffolk District Council, and outlines our planned audit strategy in response to those risks.

We welcome the opportunity to discuss this report with you at the next Audit Committee and to understand whether there are other matters which you consider may influence our audit.

Yours faithfully

Andy Clewer

Partner
For and behalf of Ernst & Young LLP
Enc

Contents

In April 2015 Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA) issued ''Statement of responsibilities of auditors and audited bodies 2015-16'. It is available from the Chief Executive of each audited body and via the PSAA website (www.psaa.co.uk)

The Statement of responsibilities serves as the formal terms of engagement between appointed auditors and audited bodies. It summarises where the different responsibilities of auditors and audited bodies begin and end, and what is to be expected of the audited body in certain areas.

The 'Terms of Appointment from 1 April 2015' issued by PSAA sets out additional requirements that auditors must comply with, over and above those set out in the National Audit Office Code of Audit Practice (the Code) and statute, and covers matters of practice and procedure which are of a recurring nature.

This Audit Plan is prepared in the context of the Statement of responsibilities. It is addressed to the Audit Committee, and is prepared for the sole use of the audited body. We, as appointed auditor, take no responsibility to any third party.

Our Complaints Procedure – If at any time you would like to discuss with us how our service to you could be improved, or if you are dissatisfied with the service you are receiving, you may take the issue up with your usual partner or director contact. If you prefer an alternative route, please contact Steve Varley, our Managing Partner, 1 More London Place, London SE1 2AF. We undertake to look into any complaint carefully and promptly and to do all we can to explain the position to you. Should you remain dissatisfied with any aspect of our service, you may of course take matters up with our professional institute. We can provide further information on how you may contact our professional institute.

1. Overview

This Audit Plan covers the work that we plan to perform to provide you with:

- Our audit opinion on whether the financial statements of Mid Suffolk District Council give a true and fair view of the financial position as at 31 March 2016 and of the income and expenditure for the year then ended.

We are also required to report to you by exception if we conclude that you have not put in place proper arrangements to secure value for money in the use of your resources for the relevant period.

We will also review and report to the National Audit Office (NAO), to the extent and in the form required by them, on the Council's Whole of Government Accounts return.

Our audit will also include the mandatory procedures that we are required to perform in accordance with applicable laws and auditing standards.

When planning the audit we take into account several key inputs:

- Strategic, operational and financial risks relevant to the financial statements;
- Developments in financial reporting and auditing standards;
- The quality of systems and processes;
- Changes in the business and regulatory environment; and,
- Management's views on all of the above.

By considering these inputs, our audit is focused on the areas that matter and our feedback is more likely to be relevant to the Council.

2. Financial statement risks

We outline below our current assessment of the financial statement risks facing the Council, identified through our knowledge of the Council's operations and discussion with those charged with governance and officers.

At our meeting, we will seek to validate these with you.

Significant risks (including fraud risks)	Our audit approach
Risk of fraud in revenue recognition	
Under ISA240 there is a presumed risk that revenue may be misstated due to improper recognition of revenue. In the public sector, this requirement is modified by Practice Note 10, issued by the Financial Reporting Council, which states that auditors should also consider the risk that material misstatements may occur by the manipulation of expenditure recognition.	We will: ► Review and test expenditure recognition policies; ► Review and discuss with management any accounting estimates on expenditure recognition for evidence of bias; ► Develop a testing strategy to test material expenditure streams; and ► Review and test expenditure cut-off at the period end date.
Risk of management override	
As identified in ISA (UK and Ireland) 240, management is in a unique position to perpetrate fraud because of its ability to manipulate accounting records directly or indirectly and prepare fraudulent financial statements by overriding controls that otherwise appear to be operating effectively. We identify and respond to this fraud risk on every audit engagement.	Our approach will focus on: ► Testing the appropriateness of journal entries recorded in the general ledger and other adjustments made in the preparation of the financial statements; ► Reviewing accounting estimates and provisions for evidence of management bias; ► Evaluating the business rationale for significant unusual transactions; and ► Reviewing capital expenditure on property, plant and equipment to ensure it meets the relevant accounting requirements to be capitalised.
Valuation of property, plant and equipment	
Material error and weaknesses were identified during our audit of 2014/15 draft financial statements in respect of the valuation of property, plant and equipment. Due to the complexity of accounting for property, plant and equipment, the cyclical approach to valuations, and the material values involved, there is a higher risk that asset valuations contain material misstatements.	Our approach will focus on: ► Reliance on management's valuations experts. This will include comparison to industry valuation trends and reliance on our own valuation experts where significant unexplained variations are identified; ► Testing of journals, supporting spreadsheets and derivation of accounting entries; and ► Testing the accounting treatment of valuations made in the year, including the assessment and treatment of impairment.

Other financial statement risks

Pension liability valuation

The actuarial assumptions used for pension valuations are subject to a high degree of estimation uncertainty that requires the exercise of judgement in determining the appropriate assumptions underlying the valuation.

The local government pension scheme is administered by Suffolk County Council which has engaged Hymans Robertson as its management expert.

Our approach will focus on:

- ► Reviewing the actuary's report and the underlying assumptions used to calculate the year end pension liability;
- ► Considering the reasonableness of the estimates and judgements used,
- ► Writing to the pension scheme auditor (also EY) to obtain assurance over the controls for providing complete and accurate data to the actuary; and
- ► Assessing the extent to which the Council has met the extensive disclosure requirements.

Allocation and reporting of costs and transactions between Mid Suffolk District Council and Babergh District Council

Mid Suffolk DC works with Babergh DC to deliver services under a joint management structure. The allocation of non-payroll costs between the two councils is determined by officers and budget holders coding expenditure to services.

Given the increasing level of joint working, there is a heightened risk of:

- ► misclassification of non-payroll expenditure between Mid Suffolk DC and Babergh DC
- ► recharges not being undertaken in accordance with the agreed basis of allocation

Mid Suffolk DC and Babergh DC are aligning the style and format of their financial statements for the first time this year. There is an increased risk of adjustments being required for either Council due to previous inconsistent coding, accounting or reporting.

Our approach will focus on:

- ► Testing the allocation of non-payroll expenditure between the two Councils to ensure that a satisfactory rationale supports the split;
- ► Sample testing expenditure recharged from Mid Suffolk DC to Babergh DC and vice versa; and
- ► Identifying and testing any items relating to 'Babergh DC' included within Mid Suffolk DC's analytics data.
- ► Reviewing any additional and significant financial transactions that take place between Mid Suffolk and Babergh throughout the 2015/16 financial year.
- ► Reviewing the reporting and disclosure of costs and transactions in the 2015/16 financial statements to ensure harmonisation and consistency between Mid Suffolk District Council and Babergh District Council.

2.1 Responsibilities in respect of fraud and error

We would like to take this opportunity to remind you that management has the primary responsibility to prevent and detect fraud. It is important that management, with the oversight of those charged with governance, has a culture of ethical behaviour and a strong control environment that both deters and prevents fraud.

Our responsibility is to plan and perform audits to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole are free of material misstatements whether caused by error or fraud. As auditors, we approach each engagement with a questioning mind that accepts the possibility that a material misstatement due to fraud could occur, and design the appropriate procedures to consider such risk.

Based on the requirements of auditing standards our approach will focus on:

- Identifying fraud risks during the planning stages;
- Enquiry of management about risks of fraud and the controls to address those risks;
- Understanding the oversight given by those charged with governance of management's processes over fraud;
- Consideration of the effectiveness of management's controls designed to address the risk of fraud;
- Determining an appropriate strategy to address any identified risks of fraud, and,
- Performing mandatory procedures regardless of specifically identified risks.

3. Value for money risks

We are required to consider whether the Council has put in place 'proper arrangements' to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness on its use of resources.
For 2015-16 this is based on the overall evaluation criterion:

"In all significant respects, the audited body had proper arrangements to ensure it took properly informed decisions and deployed resources to achieve planned and sustainable outcomes for taxpayers and local people"

Proper arrangements are defined by statutory guidance issued by the National Audit Office. They comprise your arrangements to:

- Take informed decisions;
- Deploy resources in a sustainable manner; and
- Work with partners and other third parties.

We are only required to determine whether there are any risks that we consider significant, which the Code of Audit Practice defines as:

"A matter is significant if, in the auditor's professional view, it is reasonable to conclude that the matter would be of interest to the audited body or the wider public"

Our risk assessment supports the planning of sufficient work to enable us to deliver a safe conclusion on arrangements to secure value for money and enables us to determine the nature and extent of further work that may be required. If we do not identify any significant risks there is no requirement to carry out further work.

We have undertaken a high level summary of our risk assessment and have not identified any significant risks.

We will keep our risk assessment under review throughout our audit and communicate to the Audit Committee any revisions to our assessment and any additional local risk-based work we may need to undertake as a result.

4. Our audit process and strategy

4.1 Objective and scope of our audit

Under the Code of Audit Practice our principal objectives are to review and report on the Council's:

- Financial statements
- By exception, where we are not satisfied that the Council has established arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources to the extent required by the relevant legislation and the requirements of the Code.

We issue an audit report that covers:

1. **Financial statement audit**

Our objective is to form an opinion on the financial statements under International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland).

We report to you by exception in respect of your governance statement and other accompanying material as required, in accordance with relevant guidance prepared by the NAO on behalf of the Comptroller and Auditor General.

We also review and report to the NAO on the Whole of Government Accounts return to the extent and in the form they require.

2. **Arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness (value for money)**

We are required to consider whether the Council has put in place 'proper arrangements' to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness on its use of resources.

4.2 Audit process overview

Our intention is to carry out a fully substantive audit in 2015/16 rather than rely on the operation of controls as we believe this to be a more efficient approach. Although we are not therefore intending to rely on individual system controls in 2015/16, the Council's control arrangements form part of our assessment of your overall control environment and will form part of the evidence for your Annual Governance Statement. We will review the work completed by Internal Audit as part of this element of work.

Analytics

We will use our computer-based analytics tools to enable us to capture whole populations of your financial data, in particular journal entries. These tools:

- help identify specific exceptions and anomalies which can then be subject to more traditional substantive audit tests; and
- give greater likelihood of identifying errors than random sampling techniques.

We will report the findings from our process and analytics work, including any significant weaknesses or inefficiencies identified and recommendations for improvement, to management and the Audit Committee.

Internal audit

As referred to earlier, we will review internal audit plans and the results of their work. We will reflect the findings from these reports, together with reports from any other work completed in the year, in our detailed audit plan, where we raise issues that could have an impact on the year-end financial statements

Use of specialists

When auditing key judgements, we are often required to rely on the input and advice provided by specialists who have qualifications and expertise not possessed by the core audit team. The areas where either EY or third party specialists provide input for the current year audit are:

Area	Specialists
Pensions	Actuary/EY pensions team
Property Plant and Equipment	Expert valuer/EY valuations team

In accordance with Auditing Standards, we will evaluate each specialist's professional competence and objectivity, considering their qualifications, experience and available resources, together with the independence of the individuals performing the work.

We also consider the work performed by the specialist in light of our knowledge of the Council's environment and processes and our assessment of audit risk in the particular area. For example, we would typically perform the following procedures:

- Analyse source data and make inquiries as to the procedures used by the expert to establish whether the source date is relevant and reliable;
- Assess the reasonableness of the assumptions and methods used;
- Consider the appropriateness of the timing of when the specialist carried out the work; and
- Assess whether the substance of the specialist's findings are properly reflected in the financial statements.

4.3 Mandatory audit procedures required by auditing standards and the Code

As well as the financial statement risks (section two) and value for money risks (section three), we must perform other procedures as required by auditing, ethical and independence standards, the Code and other regulations. We outline below the procedures we will undertake during the course of our audit.

Procedures required by standards

- Addressing the risk of fraud and error;
- Significant disclosures included in the financial statements;
- Entity-wide controls;
- Reading other information contained in the financial statements and reporting whether it is inconsistent with our understanding and the financial statements;
- Auditor independence.

Procedures required by the Code

- ► Reviewing, and reporting on as appropriate, other information published with the financial statements, including the Annual Governance Statement;
- ► Reviewing and reporting on the Whole of Government Accounts return, in line with the instructions issued by the NAO; and
- ► Reviewing and examining, where appropriate, evidence relevant to the Council's corporate performance management and financial management arrangements, and its reporting on these arrangements.

Finally, we are also required to discharge our statutory duties and responsibilities as established by the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014.

In performing these procedures we will take account of matters that have been drawn to our attention from a member of the public since the closure of the 2014/15 audit. The matters raised related to the adequacy of disclosure of financial transactions that take place between Mid Suffolk District Council and Babergh District Council and on the letter of representation that was provided to us by management and presented to 28 September 2015 Audit Committee prior to the approval of the Council's 2014-2015 financial statements. In addition to costs and recharges for joint working between the Councils, during the 2014/15 financial year, Babergh DC provided a £1million short term loan to Mid Suffolk District Council which was included in the Council's total borrowings of £88million in the balance sheet.

We were not the auditors of Babergh District Council for the 2014/15 audit. However, we have been made aware from a member of the public since the closure of the 2014/15 Mid Suffolk District Council audit that there were inconsistencies in the disclosure of £1million loan, as well as the recharges and financial transactions in the related party transaction note of both Councils. Mid Suffolk District Council's 2014-2015 audited financial statements do not separately disclose these transactions in the related parties note whereas these were disclosed in the audited 2014/15 financial statements for Babergh District Council.

Paragraph 3.9.4.4 of CIPFA's Code of Practice for Local Authority Accounting does exclude the detailed related party disclosure requirements (set out in paragraph 3.9.4.1) for central government and other local authorities, which would apply here.

However, given the nature of the joint working, and in the interests of openness, transparency and consistency, we agree there should be greater harmonisation of disclosures on the allocation and reporting of financial transactions in the financial statements for both Councils.

We will therefore:

- Review and ensure consistency and harmonisation in the disclosure of financial transactions that take place between Mid Suffolk District Council and Babergh District Council, to recognise the extent of shared and joint working that take places between the Councils.
- Ensure that the letter of representation we receive from management and considered by those charged with governance does not contain any typographical error that could give an incorrect impression on where responsibilities lie. In management letter of representation on the 2014/15 financial statements, the Council have acknowledged that they incorrectly referred to 'you' rather than 'we' on one section relating to the design, implementation and maintenance of internal controls to prevent and detect fraud. The Council however were clear in its Statement of Responsibilities in the audited 2014-2015 financial statements on their responsibilities in this area, and also in written communications we received from management and those charged with governance regarding internal controls during the course of our audit.
- Reviewing the appropriateness of any proposed accounting adjustment the Council intends to make to correct the unadjusted error of £184,786 reported in the 2014/15 audit relating to a 2013/14 accrual not being reversed.

4.4 Materiality

For the purposes of determining whether the financial statements are free from material error, we define materiality as the magnitude of an omission or misstatement that, individually or in aggregate, could reasonably be expected to influence the users of the financial statements. Our evaluation requires professional judgement and so takes into account qualitative as well as quantitative considerations implied in the definition.

We have determined at the planning stage that overall materiality for the financial statements of the Council is £944k based on 2% of gross expenditure. We will communicate uncorrected audit misstatements greater than £47k to you.

The amount we consider material at the end of the audit may differ from our initial determination. At this stage, however, it is not feasible to anticipate all the circumstances that might ultimately influence our judgement. At the end of the audit we will form our final opinion by reference to all matters that could be significant to users of the financial statements, including the total effect of any audit misstatements, and our evaluation of materiality at that date.

4.5 Fees

The duty to prescribe fees is a statutory function delegated to Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA) by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. PSAA has published a scale fee for all relevant bodies. This is defined as the fee required by auditors to meet statutory responsibilities under the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 in accordance with the NAO Code. The indicative fee scale for the audit of Mid Suffolk District Council is £43,425.

4.6 Your audit team

The engagement team is led by Andy Clewer, Partner. Andy is supported by Melanie Richardson who as Audit Manager is responsible for the day-to-day direction of audit work, and is the key contact for the Chief Financial Officer and finance team. Andy and Melanie will be supported by Katie Durham, Audit Executive who will be significantly involved in the delivery of our audit of the Council’s financial statements. Andy, Melanie and Katie have significant local government external audit experience.

4.7 Timetable of communication, deliverables and insights

We have set out below a timetable showing the key stages of the audit, including the Value for Money work and the Whole of Government Accounts. The timetable includes the 2015/16 deliverables we have agreed to provide to the Council through the Audit Committee cycle. These dates are determined to ensure our alignment with PSAA's rolling calendar of deadlines.

From time to time matters may arise that require immediate communication with the Audit Committee and we will discuss them with the Chairman as appropriate.

Following the conclusion of our audit we will prepare an Annual Audit Letter to communicate the key issues arising from our work to the Council and external stakeholders, including members of the public.

Audit phase	Timetable	Audit Committee timetable	Deliverables
High level planning	**April 2015**		Audit Fee Letter
Risk assessment and setting of scopes	**January - March 2016**	**April 2016**	Audit Plan
Testing routine processes and controls	**February – March 2016**		Progress Report if required
Year-end audit	**July - September 2016**		
Completion of audit	**September 2016**	**September 2016**	Report to those charged with governance via the Audit Results Report Audit report (including our opinion on the financial statements, and, by exception, an overall value for money conclusion). Audit completion certificate Reporting to the NAO on the Whole of Government Accounts return.
Conclusion of reporting	**October 2016**	**January 2017**	Annual Audit Letter

In addition to the above formal reporting and deliverables we will seek to provide practical business insights and updates on regulatory matters.

5. Independence

5.1 Introduction

The APB Ethical Standards and ISA (UK and Ireland) 260 ‘Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance’, requires us to communicate with you on a timely basis on all significant facts and matters that bear on our independence and objectivity. The Ethical Standards, as revised in December 2010, require that we do this formally both at the planning stage and at the conclusion of the audit, as well as during the audit if appropriate. The aim of these communications is to ensure full and fair disclosure by us to those charged with your governance on matters in which you have an interest.

Required communications

Planning stage	Final stage
► The principal threats, if any, to objectivity and independence identified by EY including consideration of all relationships between you, your affiliates and directors and us; ► The safeguards adopted and the reasons why they are considered to be effective, including any Engagement Quality Review; ► The overall assessment of threats and safeguards; ► Information about the general policies and process within EY to maintain objectivity and independence.	► A written disclosure of relationships (including the provision of non-audit services) that bear on our objectivity and independence, the threats to our independence that these create, any safeguards that we have put in place and why they address such threats, together with any other information necessary to enable our objectivity and independence to be assessed; ► Details of non-audit services provided and the fees charged in relation thereto; ► Written confirmation that we are independent; ► Details of any inconsistencies between APB Ethical Standards, NAO/PSAA Standing Guidance and your policy for the supply of non-audit services by EY and any apparent breach of that policy; and ► An opportunity to discuss auditor independence issues.

During the course of the audit we must also communicate with you whenever any significant judgements are made about threats to objectivity and independence and the appropriateness of our safeguards, for example when accepting an engagement to provide non-audit services.

We also provide information on any contingent fee arrangements, the amounts of any future contracted services, and details of any written proposal to provide non-audit services;

We ensure that the total amount of fees that EY and our network firms have charged to you and your affiliates for the provision of services during the reporting period are disclosed analysed in appropriate categories.

5.2 Relationships, services and related threats and safeguards

We highlight the following significant facts and matters that may be reasonably considered to bear upon our objectivity and independence, including any principal threats. However we have adopted the safeguards below to mitigate these threats along with the reasons why they are considered to be effective.

Self-interest threats

A self-interest threat arises when EY has financial or other interests in your entity. Examples include where we have an investment in your entity; where we receive significant fees in respect of non-audit services; where we need to recover long outstanding fees; or where we enter into a business relationship with the Council.

At the time of writing, there are no long outstanding fees.

We believe that it is appropriate for us to undertake permissible non-audit services, and we will comply with the policies that the Council has approved and that are in compliance with the NAO/PSAA's Standing Guidance.

A self-interest threat may also arise if members of our audit engagement team have objectives or are rewarded in relation to sales of non-audit services to the Council. We confirm that no member of our audit engagement team, including those from other service lines, is in this position, in compliance with Ethical Standard 4.

There are no other self-interest threats at the date of this report.

Self-review threats

Self-review threats arise when the results of a non-audit service performed by EY or others within the EY network are reflected in the amounts included or disclosed in the financial statements.

There are no other self-review threats at the date of this report.

Management threats

Partners and employees of EY are prohibited from taking decisions on behalf of management of your entity. Management threats may also arise during the provision of a non-audit service where management is required to make judgements or decisions based on that work.

There are no management threats at the date of this report.

Other threats

Other threats, such as advocacy, familiarity or intimidation, may arise.

There are no other threats at the date of this report.

Overall Assessment

Overall we consider that the adopted safeguards appropriately mitigate the principal threats identified, and we therefore confirm that EY is independent and the objectivity and independence of Andy Clewer, the audit engagement Partner and the audit engagement team have not been compromised.

5.3 Other required communications

EY has policies and procedures that instil professional values as part of firm culture and ensure that the highest standards of objectivity, independence and integrity are maintained.

Details of the key policies and processes within EY for maintaining objectivity and independence can be found in our annual Transparency Report, which the firm is required to publish by law. The most recent version of this report is for the year ended June 2015 and can be found here:

http://www.ey.com/UK/en/About-us/EY-UK-Transparency-Report-2015

Appendix A Fees

A breakdown of our agreed fee is shown below.

	Planned Fee 2015/16 £	Scale fee 2015/16 £	Outturn fee 2014/15 £
Opinion Audit and VFM Conclusion – Code work	43,425	43,425	57,900
Certification of claims and returns	18,665	18,665	25,245

All fees exclude VAT.

The agreed fee presented above is based on the following assumptions:

- ► Officers meeting the agreed timetable of deliverables;
- ► We can rely on the work of internal audit as planned;
- ► Our accounts opinion and value for money conclusion being unqualified;
- ► Appropriate quality of documentation is provided by the Council; and
- ► The Council has an effective control environment.

If any of the above assumptions prove to be unfounded, we will seek a variation to the agreed fee. This will be discussed with the Head of Corporate Resources in the first instance.

Appendix B UK required communications with those charged with governance

There are certain communications that we must provide to the Audit Committee. These are detailed here:

Required communication	Reference
Planning and audit approach Communication of the planned scope and timing of the audit including any limitations.	► Audit Plan
Significant findings from the audit ► Our view about the significant qualitative aspects of accounting practices including accounting policies, accounting estimates and financial statement disclosures ► Significant difficulties, if any, encountered during the audit ► Significant matters, if any, arising from the audit that were discussed with management ► Written representations that we are seeking ► Expected modifications to the audit report ► Other matters if any, significant to the oversight of the financial reporting process	► Report to those charged with governance
Misstatements ► Uncorrected misstatements and their effect on our audit opinion ► The effect of uncorrected misstatements related to prior periods ► A request that any uncorrected misstatement be corrected ► In writing, corrected misstatements that are significant	► Report to those charged with governance
Fraud ► Enquiries of the Audit Committee to determine whether they have knowledge of any actual, suspected or alleged fraud affecting the entity ► Any fraud that we have identified or information we have obtained that indicates that a fraud may exist ► A discussion of any other matters related to fraud	► Report to those charged with governance
Related parties Significant matters arising during the audit in connection with the entity's related parties including, when applicable: ► Non-disclosure by management ► Inappropriate authorisation and approval of transactions ► Disagreement over disclosures ► Non-compliance with laws and regulations ► Difficulty in identifying the party that ultimately controls the entity	► Report to those charged with governance
External confirmations ► Management's refusal for us to request confirmations ► Inability to obtain relevant and reliable audit evidence from other procedures	► Report to those charged with governance
Consideration of laws and regulations ► Audit findings regarding non-compliance where the non-compliance is material and believed to be intentional. This communication is subject to compliance with legislation on tipping off ► Enquiry of the Audit Committee into possible instances of non-compliance with laws and regulations that may have a material effect on the financial statements and that the Audit Committee may be aware of	► Report to those charged with governance

Required communication	Reference
Independence Communication of all significant facts and matters that bear on EY's objectivity and independence Communication of key elements of the audit engagement director's consideration of independence and objectivity such as: ► The principal threats ► Safeguards adopted and their effectiveness ► An overall assessment of threats and safeguards ► Information about the general policies and process within the firm to maintain objectivity and independence	► Audit Plan ► Report to those charged with governance
Going concern Events or conditions identified that may cast significant doubt on the entity's ability to continue as a going concern, including: ► Whether the events or conditions constitute a material uncertainty ► Whether the use of the going concern assumption is appropriate in the preparation and presentation of the financial statements ► The adequacy of related disclosures in the financial statements	► Report to those charged with governance
Significant deficiencies in internal controls identified during the audit	► Report to those charged with governance
Fee Information ► Breakdown of fee information at the agreement of the initial audit plan ► Breakdown of fee information at the completion of the audit	► Audit Plan ► Report to those charged with governance ► Annual Audit Letter if considered necessary

EY | Assurance | Tax | Transactions | Advisory

Ernst & Young LLP

Ernst & Young LLP, 1 More London Place, London, SE1 2AF.

ey.com