



# Audit Committee Update for Derby City Council

---

**Year ended 31 March 2014**

27 February 2014

**Phil W Jones**

Director

T 0121 232 5232

E [phil.w.jones@uk.gt.com](mailto:phil.w.jones@uk.gt.com)

**Tony Parks**

Manager


T 0121 232 5301

E [tony.l.parks@uk.gt.com](mailto:tony.l.parks@uk.gt.com)

**Matt Berrisford**

Executive

E [matthew.j.berrisford@uk.gt.com](mailto:matthew.j.berrisford@uk.gt.com)



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

---

# Contents

Section	Page
Introduction	4
Progress at 27 February 2014	5
Emerging issues and developments	
Local government guidance	8
Grant Thornton	12
Accounting and audit issues	15

---

# Introduction

This paper provides the Audit Committee with a report on progress in delivering our responsibilities as your external auditors. The paper also includes:

- a summary of emerging national issues and developments that may be relevant to you as a city council
- includes a number of challenge questions in respect of these emerging issues which the Committee may wish to consider.

Members of the Audit Committee can find further useful material on our website [www.grant-thornton.co.uk](http://www.grant-thornton.co.uk), where we have a section dedicated to our work in the public sector. Here you can download copies of our publications – 'Local Government Governance Review 2013', 'Towards a tipping point?', 'The migration of public services', 'The developing internal audit agenda', 'Preparing for the future', 'Surviving the storm: how resilient are local authorities?'

If you would like further information on any items in this briefing, or would like to register with Grant Thornton to receive regular email updates on issues that are of interest to you, please contact either your Engagement Lead or Audit Manager.

Phil Jones Engagement Lead T 0121 232 5232 M 0782 434 3631 [phil.w.jones@uk.gt.com](mailto:phil.w.jones@uk.gt.com)  
Tony Parks Audit Manager T 0121 232 5301 M 07880 456 113 [tony.l.parks@uk.gt.com](mailto:tony.l.parks@uk.gt.com)

## Progress at 27 February 2014

Work	Planned date	Complete?	Comments
<b>2013-14 Accounts Audit Plan</b> We are required to issue a detailed accounts audit plan to the Council setting out our proposed approach in order to give an opinion on Council's 2013-14 financial statements.	March 2014	In progress	Audit planning has commenced with our internal planning meeting completed. The Audit Plan is expected to go to the 26 March 2014 Audit Committee.
<b>Interim accounts audit</b> Our interim fieldwork visit includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• updating our review of the Council's control environment</li> <li>• updating our understanding of financial systems</li> <li>• review of Internal Audit reports on core financial systems</li> <li>• early work on emerging accounting issues</li> <li>• early substantive testing.</li> </ul>	February & March 2014	In progress	Our interim fieldwork visit is in progress.
<b>2013-14 final accounts audit</b> Including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• audit of the 2013-14 financial statements</li> <li>• proposed opinion on the Council 's accounts</li> </ul>	July – September 2014	Not yet due	

## Progress at 1 March 2014

Work	Planned date	Complete?	Comments
<b>Value for Money (VfM) conclusion</b> Our VfM conclusion is based on the following criteria specified by the Audit Commission <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The organisation has proper arrangements in place for securing financial resilience</li><li>• The organisation has proper arrangements for challenging how it secures economy, efficiency and effectiveness</li></ul>	March & August 2014	Not yet due	
<b>Other activity undertaken</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Certification of Regional Growth Fund</li><li>• VAT and Corporation Tax advice in connection with the Innovation Centre regeneration project.</li></ul>	February 2014 February & March 2014	Yes No	

---

## Emerging issues and developments

# Councils must continue to adapt to meet the needs of local people

## Local government guidance

### Audit Commission research - Tough Times 2013

The Audit Commission's latest research, <http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Tough-Times-2013-Councils-Responses-to-Financial-Challenges-w1.pdf> shows that England's councils have demonstrated a high degree of financial resilience over the last three years, despite a 20 per cent reduction in funding from government and a number of other financial challenges. However, with uncertainty ahead, the Commission says that councils must carry on adapting in order to fulfil their statutory duties and meet the needs of local people.

The Audit Commission Chairman, Jeremy Newman said that with continuing financial challenges 'Councils must share what they have learnt from making savings and keep looking for new ways to deliver public services that rely less on funding from central government'.

#### Key findings:

The Audit Commission's research found that:

- the three strategies most widely adopted by councils have been reducing staff numbers, securing service delivery efficiencies and reducing or restructuring the senior management team;
- three in ten councils exhibited some form of financial stress in 2012/13 – exhibited by a mix of difficulties in delivering budgets and taking unplanned actions to keep finances on track;
- auditors expressed concerns about the medium term prospects of one third of councils (36 per cent)

#### Issues to consider/challenge questions:

How have the Cabinet and Audit and Accounts Committee satisfied themselves that the Council can deliver a balanced budget, that the medium term strategy/budget has been subject to appropriate challenge and that the Council's finances are resilient over the medium term (3 years) and beyond?



---

# Councils choosing their auditors one step closer

## Local government guidance

### Local Audit and Accountability Act

The Local Audit and Accountability Act received Royal Assent on 30 January 2014.

#### Key points

Amongst other things:

- the Act makes provision for the closure of the Audit Commission on 31 March 2015;
- arrangements are being worked through to transfer residual Audit Commission responsibilities to new organisations;
- there will be a new framework for local public audit due to start when the Commission's current contracts with audit suppliers end in 2016/17, or potentially 2019/20 if all the contracts are extended;
- the National Audit Office will be responsible for the codes of audit practice and guidance, which set out the way in which auditors are to carry out their functions;
- Local Authority's will take responsibilities for choosing their own external auditors;
- recognised supervisory bodies (accountancy professional bodies) will register audit firms and auditors and will be required to have rules and practices in place that cover the eligibility of firms to be appointed as local auditors;
- Local Authority's will be required to establish an auditor panel which must advise the authority on the maintenance of an independent relationship with the local auditor appointed to audit its accounts;
- existing rights around inspection of documents, the right to make an objection at audit and for declaring an item of account unlawful are in line with current arrangements;
- transparency measures give citizens the right to film and tweet from any local government body meeting.

Issues to consider/challenge questions:

- Has the Audit and Accounts Committee considered the implications of the Local Audit and Accountability Act for the Council's future external audit arrangements?

# Joint Health and Social Care Plans to be in place by 4<sup>th</sup> April

## Local government guidance

### Better Care Fund

In the June 2013 Spending Round the Government announced the prospective implementation of the Better Care Fund (formerly the integration transformation fund). The key aim is to ensure a transformation in integrated health and social care through local single pooled budget arrangements. Pooled budget arrangements are formally underpinned by Section 75 of the NHS Act 2006.

#### Key issues

- £3.8 billion for funding will be available from 2015/16, largely through a top slice of existing Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) budgets;
- Local Authorities with Adult Social Services, CCGs and NHS Trusts will need to collaborate through a single pooled budget arrangement to support the delivery of health and social care services in their designated local areas;
- finalised joint health and social care plans must be in place setting out how pooled budgets will be spent – draft plans must be formally signed off by each statutory Health and Well Being Board and submitted to NHS England area teams by 14 February, with a 4 April 2014 deadline for submission of finalised plans.

#### Issues to consider/challenge questions:

- Is the local Health and Wellbeing Board on track to finalise and sign off the joint health and social care plan for submission to the NHS England area team?
- Has the size of the pooled budget been clarified?
- Is the Authority collaborating with its partner bodies to work through funding and delivery arrangements?
- Have roles and responsibilities been defined and understood for the Authority and its partner CCGs, NHS Trusts and the Health and Wellbeing Board?

---

# Austerity continued – further cuts in spending powers

## Local Government Guidance

### Final local government finance settlement 2014/15

On 5 February 2014 the government published the final local government finance settlement for 2014/15. This confirmed the proposals laid out in the provisional finance settlement. The government has proposed that any council tax increases made by billing or precepting authorities of 2 per cent or more will be subject to a referendum. This proposal needs to be accepted by Parliament.

Excluding the Greater London Authority, the spending power for local authorities in England will fall by 2.9% in 2014/15 compared to 2013/14. As in previous years, councils will have their funding reduction capped at 6.9%. Indicative funding levels for 2015/16 have also been provided to assist local authorities with their medium term financial planning. The settlement will be finalised in February 2014.

#### Challenge questions:

- Has your Director of Finance and Procurement reviewed the proposed settlement and assessed the impact on your Council?

# 79% of Councils anticipate Tipping Point soon

## Grant Thornton

### 2016 tipping point? Challenging the current

This report [http://www.grant-thornton.co.uk/Global/Publication\\_pdf/LG-Financial-Resilience-2016-tipping-point.pdf](http://www.grant-thornton.co.uk/Global/Publication_pdf/LG-Financial-Resilience-2016-tipping-point.pdf) is the third in an annual series which assesses whether English local authorities have the arrangements in place to ensure their sustainable financial future.

Local authorities have so far met the challenges of public sector budget reductions. However, some authorities are predicting reaching tipping point, when the pressure becomes acute and financial failure is a real risk. Based on our review of forty per cent of the sector, this report shows that seventy nine per cent of local authorities anticipate some form of tipping point in 2015/16 or 2016/17.

Our report rates local authorities in four areas - key indicators of financial performance, strategic financial planning, financial governance and financial control. It also identifies a series of potential 'tipping point scenarios' such as local authorities no longer being able to meet statutory responsibilities to deliver a range of services.

Our report also suggest some of the key priorities for local authorities in responding to the challenge of remaining financially sustainable. This includes a relentless focus on generating additional sources of revenue income, and improving efficiency through shared services, strategic partnerships and wider re-organisation.

#### Challenge questions

- Our report includes a good practice checklist designed to provide senior management and members with an overview of key tipping point risks. Has the Director of Finance and Procurement considered how the checklist could support the Council's budget process?
- The report also includes good practice case studies in strategic financial planning, financial governance and financial control. Has the Director of Finance and Procurement reviewed these case studies and considered whether there is scope to adopt these?

# Alternative Delivery Models – are you making the most of them?

## Grant Thornton

### Alternative delivery models in local government

This report: <http://www.grant-thornton.co.uk/en/Publications/2014/Responding-to-the-challenge-alternative-delivery-models-in-local-government/> discusses the main alternative delivery models available to local government. These are based on our recent client survey and work with local government clients. It aims to assist others as they develop their options and implement innovation strategies.

Local government has increased the variety and number of alternative delivery models it uses in recent years including contracts and partnerships with other public bodies and private sector organisations, as well as developing new public sector and non-public sector entities. With financial austerity set to continue, it is important that local authorities continue innovating, if they are to remain financially resilient and commission better quality services at reduced cost.

This report is based on a brief client survey and work with local authority clients and:

- Outlines the main alternative delivery models available to local authorities
- Aims to assist other authorities as they develop their options and implement innovation strategies
- Considers aspects of risk.

#### Challenge question

- Our report includes a number of case studies summarising how public services are being delivered through alternative service models. Has the Authority reviewed these case studies and assessed whether there are similar opportunities available to it?
- Our report includes three short checklists on supporting innovation in service delivery, setting up a company and questions that members should ask officers when considering the development of a new delivery model. Are the checklists being considered as part of the development of the Authority's commissioning strategy?

# Welfare reforms – what you think of it so far?

## Grant Thornton

### Reaping the benefits: first impressions of the impact of welfare reform.

The potential scope of this topic is broad, so our report, [http://www.grant-thornton.co.uk/Global/Publication\\_pdf/Reaping-the-benefits-LG-Welfare-Reform.pdf](http://www.grant-thornton.co.uk/Global/Publication_pdf/Reaping-the-benefits-LG-Welfare-Reform.pdf) focuses on the financial and managerial aspects of welfare reform. This involves:

- Understanding the challenges currently facing local government and housing associations in regard to welfare reform and what organisations have been doing to meet this challenge in terms of strategy, projects and new processes.
- Reporting on the early indications of effectiveness following the implementation of these measures and the impact of reform.
- Providing early insight into challenges facing these organisations in the near future.

We have pulled together information from a variety of sources, including our regular conversations across the local government and housing sectors and surveying local authorities and housing associations in England.

We found that:

- In general, organisations have been very active in engaging with stakeholders and putting in place appropriate governance arrangements and systems to implement specific reforms. A minority of organisations did not fully exploit all the options open to them in preparing for reform.
- So far, the indication is that the impact of reform experienced by local authorities and partners has been managed effectively. This may be because the full impact has not yet been felt. Some worrying signs are emerging, including rising rental arrears, homelessness and reliance on food banks, which may be linked to the reforms.
- Looking ahead, further reforms, such as the implementation of universal credit and the move to direct payments present significant uncertainties and challenges over the next few years.

Challenge questions

- Has the Head of Benefits and Exchequer Services kept the Audit and Accounts Committee informed of progress with stakeholder engagement and changes to governance arrangements to implement specific reforms?
- What impact assessment is the Authority carrying out on council tax localisation, the benefit cap and housing benefit, the spare room subsidy and changes to the Social Fund?
- Does the Authority have a plan in place or in development for the introduction of universal credit?

# How do you recognise a PFI?

## Accounting and audit issues

### Private Finance Initiative Schemes and Service Concessions

The Government financial reporting manual (FReM) and the Local Government CIPFA Code of Practice have now adopted IPSAS 32 (International public sector accounting standards) – Service Concession Arrangements.

Previously under IAS 17 (International Accounting Standards – Leases ), the recognition point for an asset and a liability in the financial statements for such a scheme was at the commencement date of the contract, when the asset was handed over to the public sector and ready for use.

Now under IPSAS 32, the recognition point is when:

- it is probable that future economic benefits associated with the asset will flow to the organisation
- the cost of the asset can be measured reliably.

This suggests that some authorities may need to consider recognising service concession assets during the construction phase as assets under construction. In reaching a judgement as to whether to recognise an asset under construction, we would expect authorities to consider the extent to which they bear construction risk and whether they can get reliable information on the cost of construction from the operator.

Challenge questions:

- Has your Director of Finance and Procurement considered whether IPSAS 32 is relevant to your authority?
- Do you have any partially built assets at the year end under such a scheme which would now need to be accounted for differently?
- As the standard is retrospectively applied, do your financial statements require a prior period adjustment for the financial statements year ending 31 March 2013?

# Keeping your PFI accounting up to date

## Accounting and audit issues

### Private Finance Initiative Schemes and Service Concessions

#### Updating the accounting model during the operational phase

Most authorities derive their accounting entries from an accounting model which, in turn, is derived from the operators costing model. The initial accounting model will have included a range of assumptions, such as inflationary increases. We would expect authorities to update the accounting model for actual information, such as inflationary increases and performance variations, during the contract.

#### Disclosing the impact of inflation on commitments

We expect authorities to disclose the impact of inflation on their service concession commitments. These commitments are affected by:

- past inflation – previous price rises will be built into future payments
- fluctuations in future inflation – this gives rise to uncertainties about future payments.

#### Disclosing the fair value of the service concession liability

Service concession liabilities are financial instruments. Therefore, we would expect authorities to disclose the fair value of the liability unless this is not materially different from the carrying value. In most cases we would expect the fair value for operational schemes to be higher than the carrying value. This is because once a scheme is operational, authorities have access to lower interest rates for refinancing. This is because the pre-construction interest rate reflects the risks associated with construction.

#### Challenge questions:

- Does the Authority regularly update the accounting model?
- Has your authority disclosed the impact of past and future inflation on its commitments?
- Has your authority disclosed the fair value of its PFI liability?



# Revaluing your assets – clarification of accounting guidance

## Accounting and audit issues

### Property, plant and equipment valuations

The 2013/14 Code has clarified the requirements for valuing property, plant and equipment and now states explicitly that revaluations must be 'sufficiently regular to ensure that the carrying amount does not differ materially from that which would be determined using the fair value at the end of the reporting period.' This means that a local authority will need to satisfy itself that the value of assets in its balance sheet is not materially different from the amount that would be given by a full valuation carried out on 31 March 2014. This is likely to be a complex analysis which might include consideration of:

- the condition of the authority's property portfolio at 31 March 2014
- the results of recent revaluations and what this might mean for the valuation of property that has not been recently valued
- general information on market prices and building costs
- the consideration of materiality in its widest sense - whether an issue would influence the view of a reader of the accounts.

The Code also follows the wording in IAS 16 more closely in the requirements for valuing classes of assets:

- items within a class of property, plant and equipment are to be revalued simultaneously to avoid selective revaluation of assets and the reporting of amounts in the financial statements that are a mixture of costs and values as at different dates
- a class of assets may be revalued on a rolling basis provided revaluation of the class of assets is completed within a short period and provided the revaluations are kept up to date.

There has been much debate on what is a short period and whether assets that have been defined as classes for valuation purposes should also be disclosed separately in the financial statements. These considerations are secondary to the requirement that the carrying value does not differ materially from the fair value. However, we would expect auditors to report to those charged with governance where, for a material asset class:

- all assets within the class are not all valued in the same year
- the class of asset is not disclosed separately in the property, plant and equipment note.

### Challenge question

Has the Audit and Accounts Committee been consulted on the programme of valuations and the proposals for disclosing information about classes of assets?

# Estimating the impact of business rate appeals

## Accounting and audit issues

### Business rate appeals provisions

Local authorities are liable for successful appeals against business rates. They should, therefore, recognise a provision for their best estimate of the amount that businesses have been overcharged up to 31 March 2014.

However, there are practical difficulties which mean that making a reliable estimate for the total amount that has been overcharged is challenging:

- the appeals process is managed by the Valuation Office Agency (VOA) and so local authorities are reliant on the information provided to them by the VOA
- some businesses may have been overcharged but not yet made an appeal.

We would expect local authorities:

- to work with the VOA to make sure that they have access to the information they need
- where appeals have been made, to determine a methodology for estimating a provision and to apply this methodology consistently
- where appeals have not been made:
  - to consider the extent to which a reliable estimate can be made (for example, in relation to major businesses)
  - to recognise a provision where a reliable estimate can be made
  - to disclose a contingent liability where a reliable estimate cannot be made
  - to provide a rationale to support their judgement that a reliable estimate cannot be made
- to revisit the estimate with the latest information available immediately before the audit opinion is issued.

Challenge questions:

- Is your authority confident of obtaining the information it needs from the VOA?
- Has your authority recognised a provision where it is possible to make a reliable estimate? Has a robust methodology been used?
- Has your authority provided a robust rationale where it has decided it cannot make a reliable estimate? Is it planning to disclose a contingent liability?
- Is your authority planning to revisit its provision and contingent liability before the audit opinion is issued?

---

# Reporting the costs of public health

## Accounting and audit issues

### Changes to SeRCOP – new public health line

SeRCOP for 2013/14 introduces a new cost of service line for 'Public health'. This has been introduced to reflect new responsibilities placed upon local authorities following restructuring in the NHS. We expect this new service line to be presented on the face of the CIES within cost of services. If there were material amounts relating to this service in 2013/14, we would expect comparative figures to be restated.

#### Challenge question

- Is your Director of Finance and Procurement confident that he can provide accurate information and a robust audit trail for the public health line within cost of services?

# Accounting for pensions

## Accounting and audit issues

### Accounting for and financing the local government pension scheme costs

#### Accounting issues

The 2013/14 Code follows amendments to IAS 19 and changes the accounting requirements for defined benefit pension liabilities such as those arising from the local government pension scheme (LGPS). This is a change in accounting policy and will apply retrospectively.

The main changes we expect to see are:

- a reallocation of amounts charged in the comprehensive income and expenditure statement (CIES)
- more detailed disclosures.

We do not expect changes to balance sheet items (the net pension liability and pension reserve balance). This means that whilst we would expect the CIES to be restated, a third balance sheet is not required. Actuaries should be providing local authorities with the information they need to prepare the financial statements, including restated comparatives.

#### Financing issues

The amount to be charged to the general fund in a financial year is the amount that is payable for that financial year as set out in the actuary's rates and adjustments certificate. Some local authorities are considering paying pension fund contributions early in exchange for a discount but not charging the general fund until later.

Local authorities must be satisfied that the amounts charged to the general fund in a financial year are the amounts payable for that year. Where local authorities are considering making early payments, we would expect them to obtain legal advice (either internally or externally) to determine the amounts that are chargeable to the general fund. We would expect this to include consideration of:

- the actuary's opinion on the amounts that are payable by the local authority into the pension fund
- the agreement between the actuary and the local authority as to when these payments are to be made
- the wording in the rates and adjustments certificate setting out when amounts are payable for each financial year.

For example, if a local authority agrees to make a payment to the pension fund in a single year and proposes to charge this amount to the general fund over a three-year period, we would expect the rates and adjustments certificate to show, unambiguously, that the amount payable is spread over the three years.

---

# Accounting for pensions

## Accounting and audit issues

Challenge questions:

- Is your local authority confident of getting the information from its actuary to meet the changes in the requirements for accounting for the LGPS (including restating the comparatives)?
- If your authority is considering making an early payment to the pension fund, has it set out a reasonable argument for how it proposes to charge this amount to the general fund? Is this supported by legal advice?

# Changes to the public services pension scheme

## Accounting and audit issues

### Changes to the Local Government Pension Scheme

The Public Service Pensions Bill received Royal Assent in April 2013, becoming the Public Service Pensions Act 2013 ('the Act'). The Act makes provision for new public service pension schemes to be established in England, Wales & Scotland. Consequent regulations have been laid to introduce changes to the LGPS in England and Wales from 1st April 2014. (The regulations for the changes in Scotland have not yet been laid and will only impact from 1 April 2015).

These introduce a number of changes including:

- a change from a final salary scheme to a career average scheme
- introduction of a 50/50 option whereby members can choose to reduce their contributions by 50% to receive 50% less benefit
- calculation of contributions based on actual salary which could lead to some staff with irregular patterns of working moving between contribution rate bandings on a regular basis
- changes in employee contribution rates and bandings
- transitional protection for people retiring within 10 years of 1 April 2014 (further regulations are still awaited).

The above changes have implications for all employers involved in the LGPS introducing required changes to their payroll systems to ensure pension contributions are calculated correctly. This has consequent implications for administering authorities to communicate with employers and consider how they will obtain assurance over the accuracy and completeness of contributions going forwards since the calculations are more complex going forwards and less predictable. In addition changes are also required to pension administration/payment systems as well as much more detailed processes around maintaining individual pension accounts for all members to ensure the correct payment of future pensions.

The Act also requires changes to the governance arrangements although regulations for the LGPS have not yet been laid for these and the changes in governance arrangements are not expected to be implemented until 1 April 2015.

(continued overleaf)

---

# Changes to the public services pension scheme

## Accounting and audit issues

### Changes to Local Government Pension Scheme continued

#### Challenge questions

- Is the authority aware of the detailed requirements and their impact on its current payroll system and processes?
- Is the authority taking appropriate action to ensure implementation of the required changes to its payroll system and processes by 1 April 2014?
- Has the authority liaised with the administering authority over any changes they may need in the assurances provided over the completeness and accuracy of contributions?



© 2014 Grant Thornton UK LLP. All rights reserved.

'Grant Thornton' means Grant Thornton UK LLP, a limited liability partnership.

Grant Thornton is a member firm of Grant Thornton International Ltd (Grant Thornton International). References to 'Grant Thornton' are to the brand under which the Grant Thornton member firms operate and refer to one or more member firms, as the context requires. Grant Thornton International and the member firms are not a worldwide partnership. Services are delivered independently by member firms, which are not responsible for the services or activities of one another. Grant Thornton International does not provide services to clients.

**[grant-thornton.co.uk](http://grant-thornton.co.uk)**