



cutting through complexity™

Report to those charged with governance (ISA 260) 2013/14

Rutland County Council

September 2014



The contacts at KPMG in connection with this report are:

Tony Crawley

Director
KPMG LLP (UK)

Tel: 0116 256 6067
tony.crawley@kpmg.co.uk

Mike Norman

Manager
KPMG LLP (UK)

Tel: 0115 935 3554
michael.norman@kpmg.co.uk

Peter Wilson

Assistant Manager
KPMG LLP (UK)

Tel: 0116 256 6066
peter.wilson@kpmg.co.uk

Report sections

	Page
■ Introduction	2
■ Headlines	3
■ Financial statements	4
■ VFM conclusion	10

Appendices

1. Key issues and recommendations	11
2. Audit differences	12
3. Declaration of independence and objectivity	13

This report is addressed to the Authority and has been prepared for the sole use of the Authority. We take no responsibility to any member of staff acting in their individual capacities, or to third parties. The Audit Commission has issued a document entitled *Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and Audited Bodies*. This summarises where the responsibilities of auditors begin and end and what is expected from the audited body. We draw your attention to this document which is available on the Audit Commission’s website at www.auditcommission.gov.uk.

External auditors do not act as a substitute for the audited body’s own responsibility for putting in place proper arrangements to ensure that public business is conducted in accordance with the law and proper standards, and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for, and used economically, efficiently and effectively.

If you have any concerns or are dissatisfied with any part of KPMG’s work, in the first instance you should contact Tony Crawley, the appointed engagement lead to the Authority, who will try to resolve your complaint. If you are dissatisfied with your response please contact Trevor Rees on 0161 246 4000, or by email to trevor.rees@kpmg.co.uk, who is the national contact partner for all of KPMG’s work with the Audit Commission. After this, if you are still dissatisfied with how your complaint has been handled you can access the Audit Commission’s complaints procedure. Put your complaint in writing to the Complaints Unit Manager, Audit Commission, 3rd Floor, Fry Building, 2 Marsham Street, London, SW1P 4DF or by email to complaints@audit-commission.gsi.gov.uk. Their telephone number is 03034448330.

This document summarises:

- the key issues identified during our audit of the financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2014 for the Authority; and
- our assessment of the Authority's arrangements to secure value for money.

Scope of this report

This report summarises the key findings arising from:

- our audit work at Rutland County Council ('the Authority') in relation to the Authority's 2013/14 financial statements; and
- the work to support our 2013/14 conclusion on the Authority's arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources ('VFM conclusion').

Financial statements

Our *External Audit Plan 2013/14*, presented to you in April 2014, set out the four stages of our financial statements audit process.



This report focuses on the second and third stages of the process: control evaluation and substantive procedures. Our on site work for these took place during March 2014 (interim audit) and July/August 2014 (year end audit).

We are now in the final phase of the audit, the completion stage. Some aspects of this stage are also discharged through this report.

VFM conclusion

Our *External Audit Plan 2013/14* explained our risk-based approach to VFM work, which follows guidance provided by the Audit Commission. We have now completed our work to support our 2013/14 VFM conclusion. This included:

- assessing the potential VFM risks and identifying the residual audit risks for our VFM conclusion; and

- considering the results of any relevant work by the Authority and other inspectorates and review agencies in relation to these risk areas.

Structure of this report

This report is structured as follows:

- Section two summarises the headline messages.
- Section three sets out our key findings from our audit work in relation to the 2013/14 financial statements.
- Section four outlines our key findings from our work on the VFM conclusion.

Our recommendations are included in Appendix 1.

Acknowledgements

We would like to take this opportunity to thank officers and Members for their continuing help and co-operation throughout our audit work.

This table summarises the headline messages. Sections three and four of this report provide further details on each area.

Proposed audit opinion	We anticipate issuing an unqualified audit opinion on the Authority's financial statements by 30 September 2014. We will also report that the wording of your Annual Governance Statement accords with our understanding.
Audit adjustments	Our audit of your financial statements has identified one classification misstatement within current assets which was material in value (Appendix 2). The audit adjustment does not change the balance sheet net assets total or useable reserves. There are no uncorrected differences identified by our audit of the Authority's financial statements that we need to report to you.
Key financial statements audit risks	We have worked with officers throughout the year to discuss specific risk areas. The Authority addressed the issues appropriately.
Accounts production and audit process	The Authority has maintained its good standards in the quality of its draft accounts and supporting working papers. Officers dealt efficiently with audit queries and other matters as the audit progressed.
Control environment	The Authority's organisational control environment is effective overall, and we have not identified any significant weaknesses in controls over key financial systems.
Completion	At the date of this report our audit of the financial statements is substantially complete subject to completing the remaining audit work and final checks, including Director review, as part our completion procedures. Before we can issue our opinion we require a signed management representation letter. We confirm that we have complied with requirements on objectivity and independence in relation to this year's audit of the Authority's financial statements.
VFM conclusion and risk areas	We have concluded that the Authority has made proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources. We therefore anticipate issuing an unqualified VFM conclusion by 30 September 2014.

Acknowledgements

We would like to take this opportunity to thank all of the Authority's staff who have assisted us during our audit.

We anticipate issuing an unqualified audit opinion in relation to the Authority's financial statements by 30 September 2014.

There are no uncorrected misstatements that we need to report to you.

The wording of your Annual Governance Statement accords with our understanding.

Proposed audit opinion

Subject to all outstanding queries being resolved to our satisfaction, we anticipate issuing an unqualified audit opinion on the Authority's financial statements following approval of the Statement of Accounts by the Audit and Risk Committee on 23 September 2014.

Audit differences

We are required by ISA 260 to report to you any material and uncorrected audit differences.

The table on the right illustrates the total impact of the audit differences on the Authority's Balance Sheet as at 31 March 2014.

We identified one classification misstatement within current assets which was material in value (Appendix 2). This audit adjustment did not change the balance sheet net assets total or useable reserves.

We also identified a small number of other issues that have been adjusted by management. We understand officers are to provide the Audit and Risk Committee with further information on all the significant changes made to the draft statements. There are no uncorrected misstatements that we need to report to you.

In addition, we identified a small number of presentational adjustments required to ensure that the accounts are compliant with the *Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting the United Kingdom 2013/14* ('the Code'). These have all been corrected.

Annual Governance Statement

We have reviewed the Annual Governance Statement and confirmed that:

- it complies with *Delivering Good Governance in Local Government: A Framework* published by CIPFA/SOLACE; and
- it is not misleading or inconsistent with other information we are aware of from our audit of the financial statements.

Balance Sheet as at 31 March 2014		
£m	Pre-audit	Post-audit
Property, plant and equipment	73.5	73.5
Other long term assets	0.4	0.4
Current assets	26.2	25.9
Current liabilities	(7.5)	(7.5)
Long term liabilities	(56.4)	(56.4)
Net worth	36.2	35.9
General Fund	8.1	8.1
Other usable reserves	10.2	10.2
Unusable reserves	17.9	17.6
Total reserves	36.2	35.9


We have worked with officers throughout the year to discuss specific risk areas. The Authority addressed the issues appropriately.

In our External Audit Plan 2013/14, presented to you in April 2014, we identified the key risks affecting the Authority's 2013/14 financial statements. Since then we also added an additional risk around accounting for the business rates retention scheme, which we have detailed on page 6. We have now completed our testing of these areas and set out our evaluation following our substantive work.

The table below and on the next page sets out our detailed findings for each of the risks that are specific to the Authority.


Additionally, we considered the risk of management override of controls, which is a standard risk for all organisations.

Our controls testing and substantive procedures, including over journal entries, accounting estimates and significant transactions that are outside the normal course of business, or are otherwise unusual, did not identify any issues.

Key audit risk	Issue	Findings
	<p>During the year, the Pension Fund has undergone a triennial valuation with an effective date of 31 March 2013 in line with the Local Government Pension Scheme (Administration) Regulations 2008. The share of pensions assets and liabilities for each admitted body is determined in detail, and a large volume of data is provided to the actuary to support this triennial valuation. The pension numbers to be included in the financial statements for 2013/14 will be based on the output of the triennial valuation rolled forward to 31 March 2014. For 2014/15 and 2015/16 the actuary will then roll forward the valuation for accounting purposes based on more limited data.</p> <p>There is a risk that the data provided to the actuary for the valuation exercise is inaccurate and that these inaccuracies affect the actuarial figures in the accounts. The Pension Fund only includes limited disclosures around pensions liabilities but we anticipate that this will be identified as a risk area by some of the admitted bodies, whose pension liabilities represent a significant element of their balance sheet. This includes the Authority itself.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the data provided to the actuary to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The process was undertaken in a suitable control environment; ■ the accuracy of the information provided by agreeing a sample of data to source documentation; ■ the reasonableness of the completeness of the data by conducting an analysis of movements during the period, and reviewing the overall amount of records provided. <p>Our work did not identify any significant issues relating to the accounting or reporting requirements.</p>

Key financial statements audit risks (continued)

We have worked with officers throughout the year to discuss specific risk areas. The Authority addressed the issues appropriately.

Key audit risk	Issue	Findings
	<p>With the introduction of Business Rate Localisation, which took effect from 1 April 2013, there were significant changes in the requirements for the disclosure of National Non Domestic Rate balances and transactions, as per the CIPFA Code.</p> <p>This meant there were significant variances in the Collection Fund, balance sheet and the CIES as a result of the change of accounting treatment.</p> <p>In addition, the requirement ceased for an audited National Non Domestic Rate Return where auditors had completed certification work in this area in line with directions issued by the Audit Commission.</p> <p>These factors meant that we reassessed National Non Domestic Rates as a significant audit risk.</p> <p>We are currently in discussion with the Audit Commission about how this additional work is to be funded, and this may result in an additional audit fee, but there will be no NNDR certification fee.</p>	<p>We reviewed the accounting treatment for business rates and found it to be in line with CIPFA guidance.</p>

The Authority has maintained its good standards in the quality of its draft accounts and the supporting working papers.

Officers dealt efficiently with audit queries as the audit progressed.

Accounts production and audit process

ISA 260 requires us to communicate to you our views about the significant qualitative aspects of the Authority's accounting practices and financial reporting. We also assessed the Authority's process for preparing the accounts and its support for an efficient audit.

We considered the following criteria:

Element	Commentary
Accounting practices and financial reporting	<p>The Authority has maintained its good financial reporting processes.</p> <p>We consider that accounting practices are appropriate.</p>
Completeness of draft accounts	<p>We received a complete set of draft accounts on 27 June 2014, ahead of the 30 June 2014 deadline.</p>
Quality of supporting working papers	<p>Our <i>Accounts Audit Protocol</i> set out our working paper requirements for the audit.</p> <p>The quality of working papers provided met the standards specified in our <i>Accounts Audit Protocol</i>.</p> <p>We have made two recommendations at Appendix 1 aimed at further improving the arrangements for next year.</p>
Response to audit queries	<p>Officers resolved audit queries in a reasonable time.</p>

Control environment

The Authority's organisational control environment is effective, and we were able to rely on the controls over the key financial systems.

During March 2014 we completed our control evaluation work. We did not issue an interim report as there were no significant issues arising from this work. For completeness we reflect on key findings from this work.

Organisational and control environment

Controls operated at an organisational level often have an impact on controls at an operational level and if there were weaknesses this would have implications for our audit. We therefore obtain an understanding of the Authority's overall control environment and determine if appropriate controls have been implemented.

We did not identify any specific concerns in relation to your organisational and control environment that we need to report to you.

Internal Audit

We work with your internal auditors to assess the Authority's control framework and may seek to rely on any relevant work they have completed.

We did not need to rely this year on any specific pieces of Internal Audit work in carrying out our testing of the controls over the Authority's key financial systems. We have though taken their work into account in forming our assessment of the general control environment, and in reviewing the Authority's Annual Governance Statement. There are no issues that we wish to raise with you in relation to internal audit.

Controls over key financial systems

Where we have determined that this is the most efficient audit approach to take, we test selected controls that address key risks within the financial systems. The strength of the control framework informs the substantive testing we complete during our final accounts visit.

We were able to rely on the controls selected and there are no specific issues or concerns that we need to report to the Authority.

We confirm that we have complied with requirements on objectivity and independence in relation to this year's audit of the Authority's financial statements.

Before we can issue our opinion we require a signed management representation letter.

Once we have finalised our opinions and conclusions we will prepare our *Annual Audit Letter* and close our audit.

Declaration of independence and objectivity

As part of the finalisation process we are required to provide you with representations concerning our independence.

In relation to the audit of the financial statements of Rutland County Council for the year ending 31 March 2014, we confirm that there were no relationships between KPMG LLP and Rutland County Council, its directors and senior management and its affiliates that we consider may reasonably be thought to bear on the objectivity and independence of the audit engagement lead and audit staff.

We also confirm that we have complied with Ethical Standards and the Audit Commission's requirements in relation to independence and objectivity.

We have provided a detailed declaration in Appendix 3 in accordance with ISA 260.

Management representations

You are required to provide us with representations on specific matters such as your financial standing and whether the transactions within the accounts are legal and unaffected by fraud. We have provided a template to Managers for presentation to the Audit and Risk Committee. We require a signed copy of your management representations before we issue our audit opinion.

Other matters

ISA 260 requires us to communicate to you by exception 'audit matters of governance interest that arise from the audit of the financial statements' which include:

- significant difficulties encountered during the audit;
- significant matters arising from the audit that were discussed, or subject to correspondence with management;
- other matters, if arising from the audit that, in the auditor's

professional judgment, are significant to the oversight of the financial reporting process; and

- matters specifically required by other auditing standards to be communicated to those charged with governance (e.g. significant deficiencies in internal control; issues relating to fraud, compliance with laws and regulations, subsequent events, non disclosure, related party, public interest reporting, questions/objections, opening balances etc).

There are no others matters which we wish to draw to your attention in addition to those highlighted in this report or our previous reports relating to the audit of the Authority's 2013/14 financial statements.

Our VFM conclusion considers how the Authority secures financial resilience and challenges how it secures economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

We have concluded that the Authority has made proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources.

Background

Auditors are required to give their statutory VFM conclusion based on two criteria specified by the Audit Commission. These consider whether the Authority has proper arrangements in place for:

- securing financial resilience: looking at the Authority's financial governance, financial planning and financial control processes; and
- challenging how it secures economy, efficiency and effectiveness: looking at how the Authority is prioritising resources and improving efficiency and productivity.

We follow a risk based approach to target audit effort on the areas of greatest audit risk. We consider the arrangements put in place by the Authority to mitigate these risks and plan our work accordingly.

The key elements of the VFM audit approach are summarised in the diagram below.

Work completed

We performed a risk assessment earlier in the year and have reviewed this throughout the year.

Conclusion

We have concluded that the Authority has made proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources.

VFM criterion	Met
Securing financial resilience	✓
Securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness	✓



We make two recommendations based on the findings from this year's audit.

Priority rating for recommendations		
<p>1 Priority one: issues that are fundamental and material to your system of internal control. We believe that these issues might mean that you do not meet a system objective or reduce (mitigate) a risk.</p>	<p>2 Priority two: issues that have an important effect on internal controls but do not need immediate action. You may still meet a system objective in full or in part or reduce (mitigate) a risk adequately but the weakness remains in the system.</p>	<p>3 Priority three: issues that would, if corrected, improve the internal control in general but are not vital to the overall system. These are generally issues of best practice that we feel would benefit you if you introduced them.</p>

No.	Risk	Recommendation	Response
1.	2	The draft Statement of Accounts was adjusted to correct a classification misstatement which was material in value (Appendix 2). Finance staff should in future years check to confirm that only those with a maturity date of less than three months are classified as Cash and Cash Equivalents in the balance sheet. This will ensure that the appropriate presentation, in line with the Authority's accounting policies, is made in the balance sheet.	<p>Finance Manager - Technical</p> <p>The Council has checks in place which ensure this will be picked up in the future.</p>
2.	2	The disclosure of Related Party Transactions within the Statement of Accounts is supported by a process of annual declarations from members and senior managers. In 2013/14 5 members did not return their declarations. The Audit and Risk Committee should monitor the process in future years and follow up any individual cases of non declaration.	<p>Finance Manager - Technical</p> <p>The number of returns received this year is an improvement on the previous year, but the point is noted.</p>

Appendix 2: Audit differences

This appendix sets out the material audit differences, which has been adjusted. There are no unadjusted misstatements that need to be reported to you.

We are required to report to you all material misstatements that have been corrected.

We are also required to report all uncorrected misstatements, other than those that we believe are clearly trivial.

Corrected audit differences

The following table sets out the material audit differences identified during the audit of Rutland County Council's financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2014. The draft Statement of Accounts have been adjusted to correct this misstatement. This audit adjustment did not change the balance sheet net assets total or useable reserves.

No.	Income and Expenditure Statement	Movement in Reserves Statement	Impact			Basis of audit difference
			Assets	Liabilities	Reserves	
1	-	-	Dr ST investments £5.0m Cr Cash and Cash Equivalents £5.0m		-	It was identified that an investment with a maturity date in December 2014 had been included within Cash and Cash Equivalents (this makes it a short term investment as the maturity date is more than 3 months after the 31 March 2014).
	-	-	-	-	-	Total impact of adjustments: £0

Uncorrected audit differences

There are no uncorrected misstatements which we need to report to you.

The Code of Audit Practice requires us to exercise our professional judgement and act independently of both the Commission and the Authority.

Requirements

Auditors appointed by the Audit Commission must comply with the *Code of Audit Practice* (the 'Code') which states that:

“Auditors and their staff should exercise their professional judgement and act independently of both the Commission and the audited body. Auditors, or any firm with which an auditor is associated, should not carry out work for an audited body that does not relate directly to the discharge of auditors’ functions, if it would impair the auditors’ independence or might give rise to a reasonable perception that their independence could be impaired.”

In considering issues of independence and objectivity we consider relevant professional, regulatory and legal requirements and guidance, including the provisions of the Code, the detailed provisions of the Statement of Independence included within the Audit Commission’s *Standing Guidance for Local Government Auditors* ('Audit Commission Guidance') and the requirements of APB Ethical Standard 1 *Integrity, Objectivity and Independence* ('Ethical Standards').

The Code states that, in carrying out their audit of the financial statements, auditors should comply with auditing standards currently in force, and as may be amended from time to time. Audit Commission Guidance requires appointed auditors to follow the provisions of ISA (UK & I) 260 Communication of *Audit Matters with Those Charged with Governance* that are applicable to the audit of listed companies. This means that the appointed auditor must disclose in writing:

- Details of all relationships between the auditor and the client, its directors and senior management and its affiliates, including all services provided by the audit firm and its network to the client, its directors and senior management and its affiliates, that the auditor considers may reasonably be thought to bear on the auditor’s objectivity and independence.
- The related safeguards that are in place.

- The total amount of fees that the auditor and the auditor’s network firms have charged to the client and its affiliates for the provision of services during the reporting period, analysed into appropriate categories, for example, statutory audit services, further audit services, tax advisory services and other non-audit services. For each category, the amounts of any future services which have been contracted or where a written proposal has been submitted are separately disclosed. We do this in our *Annual Audit Letter*.

Appointed auditors are also required to confirm in writing that they have complied with Ethical Standards and that, in the auditor’s professional judgement, the auditor is independent and the auditor’s objectivity is not compromised, or otherwise declare that the auditor has concerns that the auditor’s objectivity and independence may be compromised and explaining the actions which necessarily follow from his. These matters should be discussed with the Audit Committee.

Ethical Standards require us to communicate to those charged with governance in writing at least annually all significant facts and matters, including those related to the provision of non-audit services and the safeguards put in place that, in our professional judgement, may reasonably be thought to bear on our independence and the objectivity of the Engagement Lead and the audit team.

General procedures to safeguard independence and objectivity

KPMG’s reputation is built, in great part, upon the conduct of our professionals and their ability to deliver objective and independent advice and opinions. That integrity and objectivity underpins the work that KPMG performs and is important to the regulatory environments in which we operate. All partners and staff have an obligation to maintain the relevant level of required independence and to identify and evaluate circumstances and relationships that may impair that independence.

We confirm that we have complied with requirements on objectivity and independence in relation to this year's audit of the Authority's financial statements.

Acting as an auditor places specific obligations on the firm, partners and staff in order to demonstrate the firm's required independence. KPMG's policies and procedures regarding independence matters are detailed in the *Ethics and Independence Manual* ('the Manual'). The Manual sets out the overriding principles and summarises the policies and regulations which all partners and staff must adhere to in the area of professional conduct and in dealings with clients and others.

KPMG is committed to ensuring that all partners and staff are aware of these principles. To facilitate this, a hard copy of the Manual is provided to everyone annually. The Manual is divided into two parts. Part 1 sets out KPMG's ethics and independence policies which partners and staff must observe both in relation to their personal dealings and in relation to the professional services they provide. Part 2 of the Manual summarises the key risk management policies which partners and staff are required to follow when providing such services.

All partners and staff must understand the personal responsibilities they have towards complying with the policies outlined in the Manual and follow them at all times. To acknowledge understanding of and adherence to the policies set out in the Manual, all partners and staff are required to submit an annual ethics and independence confirmation. Failure to follow these policies can result in disciplinary action.

For any non audit work provided we have established the following safeguards to maintain the integrity of the audit team:

- Separate teams to conduct the audit and non audit work
- Internal risk assessment process prior to conducting any non audit work
- Confirming the value of the work falls within the threshold set by the Audit Commission.

Auditor declaration

In relation to the audit of the financial statements of Rutland County Council for the financial year ending 31 March 2014, we confirm that there were no relationships between KPMG LLP and Rutland County Council, its directors and senior management and its affiliates that we consider may reasonably be thought to bear on the objectivity and independence of the audit engagement lead and audit staff. We also confirm that we have complied with Ethical Standards and the Audit Commission's requirements in relation to independence and objectivity.



cutting through complexity™

© 2014 KPMG LLP, a UK public limited partnership, is a subsidiary of KPMG Europe LLP and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative, a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.

The KPMG name, logo and 'cutting through complexity' are registered trademarks or trademarks of KPMG International Cooperative (KPMG International).