

Accounts and Audit Committee
Progress and Update Report for
Ribble Valley Borough Council
Year ended 31 March 2016

June 2016

Karen Murray

Engagement Lead

T 0161 234 6364

E karen.l.murray@uk.gt.com

Caroline Stead

Senior Manager

T 0161 234 6355

E caroline.l.stead@uk.gt.com

Amelia Payton


In Charge Auditor

T 0161 953 6943


E amelia.l.payton@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



Contents	Page
Introduction	4
Progress at June 2016	5
Emerging issues and developments:	
Grant Thornton reports	7
Other publications	9

Introduction

This paper provides the Accounts and Audit Committee with a report on progress in delivering our responsibilities as your external auditors.

Members of the Accounts and Audit Committee can find further useful material on our website www.grantthornton.co.uk, where we have a section dedicated to our work in the public sector. Here you can download copies of our publications including:

- Better Together: Building a successful joint venture company;
<http://www.grantthornton.co.uk/en/insights/building-a-successful-joint-venture-company/>
- Knowing the Ropes – Audit Committee; Effectiveness Review ;
www.grantthornton.co.uk/en/insights/knowing-the-ropes--audit-committee-effectiveness-review-2015/
- Making devolution work: A practical guide for local leaders (October 2015)
www.grantthornton.co.uk/en/insights/making-devolution-work/


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 Engagement Manager.



Karen Murray
Engagement Lead
T 0161 234 6364
M 07880 456 205
E karen.l.murray@uk.gt.com



Caroline Stead
Engagement Manager
T 0161 234 6355
M 07880 456 208
E caroline.l.stead@uk.gt.com



Progress at June 2016




 **Progress against plan**
On track

 **Opinion and VfM conclusion**
Plan to give before deadline of 30 September 2016

 **Outputs delivered**
Fee letter, Progress Reports, delivered to plan

2015/16 work	Completed	Comments
<p>Fee Letter We issued the 'Planned fee letter for 2015/16 in April 2015.</p>	April 2015	We have also recently issued the fee letter for 2016/17, which is included on this agenda
<p>Accounts Audit Plan 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 the Council's 2015-16 financial statements.</p> <p>We also inform you of any subsequent changes to our audit approach.</p>	March 2016	This was presented to the Accounts and Audit Committee in March.
<p>Interim accounts audit Our interim fieldwork visit includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • updating our review of the Council's control environment • updating our understanding of financial systems • review of Internal Audit reports on core financial systems • early work on emerging accounting issues • early substantive testing 	March 2016	<p>We have documented our understanding of the Council's control environment and your financial systems. We have completed walkthroughs of the key financial systems. We have undertaken early substantive testing covering the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee remuneration (payroll) • Operating expenses (payables)

Progress at June 2016



2015/16 work	Completed	Comments
<p>Final accounts audit Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit of the 2015-16 financial statements • proposed opinion on the Council's accounts 	<p><i>Planned for July - August</i></p>	<p>We are planning to complete our audit by 31st July as part of the transition to the earlier closedown and audit cycle that is required from 2018.</p> <p>We have discussed with your finance team the best way of ensuring we meet this earlier deadline.</p>
<p>Value for Money (VfM) conclusion The scope of our work has changed and is set out in the final guidance issued by the National Audit Office in November 2015. The Code requires auditors to satisfy themselves that; "the Council has made proper arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources". The guidance confirmed the overall criterion as; "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". The three sub criteria for assessment to be able to give a conclusion overall are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informed decision making • Sustainable resource deployment • Working with partners and other third parties 	<p><i>Field work in March – July , formal conclusion reported by 30 September 2016</i></p>	<p>We have undertaken our initial risk assessment which we reported as part of our audit plan.</p> <p>The results of our VfM audit work and the key messages arising will be reported in our Audit Findings Report.</p> <p>We will include our conclusion as part of our report on your financial statements which we will give by 30 September 2016.</p>

Better Together: Building a successful joint venture company

Local government is evolving as it looks for ways to protect front-line services. These changes are picking up pace as more councils introduce alternative delivery models to generate additional income and savings.

'Better together' is the next report in our series looking at alternative delivery models and focuses on the key areas to consider when deciding to set up a joint venture (JV), setting it up and making it successful.

JVs have been in use for many years in local government and remain a common means of delivering services differently. This report draws on our research across a range of JVs to provide inspiring ideas from those that have been a success and the lessons learnt from those that have encountered challenges.

Key findings from the report:

- JVs continue to be a viable option – Where they have been successful they have supported councils to improve service delivery, reduce costs, bring investment and expertise and generate income
- There is reason to be cautious – Our research found a number of JVs between public and private bodies had mixed success in achieving outcomes for councils
- There is a new breed of JVs between public sector bodies – These JVs can be more successful at working and staying together. There are an increasing number being set up between councils and wholly-owned commercial subsidiaries that can provide both the commercialism required and the understanding of the public sector culture.

Our report, Better Together: Building a successful joint venture company, can be downloaded from our website: <http://www.grantthornton.co.uk/en/insights/building-a-successful-joint-venture-company/>

Grant Thornton reports



ALTERNATIVE SERVICE DELIVERY MODELS IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Better together
Building a successful
joint venture company



Knowing the Ropes – Audit Committee Effectiveness Review

Grant Thornton reports

We have published our first cross-sector review of Audit Committee effectiveness encompassing the corporate, not for profit and public sectors.

It provides insight into the ways in which audit committees can create an effective role within an organisation’s governance structure and understand how they are perceived more widely. The report is structured into four key issues:

- What is the status of the audit committee within the organisation?
- How should the audit committee be organised and operated?
- What skills and qualities are required in the audit committee members?
- How should the effectiveness of the audit committee be evaluated?

The detailed report is available here

<http://www.grantthornton.co.uk/en/insights/knowning-the-ropes--audit-committee-effectiveness-review-2015/>

Size: 3-5 members is an ideal size for an audit committee

Frequency: meetings should be regular and the length should adapt to content

Relevance: audit committee members should be selected based on the skills and experience they bring

Communication: papers should strike the balance between detail and length

Ability: training should be provided for audit committee members

Clarity: the role of the audit committee and its relationship with other committees, should be clearly defined

Evolution: audit committees should continually develop

The two key things that audit committee members should be asking are:

- 1** What is expected of the audit committee and does it reflect the specific nature of the industry in which the organisation sits?
- 2** Does the audit committee have clear terms of reference in place? Audit committees should set themselves targets for what they want to achieve and define how these will be measured to ensure they are operating effectively.

Fighting Fraud and Corruption Locally

CIPFA publication

Fighting Fraud and Corruption Locally is a strategy for English local authorities that is the result of collaboration by local authorities and key stakeholders from across the counter fraud landscape .

This strategy is the result of an intensive period of research, surveys, face-to-face meetings and workshops. Local authorities have spoken openly about risks, barriers and what they feel is required to help them improve and continue the fight against fraud and to tackle corruption locally.

Local authorities face a significant fraud challenge. Fraud costs local authorities an estimated £2.1bn a year. In addition to the scale of losses, there are further challenges arising from changes in the wider public sector landscape including budget reductions, service remodelling and integration, and government policy changes. Local authorities will need to work with new agencies in a new national counter fraud landscape.

The strategy:

- calls upon local authorities to continue to tackle fraud with the dedication they have shown so far and to step up the fight against fraud in a challenging and rapidly changing environment
- illustrates the financial benefits that can accrue from fighting fraud more effectively
- calls upon central government to promote counter fraud activity in local authorities by ensuring the right further financial incentives are in place and helping them break down barriers to improvement
- updates and builds upon Fighting Fraud Locally 2011 in the light of developments such as The Serious and Organised Crime Strategy and the first UK Anti-Corruption Plan
- sets out a new strategic approach that is designed to feed into other areas of counter fraud and corruption work and support and strengthen the ability of the wider public sector to protect itself from the harm that fraud can cause.

The strategy can be downloaded from

<http://www.cipfa.org/services/counter-fraud-centre/fighting-fraud-and-corruption-locally>



Supported by
CIPFA COUNTER
FRAUD CENTRE



© 2016 Grant Thornton UK LLP. All rights reserved.

'Grant Thornton' refers to the brand under which the Grant Thornton member firms provide assurance, tax and advisory services to their clients and/or refers to one or more member firms, as the context requires.

Grant Thornton UK LLP is a member firm of Grant Thornton International Ltd (GTIL). GTIL and the member firms are not a worldwide partnership. GTIL and each member firm is a separate legal entity. Services are delivered by the member firms. GTIL does not provide services to clients. GTIL and its member firms are not agents of, and do not obligate, one another and are not liable for one another's acts or omissions.

grantthornton.co.uk

GRT102468