Shropshire Council audit plan

Year ending 31 March 2024

Shropshire Council

5 July 2024

Contents

Your key Grant Thornton team members are:

Avtar S Sohal
Key Audit Partner
T 0121 232 6420]
E avtar.s.sohal@uk.gt.com

Mary Wren
Senior Audit Manager
T 0121 232 5254
E mary.wren@uk.gt.com

Nikiwe M Gumbanjera Sibanda
Assistant Manager
T 0121 232 5150
E Nikiwe.m.gumbanjera.Sibanda@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 planning 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 the Council or all 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.

Grant Thornton UK LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales: No.OC307742. Registered office: 30 Finsbury Square, London, EC2A 1AG. A list of members is available from our registered office. Grant Thornton UK LLP is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority. Grant Thornton UK LLP is a member firm of Grant Thornton International Ltd (GTIL). GTIL and the member firms are not a worldwide partnership. Services are delivered by the member firms. 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.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Key matters

National context

The national economic context continues to present challenges to the local government sector. There are increasing cost pressures nationally, such as a growing population and increasing demand for local government services, especially in adult and children's social care. Combined with inflationary pressures, pay demands and energy price rises, the environment in which local authorities operate is highly challenging. Local Government funding continues to be stretched and there have been considerable reductions in the grants received by local authorities from government.

Recently, we have seen the additional strain on some councils from equal pay claims, and there has been a concerning rise in the number of councils issuing s.114 notices. These are issued when a council's Chief Financial Officer does not believe the council can meet its expenditure commitments from its income. Additionally, the levels of indebtedness at many councils is now highly concerning, and we have seen commissioners being sent in to oversee reforms at a number of entities.

Our recent value for money work has highlighted a growing number of governance and financial stability issues at a national level, which is a further indication of the mounting pressure on audited bodies to keep delivering services, whilst also managing transformation and making savings at the same time.

Audit Reporting Delays

Against a backdrop of ongoing audit reporting delays, in October 2023 PSAA found that only five local government accounts had been signed by the September deadline. In June 2023 the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) also produced a report setting out their concerns over these audit reporting delays. We issued our report About time? in March 2023 which explored the reasons for delayed publication of audited local authority accounts. A further update regarding the audit backstop is included on page 30.

In our view, to enable a timely sign off of the financial statements, it is critical that draft local authority accounts are prepared to a high standard and are supported by comprehensive working papers.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Key matters - continued

Our Responses

- As a firm, we are absolutely committed to audit quality and financial reporting in the local government sector. Our proposed work and fee, as set out in this Audit Plan has been discussed with the Executive Director of Finance.
- To ensure close work with our local audited bodies and an efficient audit process, our preference as a firm is work on site with you and your officers. We have considered this from a local perspective and have, in prior years, worked remotely for Shropshire. Although this has worked well, we will consider this as part of specific audit procedures and where onsite working is seen as more efficient this will be discussed and agreed with the Council. Please confirm in writing if this is acceptable to you, and that your officers will make themselves available to our audit team as required. This is also in compliance with our delivery commitments in our contract with PSAA.
- We offer a private meeting with the Chief Executive twice a year, and with the Director of Finance Quarterly as part of our commitment to keep you fully informed on the progress of the audit.
- At an appropriate point within the audit, we would also like to meet informally with the Chair of your Audit Committee, to brief them on the status and progress of the audit work to date.
- We will consider your arrangements for managing and reporting your financial resources as part of our audit in completing our Value for Money work.
- Our Value for Money work will also consider your arrangements relating to governance and improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness.
- Where any actions have been agreed in respect of matters identified through previous audit work, either on the financial statements or in respect of work on arrangements to secure VFM, the planning report should include reference to consideration of progress against previously agreed recommendations.
- We will continue to provide you and your Audit Committee with sector updates providing our insight on issues from a range of sources and other sector commentators via our Audit Committee updates.
- We hold annual financial reporting workshops for our audited bodies to access the latest technical guidance and interpretations, to discuss issues with our experts and to facilitate networking links with other audited bodies to support consistent and accurate financial reporting across the sector.
- With the ongoing financial pressures being faced by local authorities, in planning this audit we have considered the financial viability of the Council. We are satisfied that the going concern basis remains the correct basis behind the preparation of the accounts. We will keep this under review throughout the duration of our appointment as auditors of the Council.
- There is an increased incentive and opportunity for organisations in the public sector to manipulate their financial statements due to ongoing financial pressures. We are required to identify a significant risk with regard to management override of controls.
- There is a rebuttable presumed risk that revenue may be misstated due to the improper recognition of revenue– refer to page 7.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Introduction and headlines



Purpose

This document provides an overview of the planned scope and timing of the statutory audit of Shropshire Council ('the Council') for those charged with governance.

Respective responsibilities

The National Audit Office ('the NAO') has issued a document entitled Code of Audit Practice ('the Code'). This summarises where the responsibilities of auditors begin and end and what is expected from the audited body. Our respective responsibilities are also set out in the agreed in the Terms of Appointment and Statement of Responsibilities issued by Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA), the body responsible for appointing us as auditor of Shropshire Council. We draw your attention to these documents.

Scope of our audit

The scope of our audit is set in accordance with the Code and International Standards on Auditing (ISAs) (UK). We are responsible for forming and expressing an opinion on the Council and group's financial statements that have been prepared by management with the oversight of those charged with governance (the Audit committee); and we consider whether there are sufficient arrangements in place at the Council and group for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in your use of resources. Value for money relates to ensuring that resources are used efficiently in order to maximise the outcomes that can be achieved.

The audit of the financial statements does not relieve management or the Audit Committee of your responsibilities. It is the responsibility of the Council to ensure that proper arrangements are in place for the conduct of its business, and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for. We have considered how the Council is fulfilling these responsibilities.

Our audit approach is based on a thorough understanding of the Council's business and is risk based.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Introduction and headlines

Significant risks

Those risks requiring special audit consideration and procedures to address the likelihood of a material financial statement error have been identified as:

- Management over-ride of controls (Council and Group)
- Valuation of Land and Buildings (Council)
- Valuation of investment property (Council)
- Valuation of pension fund net liability (Council)

We will communicate significant findings on these areas as well as any other significant matters arising from the audit to you in our Audit Findings (ISA 260) Report.

Group Audit

The Council is required to prepare group financial statements that consolidate the financial information of

- Shropshire Towns and Rural Housing (STARH) Ltd
- West Mercia Energy
- Cornovii Developments Limited
- West Mercia Supplies (Pension)

Materiality

We have determined planning materiality to be £10m (PY £9m) for the group and £9.5m (PY £8.9m) for the Council, which equates to 1.4% of your prior year gross operating costs for the year. We are obliged to report uncorrected omissions or misstatements other than those which are 'clearly trivial' to those charged with governance.

Clearly trivial has been set at £0.5m (PY £0.45m).

Value for Money arrangements

Our risk assessment regarding your arrangements to secure value for money has not identified any risks of significant weakness. We will continue to update our risk assessment until we issue our Auditor's Annual Report.

Audit logistics

Our planning visit took place across March and April and our final visit will commence in August 2024. Our key deliverables are this Audit Plan, our Audit Findings Report and our Auditor's Annual Report.

Our proposed fee for the audit will be £379,791 (PY: £179,699) for the Council, subject to the Council delivering a good set of financial statements and working papers and no significant new financial reporting matters arising that require additional time and/or specialist input.

We have complied with the Financial Reporting Council's Ethical Standard (revised 2019) and we as a firm, and each covered person, confirm that we are independent and are able to express an objective opinion on the financial statements.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Significant risks identified

Significant risks are defined by ISAs (UK) as risks that, in the judgement of the auditor, require special audit consideration. In identifying risks, audit teams consider the nature of the risk, the potential magnitude of misstatement, and its likelihood. Significant risks are those risks that have a higher risk of material misstatement.

Risk	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Presumed risk of fraud in revenue recognition ISA (UK) 240	Group and Council	Under ISA (UK) 240 there is a rebuttable presumed risk that revenue may be misstated due to the improper recognition of revenue. This presumption can be rebutted if the auditor concludes that there is no risk of material misstatement due to fraud relating to revenue recognition. Having considered the risk factors set out in ISA240 and the nature of the revenue streams at the Council, we have determined that the risk of fraud arising from revenue recognition can be rebutted because: • there is little incentive to manipulate revenue recognition • opportunities to manipulate revenue recognition are very limited • the culture and ethical frameworks of local authorities, including Shropshire Council and its subsidiaries mean that all forms of fraud are seen as unacceptable. Therefore, we do not consider this to be a significant risk for the Council	Notwithstanding that we have rebutted this risk, we will still undertake a significant level of work on the Council's revenue streams, as they are material. We will: <u>Accounting policies and systems</u> • evaluate the Council's accounting policies for recognition of income for its various income streams and compliance with the CIPFA Cade • update our understanding of the Council's business processes associated with accounting for income <u>Fees, charges and other service income</u> • Agree, on a sample basis, income and year end receivables from other income to invoices and cash payment or other supporting evidence. <u>Taxation and non-specific grant income</u> • Income for national nan-domestic rates and council tax is predicable and therefore we will conduct substantive analytical procedures • For other grants we will sample test items back to supporting information and subsequent receipt, considering accounting treatment where appropriate We will also design tests to address the risk that income has been understated, by not being recognised in the current financial year .

‘Significant risks often relate to significant non-routine transactions and judgmental matters. Non-routine transactions are transactions that are unusual, due to either size or nature, and that therefore occur infrequently. Judgmental matters may include the development of accounting estimates for which there is significant measurement uncertainty.’ (ISA (UK) 315)

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Significant risks identified- continued

Risk	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Risk of fraud related to expenditure recognition PAF Practice Note 10	Group and Council	In line with the Public Audit Forum Practice Note 10, in the public sector, auditors must also consider the risk that material misstatements due to fraudulent financial reporting may arise from the manipulation of expenditure recognition (for instance by deferring expenditure to a later period) As most public bodies are net spending bodies, then the risk of material misstatement due to fraud related to expenditure recognition may in some cases be greater than the risk of material misstatement due to fraud related to revenue recognition. Having considered the nature of the expenditure of the expenditure streams of Shropshire Council, and on the same basis as set out above for revenue, we have determined that there is no significant risk of material misstatement arising from improper expenditure recognition.	Notwithstanding that we have rebutted this risk, we will still undertake a significant level of work on the Council's expenditure streams, as they are material. We will: <u>Expenditure</u> • update our understanding of the Council's business processes associated with accounting for expenditure • evaluate the Council's accounting policies for recognition of expenditure for its various material expenditure streams and compliance with the CIPFA Cade • agree, on a sample basis, expenditure and year end creditors to invoices and cash payment or other supporting evidence We will also design tests to address the risk that expenditure has been overstated, by not being recognized in the current financial year – see page 12
Management over-ride of controls	Group and Council	Under ISA (UK) 240 there is a non-rebuttable presumed risk that the risk of management over-ride of controls is present in all entities. The Council faces external scrutiny of its spending and this could potentially place management under undue pressure in terms of how they report performance. We therefore identified management override of control, in particular journals, management estimates and transactions outside the course of business as a significant risk of material misstatement.	We will: • Evaluate the design effectiveness of management controls over journals; • Analyse the journals listing and determine the criteria for selecting high risk unusual journals; • Test unusual journals recorded during the year and after the draft accounts stage for appropriateness and corroboration; • Gain on understanding of the accounting estimates and critical judgements applied by management and consider their reasonableness with regard to corroborative evidence: and • Evaluate the rationale for any changes in accounting policies, estimates or significant unusual transactions.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Significant risks identified - continued

Risk	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Valuation of other land and buildings (£431.4m per 2023/24 draft financial statements)	Council	The Council carries out a rolling programme that ensures that all Property, Plant and Equipment required to be measured at current value is revalued at least every 5 years and are subject to an annual desktop review, in year where a full valuation is not undertaken. This valuation represents a significant estimate by management in the financial statements due to the size of the numbers involved and the sensitivity of this estimate to changes in key assumptions. We will focus our audit attention on those assets that have large/unusual changes in valuation or approaches to valuation, including key inputs, has changed. The risk will be pinpointed as part of our final accounts work, once we have understood the population of assets revalued. We will report an updated risk assessment of land and buildings in our Audit Findings Report.	We will: • Evaluate management's processes and assumptions for the calculation of the estimate, the instructions issued to valuation experts and the scope of their work: • Evaluate the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the valuation expert; • Write to the value to confirm the basis on which the valuation was carried out to ensure that the requirements of the CIPFA code are met; • Challenge the information and assumptions used by the value to assess completeness and consistency with our understanding; • Engage our own valuer to assess the instructions issued by the Council to its valuer, the scope of the Council's valuer's work, the Council's valuer's reports and the assumptions that underpin the valuations; • Test revaluations made during the year to see if they had been input correctly into the Council's asset register; • Evaluate the assumptions made by management for those assets not revalued during the year end how management have satisfied themselves that these are not materially different from current value at year end . • For all assets not formally revalued or revalued on an indexation basis only, evaluate the judgements made by management or others in the determination of current value of these assets.

Management should expect engagement teams to challenge areas that are complex, significant or highly judgmental. This may be the case for accounting estimates and similar areas. Management should also expect to provide to engagement teams with sufficient evidence to support their judgments and the approach they have adopted for key accounting policies, with reference to accounting standards or changes thereto.

Where estimates are used in the preparation of the financial statements management should expect teams to challenge management's assumptions and request evidence to support those assumptions.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Significant risks identified - continued

Risk	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Valuation of Investment Property (£43m per 2023/24 draft financial statements)	Council	The Council carries out a rolling programme that ensures that all Investment Properties required to be measured at current value is revalued at least every 5 years and are subject to an annual desktop review, in year where a full valuation is not undertaken. This valuation represents a significant estimate by management in the financial statements due to the size of the numbers involved and the sensitivity of this estimate to changes in key assumptions. We will focus our audit attention on those assets that have large/unusual changes in valuation or approaches to valuation, including key inputs, has changed. The risk will be pinpointed as part of our final accounts work, once we have understood the population of assets revalued. We will report an updated risk assessment of land and buildings in our Audit Findings Report.	We will: • Evaluate management's processes and assumptions for the calculation of the estimate, the instructions issued to valuation experts and the scope of their work: • Evaluate the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the valuation expert; • Write to the value to confirm the basis on which the valuation was carried out to ensure that the requirements of the CIPFA code are met; • Challenge the information and assumptions used by the value to assess completeness and consistency with our understanding; • Engage our own valuer to assess the instructions issued by the Council to its valuer, the scope of the Council's valuer's work, the Council's valuer's reports and the assumptions that underpin the valuations; • Test revaluations made during the year to see if they had been input correctly into the Council's asset register; • Evaluate the assumptions made by management for those assets not revalued during the year end how management have satisfied themselves that these are not materially different from current value at year end . • For all assets not formally revalued or revalued on an indexation basis only, evaluate the judgements made by management or others in the determination of current value of these assets.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Significant risks identified - continued

Risk	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Valuation of the pension fund net liability (£21.397m per 2023/24 draft financial statements)	Group and Council	The pension fund net liability, as reflected in the balance sheet as the net defined benefit liability, represents a significant estimate in the financial statements. The Council's pension fund net liability is considered a significant estimate due to the size of the numbers involved (£21m per draft financial statements) and the sensitivity of the estimate to changes in key assumptions. The methods applied in the calculation of the IAS 19 estimates are routine and commonly applied by all actuarial firms in line with the requirements set out in the Code of practice for local government accounting (the applicable financial reporting framework). We have therefore concluded that there is not a significant risk of material misstatement in the IAS 19 estimate due to the methods and models used in their calculation. The source data used by the actuaries to produce the IAS 19 estimates is provided by administering authorities and employers. We do not consider this to be a significant risk as this is easily verifiable. The actuarial assumptions used are the responsibility of the entity but should be set on the advice given by the actuary. A small change in the key assumptions (discount rate, inflation rate, salary increase and life expectancy) can have a significant impact on the estimated IAS 19 liability. We therefore identified valuation of the pension fund net asset/liability as a significant risk, which was one of the most significant assessed risks of material misstatement, and a key audit matter.	We will: • update our understanding of the processes and controls put in place by management to ensure that the Council's pension fund net liability is not materially misstated and evaluate the design of the associated controls; • evaluate the instructions issued by management to their management expert (an actuary) for this estimate and the scope of the actuary's work: • assess the competence, capabilities and objectivity of the actuary who carried out the Council's pension fund valuation; • assess the accuracy and completeness of the information provided by the Council to the actuary to estimate the liability • test the consistency of the pension fund asset and liability and disclosures in the notes to the core financial statements with the actuarial report from the actuary; • undertake procedures to confirm the reasonableness of the actuarial assumptions made by reviewing the report of the consulting actuary (as auditor's expert) and performing any additional procedures suggested within the report; and • obtain assurances from the auditor of Shropshire County Pension Fund as to the controls surrounding the validity and accuracy of membership data, contributions data and benefits data sent to the actuary by the pension fund and the fund assets valuation in the pension fund financial statements

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Other risks identified

We will communicate significant findings on these areas as well as any other significant matters arising from the audit to you in our Audit Findings Report.

Risk	Risk relates to	Reason for risk identification	Key aspects of our proposed response to the risk
Operating Expenses	Council	Non-pay expenses on other goods and services also represents a significant percentage of the Council's operating expenses. Management uses judgement to estimate accruals of un-invoiced costs. Management also undertake an assessment of the levels of grant income received in the financial year to be deferred to future years based on the specific terms and conditions of funding. We therefore identify completeness of non-pay expenses as a risk requiring particular audit attention	We will • Evaluate the Council's accounting policies for recognition of non-pay expenditure streams for appropriateness • gain an understanding of the Council's system for accounting for non-pay expenditure • test a sample of balances included within trade and other payables • test a sample of payments immediately after the year end to ensure that appropriate cut-off has been applied, and therefore that the expenditure has been recognised in the correct period. • test a sample of expenditure accounted for immediately prior to and after the year end to ensure it has been recorded accurately and is recognised in the appropriate financial accounting period
Completeness, existence and accuracy of cash and cash equivalents	Council	The receipt and payment of cash represents a significant class of transactions occurring throughout the year, culminating in the year-end balance for cash and cash equivalents reported on the statement of financial position. Due to the significance of cash transactions to the Council, we identified the completeness, existence and accuracy of cash and cash equivalents as a risk requiring special audit consideration.	We will • agree all period end bank balances to the general ledger and cash book; • agree cash and cash equivalents to the bank reconciliation; • agree all material reconciling items and a sample of other items to sufficient and appropriate corroborative audit evidence; • obtain the bank reconciliation for the following month end and review the reconciling items against those included on the period end bank reconciliation; • write to the bank and obtain a bank balance confirmation; • agree the aggregate cash balance to the relevant financial statement disclosures

'In respect of some risks, the auditor may judge that it is not possible or practicable to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence only from substantive procedures. Such risks may relate to the inaccurate or incomplete recording of routine and significant classes of transactions or account balances, the characteristics of which often permit highly automated processing with little or no manual intervention. In such cases, the entity's controls over such risks are relevant to the audit and the auditor shall obtain an understanding of them.' (ISA (UK) 315)

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Group audit scope and risk assessment

In accordance with ISA (UK) 600, as group auditor we are required to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence regarding the financial information of the components and the consolidation process to express an opinion on whether the group financial statements are prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework. The Group risk assessment has not identified any changes from prior year.

Component	Individually Significant?	Level of response required under ISA (UK) 600	Risks identified	Planned audit approach
Shropshire	Yes	Audit of the financial information of the component using component materiality	• See pages 7 to 10 of this report for risks identified.	Full scope audit performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP
Shropshire Towns and Rural Housing (STARH) Ltd	No	Analytical procedures at group level	• None identified	Analytical review performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP.
West Mercia Energy	No	Analytical procedures at group level	• None identified	Analytical review performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP.
Cornovii Developments Limited	No	Analytical procedures at group level	• None identified	Analytical review performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP.
West Mercia Supplies (Pension)	No	Analytical procedures at group level	• None identified	Analytical review performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Audit scope

- Audit of the financial information of the component using component materiality
- Audit of one more classes of transactions, account balances or disclosures relating to significant risks of material misstatement of the group financial statements
- Review of component's financial information
- Specified audit procedures relating to risks of material misstatement of the group financial statements
- Analytical procedures at group level

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Other matters

Other work

In addition to our responsibilities under the Code of Practice, we have a number of other audit responsibilities, as follows:

- We read your Narrative Report and Annual Governance Statement to check that they are consistent with the financial statements on which we give an opinion and our knowledge of the Council.
- We carry out work to satisfy ourselves that disclosures made in your Annual Governance Statement are in line with requirements set by CIPFA.
- We carry out work on your consolidation schedules for the Whole of Government Accounts process in accordance with NAO group audit instructions.
- We consider our other duties under legislation and the Code, as and when required, including:
  - giving electors the opportunity to raise questions about your financial statements, consider and decide upon any objections received in relation to the financial statements;
  - issuing a report in the public interest or written recommendations to the Council under section 24 of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 (the Act);
  - application to the court for a declaration that an item of account is contrary to law under section 28 or a judicial review under section 31 of the Act;
  - issuing an advisory notice under section 29 of the Act.
- We certify completion of our audit.

Other material balances and transactions

Under International Standards on Auditing, 'irrespective of the assessed risks of material misstatement, the auditor shall design and perform substantive procedures for each material class of transactions, account balance and disclosure'. All other material balances and transactions streams will therefore be audited. However, the procedures will not be as extensive as the procedures adopted for the risks identified in this report.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Our approach to materiality

The concept of materiality is fundamental to the preparation of the financial statements and the audit process and applies not only to the monetary misstatements but also to disclosure requirements and adherence to acceptable accounting practice and applicable law.

Determination

We have determined financial statement materiality based on a proportion of the gross expenditure of the group and the Council for the financial year.

Materiality at the planning stage of our audit is £10m for the Group and £9.5m for the Council, which equates to 1.4% of your draft gross expenditure for the period.

We determine planning materiality in order to:

- establish what level of misstatement could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements;
- assist in establishing the scope of our audit engagement and audit tests;
- determine sample sizes and
- assist in evaluating the effect of known and likely misstatements in the financial statements.

Other factors

An item does not necessarily have to be large to be considered to have a material effect on the financial statements.

An item may be considered to be material by nature where it may affect instances when greater precision is required. We have identified senior officer remuneration as a balance where we will apply a lower materiality level, as these are considered sensitive disclosures. We have set a materiality of £8,000

Reassessment of materiality

Our assessment of materiality is kept under review throughout the audit process.

We reconsider planning materiality if, during the course of our audit engagement, we become aware of facts and circumstances that would have caused us to make a different determination of planning materiality.

Matters we will report to the Audit Committee

Whilst our audit procedures are designed to identify misstatements which are material to our opinion on the financial statements as a whole, we nevertheless report to the Audit Committee any unadjusted misstatements of lesser amounts to the extent that these are identified by our audit work. Under ISA 260 (UK) ‘Communication with those charged with governance’, we are obliged to report uncorrected omissions or misstatements other than those which are ‘clearly trivial’ to those charged with governance. ISA 260 (UK) defines ‘clearly trivial’ as matters that are clearly inconsequential, whether taken individually or in aggregate and whether judged by any quantitative or qualitative criteria.

We report to the Audit Committee any unadjusted misstatements of lesser amounts to the extent that these are identified by our audit work.

In the context of the Group and Council, we propose that an individual difference could normally be considered to be clearly trivial if it is less than £0.5m (PY £0.5m). If management have corrected material misstatements identified during the course of the audit, we will consider whether those corrections should be communicated to the Audit Committee to assist it in fulfilling its governance responsibilities.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Our approach to materiality (continued)

	Amount	Qualitative factors considered
Materiality for the Council's financial statements Materiality for the Group financial statements	£9.5m £10.0m	• Concentration of ownership – the Council is not owned by shareholders (ownership by shareholders could affect materiality by making it lower) • Business environment – the Council operates in a regulated, publicly funded business environment. • Control environment – the audit of the 2022-23 financial statements did not identify any significant deficiencies in the control environment , our work on the Council's control environment in relation to 23/24 is in progress. Any impact on materiality will be communicated as part of our Audit Findings Report. • Other sensitivities – no other sensitivities have been identified that would require materiality to be reduced. There has been no change in key stakeholders, therefore a higher materiality is deemed appropriate (if any changes identified, likely to lower materiality)
Materiality for specific transactions, balances or disclosures: - senior officer remuneration	£8k	An item does not necessarily have to be large to be considered to have a material effect on the financial statements. An item may be considered to be material by nature where it may affect instances when greater precision is required. Senior officers' remuneration is considered to be material by nature given public interest in the disclosure . We will apply a materiality of 1.4% to senior officer salary as an error of that magnitude arising on an individual's disclosure is considered to potentially alter the readers perception of the information presented. Based on the disclosures in the previous year's financial statements this would equate to £8,000.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

IT audit strategy

In accordance with ISA (UK) 315 Revised, we are required to obtain an understanding of the relevant IT and technical infrastructure and details of the processes that operate within the IT environment. We are also required to consider the information captured to identify any audit relevant risks and design appropriate audit procedures in response. As part of this we obtain an understanding of the controls operating over relevant Information Technology (IT) systems i.e., IT general controls (ITGCs). Our audit will include completing an assessment of the design and implementation of relevant ITGCs. We say more about ISA 315 Revised on slide 21.

The following IT systems have been judged to be in scope for our audit and based on the planned financial statement audit approach we will perform the indicated level of assessment:

IT system	Audit area	Planned level IT audit assessment
Unit 4 ERP	Financial reporting and payment system	• Detailed ITGC assessment completed by internal expert. (design effectiveness only)

Value for Money arrangements

Approach to Value for Money work for the period ended 31 March 2024

The National Audit Office issued its latest Value for Money guidance to auditors in January 2023. The Code expects auditors to consider whether a body has put in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources. Auditors are expected to report any significant weaknesses in the body's arrangements, should they come to their attention. In undertaking their work, auditors are expected to have regard to three specified reporting criteria. These are as set out below:

Improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness

How the body uses information about its costs and performance to improve the way it manages and delivers its services.

Financial sustainability

How the body plans and manages its resources to ensure it can continue to deliver its services.

Governance

How the body ensures that it makes informed decisions and properly manages its risks.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Risks of significant VFM weaknesses

As part of our planning work, we consider whether there were any risks of significant weakness in the body's arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources that we needed to perform further procedures on. At this stage our work in this area is in progress. The potential different types of recommendations we could make are set out in the second table below.

Potential types of recommendations

A range of different recommendations could be made following the completion of work on risks of significant weakness, as follows:

Statutory recommendation

Written recommendations to the body under Section 24 (Schedule 7) of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014. A recommendation under schedule 7 requires the body to discuss and respond publicly to the report.

Key recommendation

The Code of Audit Practice requires that where auditors identify significant weaknesses in arrangements to secure value for money they should make recommendations setting out the actions that should be taken by the body. We have defined these recommendations as 'key recommendations'.

Improvement recommendation

These recommendations, if implemented should improve the arrangements in place at the body, but are not made as a result of identifying significant weaknesses in the body's arrangements.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Audit logistics and team

Nikiwe Sibanda, Audit Incharge

Key audit contact responsible for the day to day management and delivery of the audit work

Mary Wren, Audit Manager

Provides oversight of the delivery of the audit including regular engagement with Governance Committees and senior officers

Avtar S Sohal, Key Audit Partner

Provides oversight of the delivery of the audit including regular engagement with Governance Committees and senior officers

Audited Entity responsibilities

Where audited bodies do not deliver to the timetable agreed, we need to ensure that this does not impact on audit quality or absorb a disproportionate amount of time, thereby disadvantaging other audited bodies. Where the elapsed time to complete an audit exceeds that agreed due to an entity not meeting its obligations we will not be able to maintain a team on site. Similarly, where additional resources are needed to complete the audit due to an entity not meeting their obligations we are not able to guarantee the delivery of the audit to the agreed timescales. In addition, delayed audits will incur additional audit fees.

Our requirements

To minimise the risk of a delayed audit, you need to :

- ensure that you produce draft financial statements of good quality by the deadline you have agreed with us, including all notes, the Narrative Report and the Annual Governance Statement
- ensure that good quality working papers are available at the start of the audit, in accordance with the working paper requirements schedule that we have shared with you
- ensure that the agreed data reports are cleansed, are made available to us at the start of the audit and are reconciled to the values in the accounts, in order to facilitate our selection of samples for testing
- ensure that all appropriate staff are available on site throughout (or as otherwise agreed) the planned period of the audit
- respond promptly and adequately to audit queries.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Audit fees and updated Auditing Standards

Audit fees are set by PSAA as part of their national procurement exercise. In 2017 , PSAA awarded a contract of audit for Shropshire Council to begin with effect from 2018/19 . This contract was re-tendered in 2023 and Grant Thornton have been re-appointed as your auditors. The scale fee set out in the PSAA contract for the 2023/24 audit is £367 241.

This contract sets out four contractual stage payments for this fee, with payment based on delivery of specified audit milestones:

- Production of the final auditor's annual report for the previous Audit Year (exception for new clients in 2023/24 only)
- Production of the draft audit planning report to Audited Body
- 50% of planned hours of an audit have been completed
- 75% of planned hours of an audit have been completed

Any variation to the scale fee will be determined by PSAA in accordance with their procedures as set out here https://www.psaa.co.uk/appointing-auditors-and-fees/fee-variations-overview/'

Assumptions

In setting these fees, we have assumed that the Council will:

- prepare a good quality set of accounts, supported by comprehensive and well-presented working papers which are ready at the start of the audit
- provide appropriate analysis, support and evidence to support all critical judgements and significant judgements made during the course of preparing the financial statements
- provide early notice of proposed complex or unusual transactions which could have a material impact on the financial statements
- maintain adequate business processes and IT controls, supported by an appropriate IT infrastructure and control environment.

Updated Auditing Standards

The FRC has issued updated Auditing Standards in respect of Quality Management (ISQM 1 and ISQM 2). It has also issued an updated Standard on quality management for an audit of financial statements (ISA 220). We confirm we will comply with these standards.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Audit fees

	Proposed fee 2023/24
Shropshire Council Audit - scale fee	£367,241
ISA 315	£12,550
Audit of subsidiary company Shropshire Towns and Rural Housing Limited (STaRH) (Fee is paid for by STaRH Housing)	£36,750
Total audit fees (excluding VAT)	£416,541

Previous year

In 2022/23 the scale fee set by PSAA was £121,811. The actual fee charged for the audit, including audit of subsidiary companies (where applicable) was £179,699.

Relevant professional standards

In preparing our fees, we have had regard to all relevant professional standards, including paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 of the FRC's Ethical Standard (revised 2019) which stipulate that the Engagement Lead (Key Audit Partner) must set a fee sufficient to enable the resourcing of the audit with partners and staff with appropriate time and skill to deliver an audit to the required professional and Ethical standards.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

IFRS 16 'Leases' and related disclosures

IFRS 16 will need to be implemented by local authorities from 1 April 2024. This Standard sets out the principles for the recognition, measurement, presentation and disclosure of leases and replaces IAS17. The objective is to ensure that lessees and lessors provide relevant information in a manner that faithfully represents those transactions. This information gives a basis for users of financial statements to assess the effect that leases have on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of an entity. As this is a shadow year for the implementation of IFRS 16, we will need to consider the work being undertaken by the Council to ensure a smooth adoption of the new standard.

Introduction

IFRS 16 updates the definition of a lease to:

> "a contract, or part of a contract, that conveys the right to use an asset (the underlying asset) for a period of time in exchange for consideration." In the public sector the definition of a lease is expanded to include arrangements with nil consideration.

IFRS 16 requires all leases to be accounted for 'on balance sheet' by the lessee (subject to the exemptions below), a major departure from the requirements of IAS 17 in respect of operating leases.

IFRS 16 requires a lessee to recognise assets and liabilities for leases with a term of more than 12 months, unless the underlying asset is of low value. A lessee is required to recognise a right-of-use asset representing its right to use the underlying leased asset and a lease liability representing its obligation to make lease payments. There is a single accounting model for all leases (similar to that of finance leases under IAS 17), with the following exceptions:

- leases of low value assets
- short-term leases (less than 12 months).

Lessor accounting is substantially unchanged leading to asymmetry of approach for some leases (operating) although if an NHS body is the intermediary and subletting there is a change in that the judgement between operating and finance lease is made with reference to the right of use asset rather than the underlying asset

Council's systems and processes

We believe that most local authorities will need to reflect the effect of IFRS 16 changes in the following areas:

- accounting policies and disclosures
- application of judgment and estimation
- related internal controls that will require updating, if not overhauling, to reflect changes in accounting policies and processes
- systems to capture the process and maintain new lease data and for ongoing maintenance

Further information

Further details on the requirements of IFRS16 can be found in the HM Treasury Financial Reporting Manual. This is available on the following link.

IFRS 16 Application Guidance December 2020.docx (publishing.service.gov.uk)

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Independence and non-audit services

Auditor independence

Ethical Standards and ISA (UK) 260 require us to give you timely disclosure of all significant facts and matters that may bear upon the integrity, objectivity and independence of the firm or covered persons. relating to our independence. We encourage you to contact us to discuss these or any other independence issues with us. We will also discuss with you if we make additional significant judgements surrounding independence matters.

We confirm that there are no significant facts or matters that impact on our independence as auditors that we are required or wish to draw to your attention. We have complied with the Financial Reporting Council's Ethical Standard and we as a firm, and each covered person, confirm that we are independent and are able to express an objective opinion on the financial statements.. Further, we have complied with the requirements of the National Audit Office's Auditor Guidance Note 01 issued in May 2020 which sets out supplementary guidance on ethical requirements for auditors of local public bodies. We confirm that we have implemented policies and procedures to meet the requirements of the Ethical Standard. For the purposes of our audit we have made enquiries of all Grant Thornton UK LLP teams providing services to the group and Council.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Independence and non-audit services

Other services

The following other services provided by Grant Thornton were identified.

The amounts detailed are fees agreed to-date for audit related and non-audit services to be undertaken by Grant Thornton UK LLP in the current financial year. These services are consistent with the group and Council's policy on the allotment of non-audit work to your auditors. Any changes and full details of all fees charged for audit related and non-audit related services by Grant Thornton UK LLP and by Grant Thornton International Limited network member Firms will be included in our Audit Findings report at the conclusion of the audit.

None of the services provided are subject to contingent fees.

Service	Fees £	Threats	Safeguards
Audit related			
Housing Capital Receipts	10,000	• Self-Interest (because this is a recurring fee) • Self review • Management	The level of this recurring fee taken on its own is not considered a significant threat to independence as the fee for this work is £10k in comparison to the total fee for the audit and in particular relative to Grant Thornton UK LLP's turnover overall. Further, it is a fixed fee and there is no contingent element to it. These factors all mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level. To mitigate against the self review threat , the timing of certification work is done after the audit has completed, materiality of the amounts involved to our opinion and unlikelihood of material errors arising and the Council has informed management who will decide whether to amend returns for our findings and agree the accuracy of our reports on grants. To mitigate against the management threat, ie acting in the capacity of management, the scope of the work does not include making decisions on behalf of management or recommending or suggesting a particular course of action for management to follow.
Teachers Pension Return	12,500	• Self-Interest (because this is a recurring fee) • Self review • Management	The level of this recurring fee taken on its own is not considered a significant threat to independence as the fee for this work is £12.5k in comparison to the total fee for the audit and in particular relative to Grant Thornton UK LLP's turnover overall. Further, it is a fixed fee and there is no contingent element to it. These factors all mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level. To mitigate against the self review threat , the timing of certification work is done after the audit has completed, materiality of the amounts involved to our opinion and unlikelihood of material errors arising and the Council has informed management who will decide whether to amend returns for our findings and agree the accuracy of our reports on grants. To mitigate against the management threat, ie acting in the capacity of management, the scope of the work does not include making decisions on behalf of management or recommending or suggesting a particular course of action for management to follow.
Housing Benefit Subsidy Claim	Fee TBC	• Self-Interest (because this is a recurring fee) • Self review • Management	The level of this recurring fee taken on its own is not considered a significant threat to independence as the fee for this work .in comparison to the total fee for the audit and in particular relative to Grant Thornton UK LLP's turnover overall. Further, it is a fixed fee and there is no contingent element to it. These factors all mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level To mitigate against the self review threat , the timing of certification work is done after the audit has completed, materiality of the amounts involved to our opinion and unlikelihood of material errors arising and the Council has informed management who will decide whether to amend returns for our findings and agree the accuracy of our reports on grants. To mitigate against the management threat, ie acting in the capacity of management, the scope of the work does not include making decisions on behalf of management or recommending or suggesting a particular course of action for management to follow.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Independence and non-audit services

Other services - continued

Service	Fees £	Threats	Safeguards
Audit related			
iXBRL tagging – Service carried out by separate Grant Thornton team for the Council's subsidiary Shropshire Towns and Rural Housing Limited (STaRH) 2023/24	£550	Self - Interest	This is potentially a recurring fee and therefore high self-interest threat. However, the level of this recurring fee taken on its own is not considered a significant threat to independence as the fee for this work of £550 in comparison to the total fee for the audit of either Shropshire Council or Shropshire Towns and Rural Housing Limited (STaRH) and, in particular, to GTUK's turnover overall. The work is on audit related service. It is carried out for and billed to STaRH, not the Council. It is a fixed fee and there is no contingent element to it. These factors all mitigate the perceived self-interest threat to an acceptable level.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance

Our communication plan	Audit Plan	Audit Findings
Respective responsibilities of auditor and management/those charged with governance	•	
Overview of the planned scope and timing of the audit, form, timing and expected general content of communications including significant risks and Key Audit Matters	•	
Confirmation of independence and objectivity of the firm, the engagement team members and all other indirectly covered persons	•	•
A statement that we have complied with relevant ethical requirements regarding independence. Relationships and other matters which might be thought to bear on independence. Details of non-audit work performed by Grant Thornton UK LLP and network firms, together with fees charged. Details of safeguards applied to threats to independence	•	•
Significant matters in relation to going concern	•	•
Matters in relation to the group audit, including: Scope of work on components, involvement of group auditors in component audits, concerns over quality of component auditors' work, limitations of scope on the group audit, fraud or suspected fraud	•	•
Views about the qualitative aspects of the Group's accounting and financial reporting practices including accounting policies, accounting estimates and financial statement disclosures		n/a

ISA (UK) 260, as well as other ISAs (UK), prescribe matters which we are required to communicate with those charged with governance, and which we set out in the table here.

This document, the Audit Plan, outlines our audit strategy and plan to deliver the audit, while the Audit Findings will be issued prior to approval of the financial statements and will present key issues, findings and other matters arising from the audit, together with an explanation as to how these have been resolved.

We will communicate any adverse or unexpected findings affecting the audit on a timely basis, either informally or via an audit progress memorandum.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance

Our communication plan	Audit Plan	Audit Findings
Significant findings from the audit		•
Significant matters and issue arising during the audit and written representations that have been sought		•
Significant difficulties encountered during the audit		•
Significant deficiencies in internal control identified during the audit		•
Significant matters arising in connection with related parties		•
Identification or suspicion of fraud(deliberate manipulation) involving management and/or which results in material misstatement of the financial statements (not typically council tax fraud)		•
Non-compliance with laws and regulations		•
Unadjusted misstatements and material disclosure omissions		•
Expected modifications to the auditor's report, or emphasis of matter		•

Respective responsibilities

As auditor we are responsible for performing the audit in accordance with ISAs (UK), which is directed towards forming and expressing an opinion on the financial statements that have been prepared by management with the oversight of those charged with governance.

The audit of the financial statements does not relieve management or those charged with governance of their responsibilities.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Escalation policy

The Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities are proposing to introduce an audit backstop date on a rolling basis to encourage timelier completion of local government audits in the future.

As your statutory auditor, we understand the importance of appropriately resourcing audits with qualified staff to ensure high quality standards that meet regulatory expectations and national deadlines. It is the Authority's responsibility to produce true and fair accounts in accordance with the CIPFA Code by the 31 May 2024 and respond to audit information requests and queries in a timely manner.

To help ensure that accounts audits can be completed on time in the future, we have introduced an escalation policy. This policy outlines the steps we will take to address any delays in draft accounts or responding to queries and information requests. If there are any delays, the following steps should be followed:

Step 1 - Initial Communication with Finance Director (within one working day of statutory deadline for draft accounts or agreed deadline for working papers)

We will have a conversation with the Finance Director(s) to identify reasons for the delay and review the Authority's plans to address it. We will set clear expectations for improvement.

Step 2 - Further Reminder (within two weeks of deadline)

If the initial conversation does not lead to improvement, we will send a reminder explaining outstanding queries and information requests, the deadline for responding, and the consequences of not responding by the deadline.

Step 3 - Escalation to Chief Executive (within one month of deadline)

If the delay persists, we will escalate the issue to the Chief Executive, including a detailed summary of the situation, steps taken to address the delay, and agreed deadline for responding.

Step 4 - Escalation to the Audit Committee (at next available Audit Committee meeting or in writing to Audit Committee Chair within 6 weeks of deadline)

If senior management is unable to resolve the delay, we will escalate the issue to the audit committee, including a detailed summary of the situation, steps taken to address the delay, and recommendations for next steps.

Step 5 – Consider use of wider powers (within two months of deadline)

If the delay persists despite all efforts, we will consider using wider powers, e.g. issuing a statutory recommendation. This decision will be made only after all other options have been exhausted. We will consult with an internal risk panel to ensure appropriateness.

By following these steps, we aim to ensure that delays in responding to queries and information requests are addressed in a timely and effective manner, and that we are able to provide timely assurance to key stakeholders including the public on the Authority's financial statements.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

Audit Backstop – update (for information)

The Government consulted in February 2024 on a proposal to introduce a series of statutory backstops to bring the local audit system back on track. The proposals also included a series of updates to the NAO's Code of Audit Practice.

Our understanding was that the necessary regulations to enact the backstop legislation were due to be laid before Parliament prior to summer recess in July 2024. This would have enabled the legislative framework which would have enabled the 30 September 2024 backstop to be implemented.

The calling of a General Election on July 5th puts this timetable in considerable doubt The Government that is elected will have to both decide if it wants to implement the backstop solution and if so, determine the timetable by which it happens. The Council does not have any prior year accounts outstanding which is positive news. We will therefore continue with the planned approach as reported in this document for the delivery of the 23/24 audit.

Audit sign off as at 31 May 2024

As at the end of May, we had signed 136 audits for 2022/23, representing 65% of our local government population. We envisage achieving a 75% sign off rate by the end of September. This compares with a sign off rate for other firms at the end of May of 7% (18 audits). If the backstop is extended to the end of the year – we envisage this figure moving to 80% completion.

We had signed off 81% of our 2021/22 audits by the end of May and envisage achieving an 85% sign off rate by the end of September. Other firms had signed off 48% of audits by the end of May.

Audit year	Grant Thornton audits signed	Grant Thornton audits signed	Other firms
	Position as at end of May 2024 (%)	Forecast position end of Sep 2024 (%)	Position as at end of May 2024 (%)
2022-23	65	75	7
2021-22	81	85	48
2020-21	92	92	81

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

© 2023 Grant Thornton UK LLP.

'Grant Thornton' refers to the brand under which the Grant Thornton member firms provide assurance, tax and advisory services to their audited entities 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 . 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.

Grant Thornton