


Deloitte.



**Shetland
Islands
Council**



Shetland Islands Integration Joint Board

Planning report to the Audit Committee on the audit for the year ending
31 March 2020

Issued 27 January 2020 for the meeting on 6 February 2020

Contents

01 Planning report

Introduction	3
Responsibilities of the Audit Committee	5
Our audit explained	6
Continuous communication and reporting	7
Materiality	8
Scope of work and approach	9
Significant risks	11
Wider scope requirements	14
Maintaining audit quality	17
Purpose of our report and responsibility statement	19

02 Appendices

Fraud responsibilities and representations	21
Independence and fees	23
Our approach to quality	24

03 Sector developments

Shaping the future of UK healthcare	26
2019 Global Health Care Outlook	27
State of the State	28
Audit Scotland "NHS in Scotland 2019"	30
What does climate change mean for business	31

Introduction

The key messages in this report

Audit quality is our number one priority. We plan our audit to focus on audit quality and have set the following audit quality objectives for this audit:

- A robust challenge of the key judgements taken in the preparation of the financial statements.
- A strong understanding of your internal control environment.
- A well planned and delivered audit that raises findings early with those charged with governance.

I have pleasure in presenting our planning report to the Audit Committee (“the Committee”) of Shetland Islands Integration Joint Board (“the IJB”) for the year ending 31 March 2020 audit. I would like to draw your attention to the key messages of this audit plan:

Audit Plan

We have updated our understanding of the IJB including discussion with management and review of relevant documentation from across the IJB. Based on these procedures, we have developed this plan in collaboration with the IJB to ensure that we provide an effective audit service that meets your expectations and focuses on the most significant areas of importance and risk to the IJB.

Key Risks

We have taken an initial view as to the significant audit risks the IJB faces. These are presented as a summary dashboard on page 11.

Audit Dimensions

The Code of Audit Practice sets out four audit dimensions which set a common framework for all public sector audits in Scotland. Our planned audit work against the four dimensions is risk based and proportionate. Our initial assessment builds upon our work in prior years to develop an understanding of the IJB’s key priorities and risks as well as any risks identified by Audit Scotland. The following specific risks have been identified:

Financial sustainability – There is a risk that that the plans for efficiency savings, achieving financial balance and service redesign are not robust enough to allow the benefits to be realised. The latest financial monitoring reports for 2019/20 are projecting an overspend of circa £2.5m. There is therefore also an increased risk in achieving short term financial balance.

We will review the progress being made in the development of the updated Medium Term Financial Plan and refreshed Strategic Commissioning Plan.

Financial management – Given the current year projected overspend, as noted above, there remains a risk that the budget setting and monitoring arrangements are not sufficiently robust to ensure that the IJB operates within the delegated budgets.

We will review the IJB’s financial management arrangements including the extent to which there is effective scrutiny over both operational spend as well as delivery of savings plans. Our work will consider the extent to which the performance impact of in year savings is monitored.

Introduction (continued)

The key messages in this report (continued)

Audit Dimensions (continued)

Governance and transparency – There is a risk that the scrutiny and governance arrangements are not sufficiently robust to achieve the full benefits of integration. We will assess the work being done to formally review the Integration Scheme during 2020. We will also specifically follow up on the recommendations made in our 2018/19 Interim Report which were being addressed as part of the IJB Governance Review which features in the IJB Business Programme.

Value for money – There is a risk that the IJB is unable to demonstrate it is achieving its objectives and meeting planned outcomes if there is no clear link between expenditure and outcomes achieved. We will review the annual refresh of the Strategic Commissioning Plan, the IJB's performance against its objectives, the IJB's reporting and monitoring of these and the actions taken to improve the performance of the IJB.

Should any further risks specific to the four audit dimensions emerge during the year, we will provide an update to the Audit Committee.

Our Commitment to Quality

We are committed to providing the highest quality audit, with input from our market leading specialists, sophisticated data analytics and our wealth of experience.

Adding value

Our aim is to add value to the IJB through our audit work by being constructive and forward looking, by identifying areas of improvement and by recommending and encouraging good practice. In this way, we aim to help the IJB promote improved standards of governance, better management and decision making and more effective use of resources.

We have also shared our recent research, informed perspectives and best practice from our work across the wider public sector on pages 26 to 31 of this paper.

Pat Kenny
Audit director

© 2020 Deloitte LLP. All rights reserved.


Responsibilities of the Audit Committee

Helping you fulfil your responsibilities

Why do we interact with the Audit Committee?




As a result of regulatory change in recent years, the role of the Audit Committee has significantly expanded. We set out here a summary of the core areas of Audit Committee responsibility to provide a reference in respect of these broader responsibilities and highlight throughout the document where there is key information which helps the Audit Committee in fulfilling its remit.




Our audit explained

We tailor our audit to your Board and your strategy



Continuous communication and reporting

Planned timing of the audit



Materiality

Our approach to materiality

Basis of our materiality benchmark

- The audit director has determined materiality as £0.790m (2018/19: £0.786m) and performance materiality as £0.632m (2018/19: £0.628m) based on professional judgement and risk factors specific to the IJB, the requirement of auditing standards and the financial measures most relevant to users of the financial statements.
- We have used 1.6% of forecast gross expenditure (2018/19: 1.6%) as the benchmark for determining materiality and applied 80% as performance materiality (2018/19: 80%).
- We will update the materiality calculation using actual gross expenditure per the draft annual accounts.
- This approach is consistent with our prior year materiality calculation.

Reporting to those charged with governance

- We will report to you all misstatements found in excess of our clearly trivial threshold which is £0.039m (2018/19: £0.039m).


- We will report to you misstatements below this threshold if we consider them to be material by nature.
- Our approach to determining the materiality benchmark is consistent with Audit Scotland guidance which states that the threshold for clearly trivial above which we should accumulate misstatements for reporting and correction to audit committees must not exceed £250k.

Our annual audit report

We will:

- Report the materiality benchmark applied in the audit of the IJB; and
- provide comparative data and explain any changes in materiality, compared to prior year, if appropriate.

Materiality



Although materiality is the judgement of the Audit Director, the Audit Committee must satisfy themselves that the level of materiality chosen is appropriate for the scope of the audit.



Scope of work and approach

Our key areas of responsibility under the Code of Audit Practice

Core audit work	Planned output	Timeline
Perform an audit of the annual accounts and express specified audit opinion	Annual audit plan Independent auditor's report	6 February 2020 30 September 2020
Consider and report on the audit dimensions	Annual audit plan Interim report Annual audit report	6 February 2020 30 June 2020 30 September 2020
Contribute to performance audits (including performance audit reports, overview reports and impact reports)	Dataset returns	8 May 2020 (part 1) 14 August 2020 (part 2)
Share audit intelligence with Audit Scotland including highlighting potential statutory reports	Current issues returns	17 January 2020 20 March 2020 7 August 2020 23 October 2020
Provide information on cases of fraud	Fraud Returns	30 November 2019 28 February 2020 31 May 2020 30 August 2020

Scope of work and approach (continued)

Our approach

Liaison with internal audit

The Auditing Standards Board's version of ISA (UK) 610 "Using the work of internal auditors" prohibits use of internal audit to provide "direct assistance" to the audit. Our approach to the use of the work of Internal Audit has been designed to be compatible with these requirements.

The IJB uses the corporate financial systems of Shetland Islands Council ("the Council") as well as the Council's internal audit function. We will review their reports and meet with them to discuss their work. We will discuss the work plan for internal audit, and where they have identified specific material deficiencies in the control environment we consider adjusting our testing so that the audit risk is covered by our work.

Using these discussions to inform our risk assessment, we can work together with internal audit to develop an approach that avoids inefficiencies and overlaps, therefore avoiding any unnecessary duplication of audit requirements on the IJB staff.

Approach to controls testing

Our risk assessment procedures will include obtaining an understanding of controls considered to be 'relevant to the audit'. This involves evaluating the design of the controls and determining whether they have been implemented ("D&I").

The results of our work in obtaining an understanding of controls will be collated and the impact on the extent of substantive audit testing required will be considered.

Promoting high quality reporting to stakeholders

We view the audit role as going beyond reactively checking compliance with requirements: we seek to provide advice on evolving good practice to promote high quality reporting.

We will utilise the Code of Practice on local authority accounts in the UK disclosure checklist to support the IJB in preparing high quality drafts of the annual report and financial statements, which we would recommend the IJB complete during drafting.

The Disclosure Checklist reflects the cutting clutter agenda and includes a "not material" column. We would encourage the IJB to exclude disclosure if the information is not material.

Audit Scotland has published good practice guides in relation to the Annual Report and the Governance Statement to support the Board in preparing high quality drafts of the Annual Report and financial statements, which we would recommend the IJB consider during drafting.

Statutory Other Information

In addition to the financial statements, we are required to consider whether the Management Commentary and Governance Statement is consistent with the financial statements and has been prepared in accordance with applicable requirements. In performing this work, we will refer to the Financial Reporting Council report issued in December 2018 following an audit quality thematic review of auditors' work on other information which identified a number of instances when insufficient work was performed to ensure that good practice is followed.

Obtain an understanding of the IJB and its environment including the identification of relevant controls.

Identify risks and controls that address those risks.

Carry out "design and implementation" work on relevant controls.

If considered necessary, test the operating effectiveness of selected controls.

Design and perform a combination of substantive analytical procedures and tests of details that are most responsive to the assessed risks.

Significant risks Dashboard

Risk	Material?	Fraud risk identified?	Planned approach to controls testing	Level of management judgement	Page no.
Completeness and accuracy of income			Design and implementation		12
Management override of controls			Design and implementation		13



Some degree of management judgement



Limited management judgement

Significant risks (continued)

Risk 1 – Completeness and accuracy of income

Risk identified

ISA 240 states that when identifying and assessing the risks of material misstatement due to fraud, the auditor shall, based on a presumption that there are risks of fraud in income recognition, evaluate which types of income, income transactions or assertions give rise to such risks.

The main components of income for the IJB are contributions from its funding partners, namely Shetland Islands Council and NHS Shetland. The significant risk is pinpointed to the recognition of this income, being completeness and accuracy of contributions received from the Health Board and the Council. Given the year-end deficit projected by the IJB, there is a risk that overspends could be funded by funding partners in the year following their approval, and therefore contributions could differ from the approved budget.

Our response We will perform the following:

- test the income to ensure that the correct contributions have been input and received in accordance with that agreed as part of budget process and that any reductions have been appropriately applied;
 - test the reconciliations performed by the IJB at 31 March 2020 to confirm all income is correctly recorded in the ledger;
 - confirm that the reconciliations performed during 2019/20 have been reviewed on a regular basis; and
 - assess the design and implementation of the controls around recognition of income.
-

Significant risks (continued)

Risk 2 – Management override of controls

We will use computer assisted audit techniques to support our work on the risk of management override

Risk identified

In accordance with ISA 240 (UK) management override is a significant risk. This risk area includes the potential for management to use their judgement to influence the financial statements as well as the potential to override the IJB's controls for specific transactions.

The key judgements in the financial statements are those which we have selected to be the significant audit risks around completeness and accuracy of income. This is inherently the areas in which management has the potential to use their judgement to influence the financial statements.

Planned audit challenge

In considering the risk of management override, we plan to perform the following audit procedures that directly address this risk:

Journal testing

- We will test the design and implementation of controls over journal entry processing.
- We will risk assess journals and select items for detailed follow-up testing. The journal entries will be selected using computer-assisted profiling based on areas which we consider to be of increased interest.
- We will test the appropriateness of journal entries recorded in the general ledger, and other adjustments made in the preparation of financial reporting.

Accounting estimates and judgements

- We will test the design and implementation of controls over any key accounting estimates and judgements.
- We will review accounting estimates for biases that could result in material misstatements due to fraud. This will include both a retrospective review of 31 March 2019 estimates and a review of the corresponding estimates as at 31 March 2020.

Significant and unusual transactions

- We will obtain an understanding of the business rationale of significant transactions that we become aware of that are outside the normal course of business for the IJB, or that otherwise appear to be unusual, given our understanding of the IJB and its environment.

Wider scope requirements

Audit dimensions

The Code of Audit Practice sets out **four audit dimensions** which set a common framework for all public sector audits in Scotland. Our planned audit work against the four dimensions is risk based and proportionate. Our initial assessment builds upon our work in prior years to develop an understanding of the IJB's key priorities and risks as well as any risks identified by Audit Scotland. We have set out below our identified audit risks in relation to the audit dimensions and proposed response. In addition, we will follow up the progress made in relation to our previous year's recommendations.

Audit dimension	Conclusions from previous years	2019/20 Audit Risks
<p>Financial sustainability looks forward to the medium and longer term to consider whether the Board is planning effectively to continue to deliver its services or the way in which they should be delivered.</p>	<p>As reported in our 2018/19 annual audit report, the IJB is not in a financially sustainable position and significant funding gaps are forecast for future years. We highlighted that the IJB needs to work with its partners to prioritise and progress transformational change, considering alternative methods of service delivery or taking difficult decisions such as changes to the level of service provided in order to reach a financially sustainable position in the medium to longer term.</p>	<p>There is a risk that that the plans for efficiency savings, achieving financial balance and service redesign are not robust enough to allow the benefits to be realised. The latest financial monitoring reports for 2019/20 are projecting an overspend of circa £2.5m. There is therefore also an increased risk in achieving short term financial balance.</p> <p>We will also review the progress being made in the development of the updated Medium Term Financial Plan and refreshed Strategic Commissioning Plan.</p>
<p>Financial management is concerned with financial capacity, sound budgetary processes and whether the control environment and internal controls are operating effectively.</p>	<p>We concluded in 2018/19 that the IJB has effective financial management in place. However, we highlighted that there was room for improvement in the budget-setting process, the reporting of progress against budget and changes to the budget in year.</p>	<p>Given the current year projected overspend, as noted above, there remains a risk that the budget setting and monitoring arrangements are not sufficiently robust to ensure that the IJB operates within the delegated budgets.</p> <p>We will review the IJB's financial management arrangements including the extent to which there is effective scrutiny over both operational spend as well as delivery of savings plans. Our work will consider the extent to which the performance impact of in year savings is monitored.</p>

Wider scope requirements (continued)

Audit dimensions (continued)

Audit dimension	Conclusions from previous years	2019/20 Audit Risks
<p>Governance and transparency is concerned with the effectiveness of scrutiny and governance arrangements, leadership and decision making, and transparent reporting of financial and performance information.</p>	<p>In 2018/19 we concluded that the IJB promotes a culture of openness and transparency. We did, however, conclude, that the IJB needs to significantly improve its approach to self assessment. We recommended that it develops a self assessment programme to ensure that it has adequate arrangements in place.</p>	<p>There is a risk that the scrutiny and governance arrangements are not sufficiently robust to achieve the full benefits of integration.</p> <p>We will assess the work being done to formally review the Integration Scheme during 2020. We will also specifically follow up on the recommendations made in our 2018/19 Interim Report which were being addressed as part of the IJB Governance Review which features in the IJB Business Programme.</p>
<p>Value for money is concerned with using resources effectively and continually improving services.</p>	<p>In 2018/19 we concluded that, while the IJB's performance continues to fare well against the national average this comes at a substantial cost. Given the current financial position, we highlighted that the IJB needs to consider the targets it sets and outline what it considers acceptable performance in lower-priority areas, ensuring such decisions are made through the engagement with the wider community.</p>	<p>There is a risk that the IJB is unable to demonstrate it is achieving its objectives and meeting planned outcomes if there is no clear link between expenditure and outcomes achieved.</p> <p>We will review the annual refresh of the Strategic Commissioning Plan, the IJB's performance against its objectives, the IJB's reporting and monitoring of these and the actions taken to improve the performance of the IJB.</p>

Wider scope requirements (continued)

Other responsibilities

Best Value (BV)

It is the duty of the IJB to secure BV as prescribed in the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973.

In accordance with Audit Scotland planning guidance, we will include comments in our annual audit report on how the IJB demonstrates that it is meeting its BV duties. We are required to report on the IJB's own arrangements for doing this and how effectively this is reported in the IJB's annual performance report and are not required to perform detailed audit work against the BV characteristics.

The Islands (Scotland) Act 2018

[The Islands \(Scotland\) Act 2018](#) received royal assent in July 2018. The Islands (Scotland) Act 2018 places a duty on 'relevant authorities' to have regard to island communities in exercising their functions. Relevant authorities must prepare an island communities impact assessment for any policy, strategy or service likely to have an effect on an island community which significantly differs from that on other communities. This is known as "island-proofing". The Act requires relevant authorities to publish information at least once annually detailing steps taken to comply with their duty of having regard to island communities.

In our 2019/20 audit we will consider the implications of the Act as part of our consideration of BV arrangements.

Sector overview/ Annual performance reports

As in previous years, the Accounts Commission will publish an annual performance report covering the local government sector. This report uses information from the audited accounts and the Annual Audit Reports, and therefore much of the required information is generally already available from the core audit work. However, we will be requested by Audit Scotland to provide important supplementary information collected as datasets. We will share these with management as soon as they are available.

Impact reports

We will also be requested to provide information to support assessing the impact of previously published performance audit reports. Audit Scotland plan to assess the impact of the report "**Children and young people's mental health**" during April/ May 2020.

Maintaining audit quality

Responding to challenges in the current audit market

This is a time of intense scrutiny for our profession with questions over the role of auditors, market choice and the provision of non-audit services by an audit firm. We welcome the debate and are engaging fully with all parties who have an interest in the current audit market reform initiatives, so that our profession, our people, our clients and most importantly, the public interest, are served to the highest standards of audit quality and independence.

The role of audit

- Public confidence in audit has weakened over recent years and the expectation gap has widened with differences between what an audit does and what people think it should do (largely in areas of internal controls, fraud, front half assurance and long term viability).
- Deloitte fully supports an independent review into the role of auditors.
- The Government's Brydon Review will consider UK audit standards and how audits should evolve.

Would it be better to have audit only firms?

- Deloitte believes that multidisciplinary firms have more knowledge, greater access to technology and a deeper talent pool. The specialist input from industry, valuation, controls, pensions, cyber, solvency, IT and tax services are critical to an effective audit.
- Our investment in audit innovation, training and technology is greater because of the multidisciplinary model.

Is the current audit market uncompetitive?

- We recognise that the competition for large, complex clients is fierce, but we wholeheartedly support greater choice being available to stakeholders.
- There are barriers to entry in the listed market that are significant, including the required global reach, unlimited liability, and the high cost of tendering.
- The audit profession has engaged with the Competition and Markets Authority with ideas on how to provide greater choice in the market, and responded to the CMA's suggested market remedies.

Independence and conflicts from other services

- Legislation and the FRC's Ethical Standard restrict the services we may provide to audit clients.
- Deloitte invests heavily in systems, processes and people to check for potential conflicts.
- We have governance arrangements in place to assess any areas of potential conflict, including where required to protect the public interest.
- Fees for non-audit services to audit clients have fallen since 2008 (17% to 7.3% of firm revenue).

Deloitte

- Our Impact Report and Transparency Report are available on our website <https://www2.deloitte.com/uk/en/pages/about-deloitte-uk/articles/annual-reports.html>

Maintaining audit quality (continued)

Our commitment to audit quality



Our objective is to deliver a distinctive, quality audit to you. Every member of the engagement team will contribute, to achieve the highest standard of professional excellence.

In particular, for your audit, we consider that the following steps will contribute to the overall quality:

- We will apply professional scepticism on material issues and significant judgements identified, by using our expertise in the local government and health sector and elsewhere to provide robust challenge to management.
- We have obtained a deep understanding of your business, its environment and of your processes in income and expenditure recognition and payroll expenditure enabling us to develop a risk-focused approach tailored to the Board.
- Our engagement team is selected to ensure that we have the right subject matter expertise and industry knowledge. We will involve specialists to support the audit team in our work.

In order to deliver a quality audit to you, each member of the core audit team will receive tailored learning to develop their expertise in audit skills, delivered by Pat Kenny and other sector experts. This includes sector specific matters, and audit methodology updates.



Engagement Quality Control Review

We have developed a tailored Engagement Quality Control approach. Our dedicated Professional Standards Review (PSR) function will provide a 'hot' review before any audit or other opinion is signed. PSR is operationally independent of the audit team, and supports our high standards of professional scepticism and audit quality by providing a rigorous independent challenge.

Purpose of our report and responsibility statement

Our report is designed to help you meet your governance duties

What we report

Our report is designed to establish our respective responsibilities in relation to the financial statements audit, to agree our audit plan and to take the opportunity to ask you questions at the planning stage of our audit. Our report includes:

- Our audit plan, including key audit judgements and the planned scope; and
- Key regulatory and corporate governance updates, relevant to you.

What we don't report

As you will be aware, our audit is not designed to identify all matters that may be relevant to the IJB.

Also, there will be further information you need to discharge your governance responsibilities, such as matters reported on by management or by other specialist advisers.

Finally, the views on internal controls and business risk assessment in our final report should not be taken as comprehensive or as an opinion on effectiveness since they will be based solely on the audit procedures performed in the audit of the financial statements and the other procedures performed in fulfilling our audit plan.

Other relevant communications

We will update you if there are any significant changes to the audit plan.

This report has been prepared for the Audit Committee, as a body, and we therefore accept responsibility to you alone for its contents. We accept no duty, responsibility or liability to any other parties, since this report has not been prepared, and is not intended, for any other purpose. Except where required by law or regulation, it should not be made available to any other parties without our prior written consent.

We welcome the opportunity to discuss our report with you and receive your feedback.



Pat Kenny, CPFA

for and on behalf of Deloitte LLP

Glasgow

27 January 2020

Appendices



Fraud responsibilities and representations

Responsibilities explained



Your Responsibilities:

The primary responsibility for the prevention and detection of fraud rests with management and those charged with governance, including establishing and maintaining internal controls over the reliability of financial reporting, effectiveness and efficiency of operations and compliance with applicable laws and regulations.



Our responsibilities:

- We are required to obtain representations from your management regarding internal controls, assessment of risk and any known or suspected fraud or misstatement.
- As auditors, we obtain reasonable, but not absolute, assurance that the financial statements as a whole are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or error.
- As set out in the significant risks section of this document, we have identified the risk of fraud in the completeness and accuracy of income and management override of controls as a key audit risk for your organisation.



Fraud Characteristics:

- Misstatements in the financial statements can arise from either fraud or error. The distinguishing factor between fraud and error is whether the underlying action that results in the misstatement of the financial statements is intentional or unintentional.
- Two types of intentional misstatements are relevant to us as auditors – misstatements resulting from fraudulent financial reporting and misstatements resulting from misappropriation of assets.

We will request the following to be stated in the representation letter signed on behalf of the IJB:

- We acknowledge our responsibilities for the design, implementation and maintenance of internal control to prevent and detect fraud and error.
- We have disclosed to you the results of our assessment of the risk that the financial statements may be materially misstated as a result of fraud.
- We are not aware of any fraud or suspected fraud that affects the entity and involves:
 - (i) management;
 - (ii) employees who have significant roles in internal control; or
 - (iii) others where the fraud could have a material effect on the financial statements.
- We have disclosed to you all information in relation to allegations of fraud, or suspected fraud, affecting the entity's financial statements communicated by employees, former employees, analysts, regulators or others.



Fraud responsibilities and representations

Inquiries

We will make the following inquiries regarding fraud:



Management:

- Management's assessment of the risk that the financial statements may be materially misstated due to fraud, including the nature, extent and frequency of such assessments.
- Management's process for identifying and responding to the risks of fraud in the entity.
- Management's communication, if any, to those charged with governance regarding its processes for identifying and responding to the risks of fraud in the entity.
- Management's communication, if any, to employees regarding its views on business practices and ethical behaviour.
- Whether management has knowledge of any actual, suspected or alleged fraud affecting the entity.
- We plan to involve management from outside the finance function in our inquiries.



Internal audit and Local Counter Fraud Specialist

- Whether internal audit and the Board's local counter fraud specialist has knowledge of any actual, suspected or alleged fraud affecting the entity, and to obtain its views about the risks of fraud.



Those charged with governance

- How those charged with governance exercise oversight of management's processes for identifying and responding to the risks of fraud in the entity and the internal control that management has established to mitigate these risks.
- Whether those charged with governance have knowledge of any actual, suspected or alleged fraud affecting the entity.
- The views of those charged with governance on the most significant fraud risk factors affecting the entity.



Independence and fees



As part of our obligations under International Standards on Auditing (UK), we are required to report to you on the matters listed below:

Independence confirmation

We confirm the audit engagement team, and others in the firm as appropriate, Deloitte LLP and, where applicable, all Deloitte network firms are independent of the Board and will reconfirm our independence and objectivity to the Audit Committee for the year ending 31 March 2020 in our final report to the Audit Committee.

Fees

The audit fee for 2019/20, in line with the fee range provided by Audit Scotland, is £26,560 as analysed below:

	£
Auditor remuneration	18,300
Audit Scotland fixed charges:	
Pooled costs	1,790
Performance Audit and Best Value	5,360
Audit support costs	1,110
Total proposed fee	26,560

There are no non-audit services fees proposed for the period.

Non-audit services

In our opinion there are no inconsistencies between the FRC's Ethical Standard and the Board's policy for the supply of non-audit services or any apparent breach of that policy. We continue to review our independence and ensure that appropriate safeguards are in place including, but not limited to, the rotation of senior partners and professional staff and the involvement of additional partners and professional staff to carry out reviews of the work performed and to otherwise advise as necessary.

Relationships

We have no other relationships with the IJB, its directors, senior managers and affiliates, and have not supplied any services to other known connected parties.

Our approach to quality

AQR team report and findings

We maintain a relentless focus on quality and our quality control procedures and continue to invest in and enhance our Audit Quality Monitoring and Measuring programme. In July 2019 the Financial Reporting Council ("FRC") issued individual reports on each of the seven largest firms, including Deloitte, on Audit Quality Inspections providing a summary of the findings of its Audit Quality Review ("AQR") team for the 2018/19 cycle of reviews.

We greatly value the FRC reviews of our audit engagements and firm-wide quality control systems, a key aspect of evaluating our audit quality. We have further transformed our internal review processes including a new focus for reviewing in progress audits, developing our Audit Quality Indicators ('AQI') which are monitored and reported to the firm's executive, and on enhanced remediation procedures.

Whilst we are pleased that overall our quality record, as measured by external inspections, has improved from 76% to 84%, we remain committed to continuous improvement and achieving as a minimum the 90% benchmark across all engagements. We are however, extremely disappointed one engagement received a rating of significant improvements required during the period. This is viewed very seriously within Deloitte and we have worked with the AQR to agree a comprehensive set of swift and significant firm-wide actions. We are also pleased to see the impact of our previous actions on impairment, group audits and contingent liability disclosures reflected in the audits under review and there being limited or no findings in those areas. These continue to be a focus in our training, internal coaching and internal review programmes.

We invest continually in our firm-wide processes and controls, which we seek to develop globally, to underpin consistency in delivering high quality audits whilst ensuring engagement teams exercise professional scepticism through robust challenge.

All the AQR public reports are available on its website. <https://www.frc.org.uk/auditors/audit-quality-review/audit-firm-specific-reports>

The AQR's 2018/19 Audit Quality Inspection Report on Deloitte LLP

"We assessed 84% of the firm's audits that we reviewed as requiring no more than limited improvements, compared with 76% in 2017/18. Of the FTSE 350 audits we reviewed this year, we assessed 75% as achieving this standard compared with 79% in 2017/18. We note that our inspection results show only modest improvements in audit quality."

"We had no significant findings arising from our firm-wide work on internal quality monitoring, engagement quality control reviews and independence and ethics."

"Our key individual review findings related principally to the need to:

- Exercise greater professional scepticism in the audit of potential prior year adjustments and related disclosures in the annual report and accounts.
- Strengthen the extent of challenge of key estimates and assumptions in key areas of judgement, including asset valuations and impairment testing.
- Improve the consistency of the quality of the firm's audit of revenue.
- Achieve greater consistency in the audit of provisions and liabilities."

"The firm has enhanced its policies and procedures during the year in a number of areas, including the following:

- Through the firm's global audit quality programmes, there has been an increased focus on consistency of audit work across the audit practice. For certain account balances, standardised approaches have been adopted, further use has been made of centres of excellence and delivery centres and new technologies embedded into the audit process to support and enable risk assessments, analytical procedures and project management activities.
- Further methodology updates and additional guidance and training for the audit practice covering group audits, accounting estimates, financial services (including the adoption of IFRS 9) provisions and contingencies and the evidencing of quality control procedures (including EQCR) on individual audits.
- Increased support for audit teams throughout the audit cycle including coaching programmes for teams and greater use of diagnostics to monitor progress.
- Continued focus on the approach to the testing of internal controls. The firm provided additional training and support to audit teams adopting a controls-based audit approach, increased focus on reporting to Audit Committees on internal controls and on the wording of auditor's reports."

Sector developments



Shaping the future of UK healthcare

Closing the digital gap

Background

Leveraging the opportunities and efficiencies offered by digital transformation is key for any organisation to remain viable and fit for the future. But for the UK's healthcare services, which are made up of multiple services and organisations, across a range of geographies and jurisdictions, the view is more complex than for most.

The latest report from our Centre for Health Solutions examines the current challenges facing the healthcare system in realising the policy ambition of a digital first NHS, and some of the solutions to overcome them. We identify the key steps to accelerate digital transformation, what the main characteristics for successful digital programmes are and what digital healthcare of the future may look like.

While a number of digital and technology systems and services are being delivered in some parts of the NHS, our research shows that technology adoption in many hospitals, primary care and community settings is slow with a gap in the digital maturity of providers.

Although most providers have some form of electronic health record platform, the functionalities vary widely. The next step for digital transformation is to be able to access, share and use health information seamlessly. For healthcare to realise this will require a radical shift in the culture and mind-set of healthcare stakeholders. It will also require a review of how digital transformation is funded.

The insights provided in this report are drawn from an extensive literature review; a comprehensive survey of 1,500 doctors, nurses and allied health professionals; structured interviews with 65 key stakeholders across the health ecosystem; and the experience of our colleagues across Deloitte who have worked with clients on digital transformation projects in the UK and other comparable countries.

Next steps

The full report is available at <https://www2.deloitte.com/uk/en/pages/life-sciences-and-healthcare/articles/shaping-the-future-of-uk-healthcare.html>

2019 Global Health Care Outlook

Shaping the future

Background

With financial sustainability, care delivery, patient centricity, digital transformation, and regulatory compliance at the top of the agenda, health care sector leaders need to collaborate with all stakeholders—both within the health care ecosystem and those in converging industries—as they look to shape the future of health care and establish a sustainable smart health community.

The adage, “What goes up, must come down” isn’t likely to apply to the global health care sector in 2019. Ageing and growing populations, greater prevalence of chronic diseases, exponential advances in innovative, but costly, digital technologies—these and other developments continue to increase health care demand and expenditures. Health care stakeholders—providers, governments, payers, consumers, and other companies/organisations—struggling to manage clinical, operational, and financial challenges envision a future in which new business and care delivery models, aided by digital technologies, may help to solve today’s problems and to build a sustainable foundation for affordable, accessible, high-quality health care. This vision may have a greater probability of becoming a reality if all stakeholders actively participate in shaping the future— by way of shifting focus away from a system of sick care in which we treat patients after they fall ill, to one of health care which supports well-being, prevention, and early intervention.

This 2019 outlook reviews the current state of the global health care sector and explores trends and issues impacting health care providers, governments, payers, patients, and other stakeholders. It also outlines suggestions for them as they seek to redefine the health care ecosystem and looks at examples from the market.

Next steps

The full report is available at <https://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/pages/life-sciences-and-healthcare/articles/global-health-care-sector-outlook.html?id=gx:2em:3int:4HCoutlook2019:5awa:6lshc:20190110>

State of the State

The view from citizens, leaders and the frontline of public services

Background and overview

Now in its eighth year, The State of the State brings together Deloitte and Reform to make an annual assessment of government and public services in the UK. As Brexit negotiations and parliamentary wrangling continues, The State of the State looks beyond the headlines to explore the UK's public sector from the view of citizens, public sector leaders and the frontline of public services.

The State of the State finds that the public want greater spending on services, and perceptions of social inequality have grown. It finds that investment in skills could make a significant difference to some of the UK's pervasive economic issues including productivity and regional disparity, and it finds frontline public sector professionals are too often hampered by out-of-date technology and working environments.

But amid these challenges, The State of the State finds much to be positive about. Our research shows that public sector leaders are enthused by the prospect of increased spending, public support is strong for government action on big issues like climate change and the thriving public sector ethos at the frontline remains one of the UK's core strengths.



The State of the State 2019-20

The view from citizens, leaders and the frontline of public services

Next steps

A summary of the key conclusions are provided on the next page. The full report is available at <https://www2.deloitte.com/uk/thestateofthestate>

State of the State (continued)

The view from citizens, leaders and the frontline of public services

Key conclusions

Combining the three perspectives in our research offers real insight into issues at the heart of a new domestic agenda. Our key observations are:

- **The public and the public sector want to know what post-austerity looks like.** Public service leaders are best placed to make their own devolved decisions, but many want direction from national governments on the shape of post-austerity, sector-wide reform. At the frontline, professionals want that reform to include greater use of mobile technology to reduce their administrative burden and boost their productivity.
- **Infrastructure and skills investment should be deployed to tackle economic inequalities.** The public think that economic inequalities in the UK are getting worse and public sector leaders believe transport infrastructure investment could tackle them if deployed with purpose. Our research also suggests that a range of the UK's economic and social challenges converge around skills – and so investment in skills provision could make a substantial difference to the UK's post-Brexit future.
- **The UK has an opportunity to consolidate its environmental leadership.** Public concerns on climate change have spiked in the past year, support for government intervention is strong and the UK has a window of opportunity to consolidate its environmental leadership when Glasgow plays host to the COP26 summit in 2020.
- **Resolving the social care crisis needs political will.** As the Queen's Speech recognised, underfunding in the social care system continues to blight lives and exacerbate demand on the NHS. Leaders across the public services want to see social care rise as a political priority and our survey finds it may be emerging as a priority for the public. Our research suggests that cross-party political leadership may be the best route to new funding arrangements – perhaps considering systems around the world as a starting point for UK options.
- **The UK could set the global gold standard in public administration.** Brexit may be dominating a substantial part of Civil Service capacity, but it has enhanced government capability and stimulated cross-departmental working. Leaving the EU is an era-defining challenge for government departments but beyond Brexit, the UK will be in a strong position to set the global gold standard for public administration, exporting UK expertise, experience of successful transformation and digital know-how.

Audit Scotland “NHS in Scotland 2019”

NHS is ‘running hot’ and needs to refocus priorities

Background

Audit Scotland published its “NHS in Scotland 2019” report in October 2019. Its overall conclusion is that Scotland's NHS needs to refocus its priorities to speed up health and social care integration and system wide reform.

The health service continues to face growing pressure from a population that is living longer. More people were seen and treated on time in the last year and patient safety improved. But just two out of eight key waiting time standards were met as staff struggled to meet rising demand for care.

Achieving financial sustainability also remains a major challenge for health boards. Half of all NHS savings were non-recurring, while predicted deficits and reliance on additional financial support from government have increased. The capital budget has also reduced by 63 per cent over the last decade and there is a near £1 billion of backlog maintenance and issues around high-profile capital builds.

The Scottish Government has taken positive steps to help health boards address their financial challenges and improve access to care. These include a shift from short to medium-term financial planning, a waiting times improvement plan and a project to develop NHS leaders. But it is too early to see the impact of these changes, and health and social care integration remains too slow.

Next steps

The full report is available at <https://www.audit-scotland.gov.uk/report/nhs-in-scotland-2019>

The report makes a number of recommendations for the Scottish Government, NHS Boards and Integration Authorities to take forward. We therefore encourage the Board to review these and ensure that the relevant issues are being addressed.

What does climate change mean for business?

New website – learning, interviews and resources

Background

Climate change is likely to drive some of the most profound changes to businesses in our lifetimes.

Impacts on products and services, supply chains, loss of asset values and market dislocation are already being caused by more frequent and severe climate-related events.

Discover how to think through the challenges and futureproof your business.

The time to act is now!

Deloitte.

IN COLLABORATION WITH
 ICAEW

[Learning](#) | [Interviews](#) | [Resources](#) | [Contact us](#)



What does climate change mean for business?

Understanding the role of finance professionals

Climate change is likely to drive some of the most profound changes to businesses in our lifetimes.

Impacts on products and services, supply chains, loss of asset values and market dislocation are already being caused by more frequent and severe climate-related events. These effects are now compounded by the accelerating pace of policy and regulatory change as humanity recognises the challenge we face and the drastic and rapid actions we all must take in order to protect our planet and our own livelihoods.

Discover how to think through the challenges and futureproof your business through [learning](#), [interviews](#) and [resources](#).

The time to act is now!

Supported by



Next steps

Deloitte and the ICAEW have launched a site to support considering what climate change means for finance professionals at www.deloitte.co.uk/climatechange



Deloitte LLP does not accept any liability for use of or reliance on the contents of this document by any person save by the intended recipient(s) to the extent agreed in a Deloitte LLP engagement contract.

If this document contains details of an arrangement that could result in a tax or National Insurance saving, no such conditions of confidentiality apply to the details of that arrangement (for example, for the purpose of discussion with tax authorities).

Deloitte LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC303675 and its registered office at 1 New Street Square, London, EC4A 3HQ, United Kingdom.

Deloitte LLP is the United Kingdom affiliate of Deloitte NSE LLP, a member firm of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee ("DTTL"). DTTL and each of its member firms are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL and Deloitte NSE LLP do not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about to learn more about our global network of member firms.