



## Orkney and Shetland Valuation Joint Board

**Planning report to the Members of the Board on the 2021/22 audit**

Issued on 25 February for the meeting on 3 March 2022

# Contents

## 01 Planning report

---

Introduction	3
Responsibilities of the Board	5
Your control environment	6
Our audit explained	7
Continuous communication and reporting	8
Materiality	9
Scope of work and approach	10
Significant risks	11
Other areas of focus	14
Coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak	16
Reporting hot topics	18
Audit quality	20
Wider scope requirements	21
Purpose of our report and responsibility statement	23

## 02 Technical update and sector developments

---

Changes to accounting standards	25
Climate change	26
The State of the State 2021-22	27

## 03 Appendices

---

Our other responsibilities explained	30
Independence and fees	32
Our approach to quality	33

# 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 Annual Report and Accounts.
- 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 Board of Orkney and Shetland Valuation Joint Board (“the VJB”) for the 2021/22 audit. I would like to draw your attention to the key messages of this paper:

### **Audit plan**

We have updated our understanding of the VJB, including discussion with management and review of relevant documents. This has included consideration of the continuing impact the COVID-19 pandemic is having on the VJB. Based on these procedures, we have developed this plan in collaboration with the VJB to ensure that we provide an effective audit service that meets your expectation and focuses on the most significant areas of importance and risk to the VJB.

### **Key risks**

We have taken an initial view as to the significant audit risks the VJB 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 is risk-based and proportionate. Our initial assessment builds upon our work in prior years, and in particular the conclusions from our 2020/21 audit where we applied an expanded wider scope. We have also considered the Board’s key priorities and risks as well as any risks identified by Audit Scotland.

As a result of a number of significant issues identified in our 2020/21, the Controller of Audit plans to report to the Accounts Commission in March 2022 under section 102(1) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973. This report draws the Commission’s attention to the issues relating to governance and decision-making that were identified in our 2020/21 audit. In view of these issues, we have concluded that it remains appropriate to apply expanded wider scope requirements to specifically follow-up on the recommendations made in 2020/21.

As part of our work on the audit dimensions, we will consider the arrangements in place to secure Best Value (BV) as well as other wider scope requirements set out on page 21.

# Introduction (continued)

## The key messages in this report (continued)

### **Regulatory change**

IFRS 16, Leases, comes into effect on 1 April 2022, therefore will be first implemented in financial year 2022/23. This will require adjustments to recognise on balance sheet arrangements currently treated as operating leases. Further details are provided on page 25 and as part of the 2021/22 audit, we will evaluate the adequacy of the arrangements in place for compliance with the new standard.

### **Out 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.

### **Managing transition to 2022/23 audits**

2021/22 is the final year of the current audit appointments. We will minimise disruption to all parties, and maximise the transfer of knowledge of the VJB, by working in partnership with Audit Scotland and the incoming auditors.

### **Added value**

Our aim is to add value to the VJB through our external 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 VJB 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 28 of this plan.

**Pat Kenny**  
**Audit Director**

# Responsibilities of the Board

## Helping you fulfil your responsibilities

Why do we interact with the Board?

To communicate audit scope

To provide timely and relevant observations

To provide additional information to help you fulfil your broader responsibilities

We use this symbol to highlight areas of our audit where the Board needs to focus attention.



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

- At the start of each annual audit cycle, ensure that the scope of the external audit is appropriate.

- Implement a policy on the engagement of the external auditor to supply non-audit services.

Oversight of external audit

Integrity of reporting

Internal controls and risks

Oversight of internal audit

Whistle-blowing and fraud

- Review the internal control and risk management systems (unless expressly addressed by separate risk committee).

- Explain what actions have been, or are being taken to remedy any significant failings or weaknesses.

- Ensure that appropriate arrangements are in place for the proportionate and independent investigation of any concerns raised by staff in connection with improprieties.

- Impact assessment of key judgements and level of management challenge.

- Review of external audit findings, key judgements, level of misstatements.

- Assess the quality of the internal team, their incentives and the need for supplementary skillsets.

- Assess the completeness of disclosures, including consistency with disclosures on business model and strategy and, where requested by the Board, provide advice in respect of the fair, balanced and understandable statement.

- Consider annually whether the scope of the internal audit programme is adequate.

- Monitor and review the effectiveness of the internal audit activities.

# Your control environment

## What we consider when we plan the audit

We expect management and those charged with governance to recognise the importance of a strong control environment and take proactive steps to deal with deficiencies identified on a timely basis.

### Responsibilities of management

Auditing standards require us to only accept or continue with an audit engagement when the preconditions for an audit are present. These preconditions include obtaining the agreement of management and those charged with governance that they acknowledge and understand their responsibilities for, amongst other things, internal control as is necessary to enable the preparation of the Annual Report and Accounts that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

### Responsibilities of the Board

As explained further in the Responsibilities of the Board slide on the previous page, the Board is responsible for:

- Reviewing the internal control and risk management systems (unless expressly addressed by a separate risk committee).
- Explaining what actions have been, or are being taken to remedy any significant failings or weaknesses.

As stakeholders tell us that they wish to understand how external audit challenges and responds to the quality of an entity's control environment, we are seeking to enhance how we plan and report on the results of the audit in response. We will be placing increased focus on how the control environment impacts the audit, from our initial risk assessment, to our testing approach and how we report on misstatements and control deficiencies.

---

#### Reliance on controls



We will seek to undertake design and implementation testing on controls in respect of our identified significant risk areas. In accordance with forthcoming revisions to ISAs, we will assess inherent risk and control risk associated with accounting estimates.

---

#### Performance materiality




We set performance materiality as a percentage of materiality to reduce the probability that, in aggregate, uncorrected and undetected misstatements exceed materiality. We determine performance materiality, with reference to factors such as the quality of the control environment and the historical error rate. Where we are unable to rely on controls, we may use a lower level of performance materiality.

---

# Our audit explained


We tailor our audit to your business and your strategy



# Continuous communication and reporting

## Planned timing of the audit

As the audit plan is executed throughout the year, the results will be analysed continuously and conclusions (preliminary and otherwise) will be drawn. The following sets out the expected timing of our reporting to and communication with you.



# Materiality

## Our approach to materiality

### Basis of our materiality benchmark


- The Audit Director has determined materiality as £33,000 (2020/21: £28,000) and performance materiality as £21,000 (2020/21: £19,000), based on professional judgement, the requirements of auditing standards and the financial measures most relevant to users of the Annual Report and Accounts.
- We have used 3.5% (2020/21: 3.5%) of budgeted gross expenditure as the benchmark for determining materiality and applied 65% (2020/21: 68%) as performance materiality. We have judged expenditure to be the most relevant measure for the users of the accounts, and applied a lower performance materiality given the changes in the finance function during the year.
- **Reporting to those charged with governance**
- We will report to you all misstatements found in excess of £1,600 (2020/21: £1,400).
- 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 the Board must not exceed £250,000.

### Our Annual Audit Report

We will:

- Report the materiality benchmark applied in the audit of the VJB;
- Provide comparative data and explain any changes in materiality compared to prior year;
- Explain any normalised or adjusted benchmarks we use; and
- Explain the concept of performance materiality and state what percentage of materiality we used, with our rationale.

### Materiality



Although materiality is the judgement of the Audit Director, the Board 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	Proposed reporting timeline to the Board	Audit Scotland/ statutory deadline
1. Auditing the annual accounts	Annual Audit Plan	3 March 2022	31 March 2022
	Independent auditor's report	September 2022	31 October 2022
2. Audit dimensions	Annual Audit Plan	3 March 2022	31 March 2022
	Annual Audit Report	September 2022	31 October 2022
43 Other wider scope audit work	Fraud Returns	N/A	30 November 2021 * 28 February 2022 31 May 2022 31 August 2022
	Current issues returns	N/A	21 January 2022 * 22 April 2022 22 July 2022 21 October 2022

---

\* Returns have been submitted in accordance with the Audit Scotland / statutory deadlines.

# Significant risks

## Significant risk dashboard

Risk	Fraud risk	Planned approach to controls	Level of management judgement	Page no
Management override of controls				12
Occurrence of Income				13

### Level of management judgement



High degree of management judgement



Some degree of management judgement



Limited management judgement

### Controls approach adopted



Assess design & implementation

# Significant risks

## Management override of controls



### Risk identified

Management is in a unique position to perpetrate fraud because of their ability to manipulate accounting records and prepare fraudulent Annual Report and Accounts by overriding controls that otherwise appear to be operating effectively.

Although management is responsible for safeguarding the assets of the entity, we planned our audit so that we had a reasonable expectation of detecting material misstatements to the Annual Report and Accounts and accounting records.



### Deloitte response and challenge

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

**Test the appropriateness of journal entries** recorded in the general ledger and other adjustments made in the preparation of the Annual Report and Accounts. In designing and performing audit procedures for such tests, we plan to:

- Test the design and implementation of controls over journal entry processing;
- Make inquiries of individuals involved in the financial reporting process about inappropriate or unusual activity relating to the processing of journal entries and other adjustments;
- Select journal entries and other adjustments made at the end of a reporting period; and
- Consider the need to test journal entries and other adjustments throughout the period.

**Review accounting estimates for biases** and evaluate whether the circumstances producing the bias, if any, represent a risk of material misstatement due to fraud. In performing this

review, we plan to:

- Evaluate whether the judgments and decisions made by management in making the accounting estimates included in the Annual Report and Accounts, even if they are individually reasonable, indicate a possible bias on the part of the entity's management that may represent a risk of material misstatement due to fraud. If so, we will re-evaluate the accounting estimates taken as a whole; and
- Perform a retrospective review of management judgements and assumptions related to significant accounting estimates reflected in the Annual Report and Accounts of the prior year.

**For significant transactions that are outside the normal course of business** for the entity, or that otherwise appear to be unusual given our understanding of the entity and its environment and other information obtained during the audit, we shall evaluate whether the business rationale (or the lack thereof) of the transactions suggests that they may have been entered into to engage in fraudulent financial reporting or to conceal misappropriation of assets.

# Significant risks (continued)

## Occurrence 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 VJB are requisitions from Orkney Islands Council and Shetland Islands Council. The significant risk is pinpointed to the recognition of this income, being occurrence of income received from the Councils given the reliance of the Board on this income and the potential that funding partners may not provide additional income to cover overspends.



---

**Deloitte  
response and  
challenge**

We will perform the following:

- Assess the final year-end position to establish whether an underspend or overspend has been achieved;
  - 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 Board at 31 March 2022 to confirm all income is correctly recorded in the ledger;
  - confirm that the reconciliations performed during 2021/22 have been reviewed on a regular basis; and
  - assess the design and implementation of the controls around recognition of income.
-

# Other areas of focus

## Transition to OIC finance team



### **Risk identified and key judgements**

During 2021/22, the responsibility for the finance function of the Board transitioned from SIC to OIC. There is a risk that the data transfer is incomplete or that it has been transferred in a way that does not enable accurate recording of transactions throughout the year.

The risk has been pinpointed to the completeness and accuracy of the data transfer. Given the significance to the financial reporting, this will be an area of audit focus.



### **Deloitte response and challenge**

We will perform the following procedures to address the risk:

- Engage with the auditors of OIC to gain assurance over common systems;
- Gain an understanding of the data transfer process and the control in place relating to the data transfer;
- Review the reconciliation from the 2020/21 closing trial balance from the SIC ledger to the opening 2021/22 opening trial balance on the OIC ledger; and
- Assess the completeness of transactions through our journal entry testing reconciliations.

# Other areas of focus (continued)

## Pension liability



### Risk identified and key judgements

The VJB participates in the Shetland Islands Council Pension Fund, administered by Shetland Islands Council.

The net pension liability increased from £1.925m in 2019/20 to £2.435m in 2020/21. The increase was a combination of an increase in the fair value of the assets and an increase in the liabilities as a result of demographic changes and financial assumptions. The liability also continues to be affected by the McCloud and Goodwin legal cases.

Hymans Robertson LLP are the VJB's appointed actuary, who produce a detailed report outlining the estimated liability at the year-end along with the associated disclosure requirements.

The pension liability valuation is an area of audit focus due to the material value and significant assumptions used in the calculation of the liability. The valuations are prepared by a reputable actuary using standard methodologies which have been considered as appropriate in previous years and no significant changes in the membership of the scheme or accrued benefits are expected in the current year. As a result, we have not identified this as a significant risk.



### Deloitte response and challenge

We will perform the following procedures to address the risk:

- Assess the independence and expertise of the actuary supporting the basis of reliance upon their work;
- review and challenge the assumptions made by Hymans Robertson;
- Obtain assurance from the auditor of the pension fund over the controls for providing accurate data to the actuary;
- Assess the reasonableness of the VJB's share of the total assets of the scheme with the Pension Fund annual accounts;
- Review and challenge the calculation of the impact of the McCloud and Goodwin cases on pension liabilities; and
- Review the disclosures within the accounts against the Code.

# Coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak

## Impact on our audit

---

The COVID-19 pandemic had a significant impact on the 2019/20 and 2020/21 audit process.

### Requirements

A key element of the reporting requirements for the Board, which will continue for 2021/22, is communicating risks and governance impacts in narrative reporting, consistent with the Financial Reporting Council's guidance to organisations on the importance of communicating the impact of COVID-19 and related uncertainties, including their impact on resilience and going concern assessments.

Entity-specific explanations of the current and expected effects of COVID-19 and the Board's plans to mitigate those effects should be included in the narrative reporting (including where relevant the Annual Governance Statement), including in the discussion on Principal Risks and Uncertainties impacting an organisation.

---

### Actions

We would expect organisations as part of their reporting to conduct a thorough assessment of the current and potential future effects of the COVID-19 pandemic including:

- Consideration of the impact across the Board's operations, including on its income streams, supply chains and cost base, and the consequent impacts on financial position;
  - The scenarios assumed in making forecasts and on the sensitivities arising should other potential scenarios materialise (including different funding scenarios); and
  - The effect of events after the reporting date, including the nature of non-adjusting events and an estimate of their financial effect, where possible.
-

# Coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak (continued)

## Impact on our audit (continued)

Impact on the VJB and management actions	Impact on Annual Report and Accounts	Impact on our audit
<p>We will consider the key impacts on the VJB such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interruptions to service provision</li><li>• Supply chain disruptions</li><li>• Unavailability of personnel</li><li>• Reductions in income</li></ul>	<p>We will consider the impact of the outbreak on the Annual Report and Accounts, discussed further on the next slide including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Narrative reporting, including disclosures on financial sustainability</li><li>• Principal risk disclosures</li><li>• Events after the reporting period and relevant disclosure</li></ul>	<p>We will continue to assess the impact on the audit including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Resource planning</li><li>• Timetable of the audit</li><li>• Impact on our risk assessment</li><li>• Logistics including meetings with entity personnel</li></ul>

### Impact on Annual Report and Accounts

<b>Narrative and other reporting issues</b>	<p>The following areas will need to be considered by the VJB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Narrative reporting as well as the usual reporting requirements will need to cover the effects of the pandemic on services, operations, performance, strategic direction, resources and financial sustainability.</li><li>• Reporting judgements and estimation uncertainty, the VJB will need to report the impact on material transactions including decisions made on the measurements of assets and liabilities.</li></ul>
<b>Going concern assessment</b>	<p>The Annual Report and Accounts should include disclosure on the basis of the Board's going concern assessment, including related uncertainties.</p> <p>The VJB also needs to report on the impact of financial pressures and its financial sustainability in the narrative report, as well as any relevant liquidity reporting requirements under IFRS 7 Financial Instruments: Disclosures.</p>
<b>Events after the reporting period and relevant disclosures</b>	<p>Events are likely to continue to move swiftly, and the VJB will need to consider the events after the reporting period and whether these events will be adjusting or non-adjusting and make decisions on a transaction by transaction basis.</p>

# Reporting hot topics

## Increased focus on quality reporting



### Deloitte view

The expectations of corporate reporting, reflected in the Financial Reporting Council's ('the FRC') monitoring and enforcement priorities, are increasing. While the focus is primarily on corporate entities, we highlight these areas where improved disclosures would help meet stakeholder expectations.



### The ongoing uncertainty about the UK's future relationship with the EU

The UK-EU Trade and Cooperation Agreement (the 'Deal') agreed on 24 December 2020 has brought certainty and clarification about many (but importantly not all) of the changes arising from the UK's departure from the EU. VJBs should update their assessments of the impact of Brexit on their operations and business model, and on the Annual Report and Accounts (both the recognition and measurement of assets and liabilities and the related disclosures).

Clear disclosure should be provided of the key assumptions used in cash flow forecasts and the significant judgements and estimates made in recognising and measuring the amounts in the Annual Report and Accounts.

**ACTION:** Depending upon events through to the date of signing, we would expect to see Annual Report and Accounts reflecting at least:

- relevant risks and uncertainties, and actions taken to manage those risks; and
- consideration of whether there is any impact on critical accounting judgements and areas of estimation uncertainty.

We will discuss with the VJB closer to the time areas where disclosures may be appropriate.

# Reporting hot topics (continued)

## Increased focus on quality reporting



### Climate-related risks

The PRI and other investors groups have published an open letter confirming their view that climate-related risks are material factors that should be reflected appropriately in Annual Report and Accounts statements. The IIGCC has also published a report reiterating their expectations for the Paris Agreement to be considered in drawing up accounts.

Investors are challenging companies that are not factoring the effects of the Paris Climate Agreement into their critical accounting judgements and are not disclosing comprehensively these judgements, assumptions, sensitivities and uncertainties.

In November 2020, the FRC published its review of climate-related considerations which includes the FRC's expectations of companies, financial statements and auditors. The FRC highlights that "the implications of climate change will affect a wide range of companies. In developing a company's strategic direction, boards "should be taking into account all the possible effects of climate change" and that "corporate reporting should address the company's impact on the environment, the resilience of its business model and the impact of climate change on its financial statements." The [FRC's year-end letter to CEOs, CFOs and Audit Committee Chairs](#) highlights that "users expect companies to provide full information about the future impact of climate change on the business and how the company's activities affect the environment" and that financial statements should explain the impact of climate-related risks, policies and strategies on measurement and disclosure.

The path to mandatory TCFD reporting is also clear:

- TCFD disclosures are required under a new listing rule for all premium listed companies, initially, on a comply or explain basis **from 1 January 2021**;
- The UK Government has published a consultation on requiring mandatory climate-related disclosures for publicly quoted companies, large private companies and LLPs in line with the four pillars of TCFD and its roadmap towards mandatory climate-related disclosures across the economy by 2025; and
- The European Commission (EC) has published proposals for a Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) that would make sustainability reporting mandatory for all EU listed and large companies. The EU has stated that its approach to standard-setting should take account of existing standards and frameworks, including TCFD. TCFD is already included in voluntary guidance on the Non-Financial Reporting Directive.

**ACTION:** Climate change is a strategic issue and should be on the Board agenda. We therefore expect the narrative within the Annual Report and Accounts to include the following:

- An explanation of how climate change is assessed as a strategic issue
- Clarity of whether climate change represents a principal or emerging risk and how it is being managed
- If climate-related targets or metrics are disclosed, an explanation of how those targets or metrics fit into strategic targets/ approach.
- An assessment of the readiness to make disclosures in line with the four areas recommended by the TCFD.

# Audit quality

## 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 by using our expertise in the local government 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 VJB.

Our engagement team is selected to ensure that we have the right subject matter expertise and industry knowledge. We will involve pensions specialists to support the audit team in our work undertaken in relation to the VJB's pension scheme.

In order to deliver a quality audit to you, each member of the core audit team has received tailored learning to develop their expertise in audit skills, delivered by Pat Kenny (Audit Director) 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.

# Wider scope requirements

## Overview

The Code of Audit Practice sets out four **audit dimensions** that frame the wider scope of the audit of the accounts. The audit dimensions provide a common framework for all the audit work conducted for the Auditor General and for the Accounts Commission.



As a result of a number of significant issues identified in our 2020/21, the Controller of Audit plans to report to the Accounts Commission in March 2022 under section 102(1) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973. This report draws the Commission's attention to the issues relating to governance and decision-making that were identified in our 2020/21 audit. In view of these issues, we have concluded that it remains appropriate to apply expanded wider scope requirements to specifically follow-up on the recommendations made in 2020/21. The following pages summarise the significant risks identified and our planned audit response.

In addition to the above, we have a duty, under the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 to consider the arrangements to secure Best Value (BV). Our work summarised above and on the following pages will contribute to this consideration.

# Wider scope requirements (continued)

## Audit dimensions (continued)

---

Audit dimension	Significant risks identified	Planned audit response
Financial sustainability	<p>In our 2020/21 annual audit report, we highlighted that the absence of medium-term financial planning and the risk to the delivery of the VJBs functions posed by vacancies at a senior level raised concerns as to the financial sustainability of the Board and its ability to continue to effectively provide its services over the medium term. This therefore remains an areas of significant risk.</p>	<p>We will assess the development of the 2022/23 budget and the Medium Term Financial Plan. We will also review the workforce plan, approved in September 2021.</p>
Governance and transparency	<p>In our 2020/21 annual audit report we identified a number of significant issues relating to governance and decision-making. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A number of actions taken by members of the VJB leadership team were ultra vires and unlawful, including incurring unlawful expenditure;</li><li>• A lack of oversight of the process for changing payments to the Depute Assessor, breakdown of controls and a lack of scrutiny or challenge by other members of the leadership team or the Board; and</li><li>• Significant deficiencies in the VJBs understanding of and adherence to the requirements of legislation, regulations and good governance principles across a number of areas.</li></ul>	<p>We will assess the progress made by the Board on each of the recommendations made in our 2020/21 audit report.</p>

As a result of our findings, the Controller of Audit plans to report these matters to the Accounts Commission in March 2022.

---

# 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 Annual Report and Accounts 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

## Use of this report

This report has been prepared for the Board, 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.

## 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 Board.

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 Annual Report and Accounts 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.



**Pat Kenny**

**for and on behalf of Deloitte LLP**

Glasgow | 25 February 2022

# Technical update and sector developments



# Changes to accounting standards

## IFRS 16 - Leases

### Background

IFRS 16 comes into effect on 1 April 2022. HM Treasury have decided that IFRS 16 will be adopted without retrospective restatement: this means that when it is implemented in 2022/23, VJBs will recognise the cumulative impact of applying the standard as at 1 April 2022, with all adjustments to opening balances at that date taken through the General Fund.

IFRS 16 introduces a single lessee accounting model that results in more faithful representation of a lessee's assets and liabilities, and improves comparability between leased and purchased assets operated by VJBs. The standard also introduces enhanced disclosures which are intended to improve transparency of financial reporting; full disclosure will be required in 2022/23 financial statements and beyond.

IAS 8 requires entities to disclose an assessment in their 2021/22 accounts of the possible impact of implementing IFRS 16. All VJBs should be in a position to estimate this impact before 1 April 2022 and make these disclosures unless immaterial.

### Next steps

We recommend that management update the Board on the progress made with the implementation of the new standard, and we will report specifically on the findings from our audit work in this area. We are aware that CIPFA are currently consulting on proposals for updating the 2021/22 Code, which includes deferring the implementation of IFRS 16 for a further year. We will discuss the impact for the Boards with management once the outcome of the consultation is concluded and final decisions made.

### Practical Challenges

There are a number of practical challenges that VJBs need to consider in preparing for implementation of the new standard, including:

- **Additional cost of asset ownership** – IFRS 16 will increase the amount of fixed assets an organisation will need to maintain information regarding to inform valuation assessments for instance (revaluation or impairment)
- **Completeness of data** – Obtaining and assessing all of the relevant data. Completeness of the lease registers/ Assets records will require greater level of detail.
- **Estimates and judgements** – Separating lease and non-lease components, consideration of extension and termination options
- **Judgements around existing arrangements** – Lack of documentation in around the lease agreement in some cases will require judgements as to what extent arrangements represent and what accounting treatment is appropriate.
- **Lease Management** – after the initial implementation Boards will have to continue maintaining control of the lease arrangements. Regular reassessment reviews etc.

There are many colleagues within VJBs and externally who can assist with challenges and issues you come across when implementing the new Standard – Finance, Estates teams, contract owners, HM Treasury, Other Boards/ IJB/ Local Authorities, National Bodies and Auditors.

# Climate change

## Consideration of the impact on the audit annual report and accounts

---

### Role of Audit

In June 2021, the Auditor General for Scotland published a blog “making climate change an audit priority” that sets out the challenges for the public sector in tackling climate change and the role audit could play in this.

In July, Audit Scotland held a roundtable to help inform its approach to auditing climate change. The roundtable was made up of the climate change leads for the Accounts Commission and key stakeholders from across Scotland. They posed some challenging questions around the opportunities and challenges of tackling climate change and what it meant for the public sector. Several **key themes and challenges** emerges which were published in an update in October 2021 [Auditing climate change: An update \(audit-scotland.gov.uk\)](https://www.audit-scotland.gov.uk/auditing-climate-change-an-update):

- Climate ambition v plans and actions.
- Importance of adaption.
- Paying for it.
- Critical role of the public.
- Joined up working.
- Public sector leadership role.

The time is right for independent audit and scrutiny to help achieve Scotland’s climate change ambitions.

---

### Annual Report and Accounts considerations

As part of our planning discussions with management, we have shared an illustrative framework. The potential impacts of climate change are extensive and pervasive, therefore we recommend the framework is adopted and continually reviewed. Specific areas to start considering in advance of drafting the Annual Report and Accounts include key risks, mitigating actions (for **narrative disclosure**) and impact on **judgements and estimates** made by management:

**Acute physical risks**, e.g. extreme weather events causing supply change disruption or severe damage to PPE.

**Chronic physical risks**, e.g. rising sea levels causing damage to PPE; or increased temperatures resulting in higher heat stress to employees.

**Policy and Legal transition risks**, e.g. direct and indirect tax compliance as tax legislation develops.

**Technology transition risks**, e.g. development and use of emerging technologies such as renewable energy and battery storage.

**Market transition risks**, e.g. changing consumer trends resulting in services becoming obsolete.

**Reputation transition risks**, e.g. damage to reputation through failure to transition effectively to a lower-carbon economy.

**Financing risks**.

# The State of the State 2021-22

## Towards a new public sector normal

---

### Background and overview

---

Now in its ninth year, this report brings together Deloitte and think tank Reform to provide an annual snapshot of the UK's public sector.

This year's report features an exclusive Ipsos MORI survey of more than 5,000 members of the UK public – including almost 900 Scottish adults – plus analysis of interviews with more than 50 senior figures across the UK's public sector. This blend of quantitative and qualitative research offers a unique perspective on government and public services.

#### **What will I learn from this year's State of the State?**

Since March 2020, the UK's governments and public services have led radical, exhaustive, and dynamic responses to the coronavirus pandemic. This year's State of the State finds them dealing with both the pandemic and its wider repercussions as a 'new normal' emerges.

Looking beyond the pandemic, the UK Government has set out its ambition to 'build back better' through infrastructure investment, levelling up economic outcomes across the regions and revitalising the UK's place in the world. At the same time, the policies and politics of Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales continue to diverge from Westminster and Whitehall as well as each other. The State of the State explores all of these developments.

---

### Next steps

---

A summary of some of the key Scottish findings are provided on the next page. The full report is available at [The State of the State 2021/22 \(deloitte.com\)](https://www.deloitte.com/uk/en/issues/public-sector/state-of-the-state-2021-22.html)



# The State of the State 2021-22 (continued)

## Towards a new public sector normal (continued)

---

### Public spending

This year has seen a shift in attitudes to public spending amongst Scottish people. Historically, the keenest in the UK on a higher tax and higher spend environment, views in Scotland are now broadly the same as those in the rest of the UK; possibly driven by the cost of the pandemic on the public purse and worries over household incomes.

**29%** of the public want to see higher levels of spending after the pandemic.

**30%** want to see the same balance of tax and spending as before the pandemic began

**27%** would like to see tax cuts and spending cuts to match.



---

### Social mobility

**40%** of Scots believe skills and employability are the most important factors when trying to get ahead in life. However, Scots feel more strongly than the UK average that wealth and region are also important indicators on getting ahead in society.



---

### Spending priorities

The Scottish public's views were in line with the rest of the UK with public health and social care the most frequently named priorities.

Support for the growth in green industries and technologies is also high in Scotland, sitting behind housing but on a par with primary and secondary schools and reducing inequality between UK regions.

# Appendices



# Our other responsibilities explained

## Fraud responsibilities



### **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 Annual Report and Accounts 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 risks of material misstatement due to fraud in relation to occurrence of income, and management override of controls.
- We will explain in our audit report how we considered the audit capable of detecting irregularities, including fraud. In doing so, we will describe the procedures we performed in understanding the legal and regulatory framework and assessing compliance with relevant laws and regulations.



### **Fraud Characteristics:**

- Misstatements in the Annual Report and Accounts 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 Annual Report and Accounts 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.

# Our other responsibilities explained (continued)

## Fraud responsibilities (continued)

We will make the following inquiries regarding fraud and non-compliance with laws and regulations:



### Management:

- Management's assessment of the risk that the Annual Report and Accounts may be materially misstated due to fraud, including the nature, extent and frequency of such assessments.
- Management's process for identifying and responding to risks of fraud.
- Management's communication, if any, to those charged with governance regarding its processes for identifying and responding to the risks of fraud.
- 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, in particular the Assessor.



### Internal audit

- Whether internal audit 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 VJB and will reconfirm our independence and objectivity to the Board for the year ending 31 March 2022 in our final report to the Audit Committee.

---

## Fees

The audit fee for 2021/22, in line with the fee range provided by Audit Scotland is £9,172, as analysed below:

	£
Auditor remuneration	8,112
Audit Scotland fixed charges:	
Pooled costs	700
Contribution to AS costs	360
<b>Total proposed fee</b>	<b>9,172</b>



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 company'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 VJB, 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

Executing high quality audits remains our number one priority. We are committed to our critical public interest role and continue to embed our culture of quality and excellence into all of our people. This includes using new technology and tools to continue to transform our audit approach.

In July 2021 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 2020/21 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.

In that context, overall FRC inspection results, showing an improvement since last year from 76% to 79% of all inspections assessed as good or needing limited improvement, reflect the progress we are making. The overall profile of our ICAEW inspections and our internal inspection programme also show a similar overall improvement since last year.

The results for the inspections of FTSE 350 entities fell short of our overall scores, reflecting specific findings on those particular audits rather than issues pervasive across other audits. Our objective continues to be for all of our audits to be assessed as good or needing limited improvement and we know we still have work to do in order to meet this standard.

We agree with and accept the FRC’s findings on the individual inspections. The FRC has recognised improvements following the actions and programmes for previous years and we welcome the good practice points raised, including in respect of impairment and revenue where individual findings continue to occur.

Overall, we are pleased that there have been no significant findings over our firm wide processes and controls over the last three inspection cycles in the areas subject to rotational review by the FRC. However, we are continually enhancing our processes and controls across our business and such changes will directly or indirectly affect audit quality.

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



# Our approach to quality (continued)

## AQR team report and findings (continued)

### The AQR's 2020/21 Audit Quality Inspection Report on Deloitte LLP

"We reviewed 19 individual audits this year and assessed 15 (79%) as requiring no more than limited improvements. Of the 11 FTSE 350 audits we reviewed this year, we assessed eight (73%) as achieving this standard".

"Our key findings related primarily to the need to:

- Improve the evaluation and challenge of management's key assumptions of impairment assessments of goodwill and other assets.
- Enhance the consistency of group audit teams' oversight of component audit teams.
- Strengthen the effectiveness and consistency of the testing of revenue."

"The firm has taken steps to address the key findings in our 2019/20 public report, with actions that included increasing the extent of consultations, and enhanced learning, coaching and support programmes.

We have identified improvements, for example, in the extent of challenge of management by audit teams in respect of the estimates used for model testing. This was identified as a key finding last year.

We also identified good practice in a number of areas of the audits we reviewed (including robust procedures relating to going concern and evidence to support the challenge of management in areas of key judgement) and in the firm-wide procedures (including establishing a centre of excellence focused on credit for banking audits to encourage the consistent application of the firm's methodology and guidance)."



# Our approach to quality (continued)

## Quality of public audit in Scotland – Annual Report 2020/21

Audit Scotland published its annual assessment of audit quality carried out on the audit work delivered by Audit Scotland and appointed firms. A copy of the full report is available: [Quality of public audit in Scotland annual report 2020/21 | Audit Scotland \(audit-scotland.gov.uk\)](https://www.audit-scotland.gov.uk/quality-of-public-audit-in-scotland-annual-report-2020-21)

The **public audit model in Scotland** is fundamentally different to the private sector audit regime and is well placed to meet the challenges arising from the reviews of the auditing profession.

The audit profession remains under scrutiny after high-profile corporate collapses in the private sector. The Brydon review, alongside the Kingman review, the Competition and Markets Authority market study of the audit services market and the Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee's report on the Future of Audit all placed a strong focus on the need for independence of auditors from the bodies they audit.

Public audit in Scotland is well placed to meet the challenges arising from the reviews of the auditing profession. It already operates many of the proposed features to reduce threats to auditor independence including:

- independent appointment of auditors by the Auditor General for Scotland and Accounts Commission
- rotation of auditors every five years (current appointments extended to six years due to Covid-19)
- independent fee-setting arrangements and limits on non-audit services
- a comprehensive Audit Quality Framework.

### Environment

The global pandemic has changed and challenged most aspects of our lives. Public bodies have been at the forefront of managing the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. Public bodies have focused on supporting those most affected. Many bodies had new obstacles to overcome as they prepared financial statements and responded to auditors.

The Scottish Government delayed the accounting and auditing deadlines for NHS and local government bodies to help accommodate these competing pressures. The Auditor General for Scotland and Accounts Commission revised their work programme and prepared COVID-19 specific briefing papers to support public bodies and auditors to respond to the pandemic.

The Auditor General for Scotland and Accounts Commission recognised that the safety and wellbeing of audit staff and staff in public bodies was paramount and that auditors would need to take a pragmatic and flexible approach to their work in 2020/21. They were clear that audit quality should not be compromised.

# Our approach to quality (continued)

## Quality of public audit in Scotland – Annual Report 2020/21 (continued)

### Key messages

1. The application of the Audit Quality Framework (AQF) continues to identify improvement areas and good practice in audit quality. Across the range of evidence used to assess audit quality the conclusion is that the quality of audit work is good in Performance audit and Best Value audit and accountancy firms, with improvement required and planned in Audit Scotland's Audit Services Group where the financial audit quality results do not meet the expected standards.
2. **Areas of Good Practice**
  - ICAS have reviewed compliance with International Standard on Quality Control 1 for all auditors and did not note any issues or matters for further consideration. [\(One Deloitte file reviewed in 2020/21\)](#)
  - All 2019/20 annual audit opinions were signed off by 9 March 2021. [\(All Deloitte opinions signed by 31 October 2020\)](#)
  - Two financial audits reviewed were awarded the highest scores available by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Scotland (ICAS) with no areas for improvement identified. [\(One Deloitte file reviewed – awarded score of 2A – limited improvement required\)](#)
  - All of the Performance audit and Best Value audits reviewed achieved expected quality standards with limited concerns identified. All audit providers have confirmed that there continued to be a strong culture of support for performing high-quality audit during the pandemic. [\(One Deloitte Best Value file reviewed – awarded score of 2A – limited improvement required\)](#)
  - Stakeholder feedback shows further improvement in the level of satisfaction with external audit services provided, the usefulness of the annual audit report and shows that audit work has had impact.
3. **Areas for improvement**
  - Seven of the eleven (64 per cent) 2019/20 Audit Services Group financial audits reviewed did not meet the expected standard. [\(Not applicable to Deloitte audits\)](#)
  - For two audits, auditors need to investigate the risk of material misstatement in the financial statements and ensure that any such misstatement is resolved appropriately. [\(Not applicable to Deloitte audits\)](#)
  - An area that continues to be an issue for most audit providers is on audit staff views of having sufficient time and resources to deliver high quality audit. [\(An area continually monitored in planning all audits\)](#)



This publication has been written in general terms and we recommend that you obtain professional advice before acting or refraining from action on any of the contents of this publication. Deloitte LLP accepts no liability for any loss occasioned to any person acting or refraining from action as a result of any material in this publication.

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](http://www.deloitte.com/about) to learn more about our global network of member firms.