

---

## EXTERNAL AUDITOR REPORT - UPDATES

### 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Recommendations from the Council's external auditors and other inspectors are monitored by Internal Audit for progress of implementation and their review falls within the discretion of this Committee.


### 2 FINAL REPORT TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE FOR YEAR 2015/16

- 2.1 This report draws Members' attention to the findings, recommendations and management responses arising from the Final Audit Report for the year ended 31 March 2016. The Final Audit Report was presented to this Committee by EY, the Council's external auditor, on 6 December 2016.
- 2.2 Outstanding recommendations, management responses and progress to date are appended.

### 3 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 It is proposed that the Committee **RESOLVES**

That the updates provided in the appended monitoring sheet in respect of external auditor recommendations be noted.



John Bostock

Assistant Director, Democratic Services

---

#### Background Papers:-

None.

For further information please contact Jim Kevany (Principal Auditor) on:

Phone: 01702 546366 Ext 3213

Email: james.kevany@rochford.gov.uk

If you would like this report in large print, Braille or another language please contact 01702 318111

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING FROM FINAL REPORT TO THE AUDIT COMMITTEE 2015/16

APPENDIX

CONCLUSIONS FROM WORK	RECOMMENDATIONS	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	TIMING
<p><b>1</b> The Council succeeded in bringing forward its timetable for the preparation of the narrative report, financial statements and annual governance statement to meet the timetable for publication this year. However, the Council made two errors in publishing the required information on the website by 30/6/2016.</p> <p>The statement of accounts did not include the cash and cash equivalents balance of £5.28 million on the face of the balance sheet as the PDF version had not picked up the relevant line from the final accounts template and the published accounts did not include the narrative statement</p>	<p>We did not consider any further formal reporting was required as the Council corrected the omissions by early July 2016. We judged this would give the public sufficient time to consider all documents fully.</p>	<p>Agreed. Rochford District Council will continue to strive to achieve the stricter timetable for closure and reporting by 2018/19 with a continual drive to reduce the time required, through a streamlined year-end process.</p> <p>The errors will not be repeated as a separate approval check by the Principal Finance Officer and then the Section 151 will now be completed.</p> <p>30 June 2016 was the first submission of a narrative statement and as such we under-estimated the length of time it would take to produce. Going forwards this will be timetabled much earlier in the closure process</p> <p><b>Update May 2017</b> A detailed timetable was produced in February 2017 to progress the</p>	<p>S151 Officer</p>	<p>Originally March 2017</p> <p>Revised to end May 2017</p>

CONCLUSIONS FROM WORK	RECOMMENDATIONS	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	TIMING
		final accounts with a target date for completion of the end of May 2017		
<p><b>2</b> Management completed its working papers to support the financial statements in the week of 18 July 2016. Management also created further working papers in response to our queries during the audit and had difficulty in fulfilling our request in respect of our analytic tools.</p>	<p>Best practice is for all working papers to be prepared at the time of sign off of the financial statements to 30 June each year. As the timetable moves to 31 May in 2017/18, management needs to bring forward its preparations to meet this date.</p>	<p>Agreed. This will form part of the streamlined year end process</p> <p><b>Update May 2017</b> In line with timetable detailed in Conclusion 1</p>	<p>S151 Officer</p>	<p>Originally March 2017</p> <p>Revised to end May 2017</p>
<p><b>3</b> Our initial review of the financial statements identified that there were no provisions disclosed in the Balance Sheet, which is unusual compared with other district council accounts.</p>	<p>Management has amended the financial statements to include a provision note within the Balance Sheet and at Note 18b</p>	<p>Agreed. Rochford District Council will continue this practice in future years</p> <p><b>Update May 2017</b> In line with timetable detailed in Conclusion 1</p>	<p>S151 Officer</p>	<p>Originally March 2017</p> <p>Revised to end May 2017</p>

CONCLUSIONS FROM WORK	RECOMMENDATIONS	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	TIMING
<p>4 Bridging the budget gap to ensure the Council’s future financial viability presents a significant challenge for the Council We have concluded that the Council is responding well to the financial challenges it is facing, but could improve arrangements for sensitivity and scenario analysis in its budget setting, its public reporting of performance and continuing to review all sources of income to increase reserves.</p>	<p>Improve Budget sensitivity &amp; scenario analysis</p> <p>Improve public Reporting of Performance</p> <p>Continue to review all sources of income</p>	<p>Agree, the budget has several scenarios and sensitivity analyses, but these are not always passed on to Members. This will form part of the budget away days in future budget rounds  <b>Update May 2017</b>                      These scenarios were discussed during January Budget Away-day</p> <p>Agree, the Performance reporting of the Council has been integrated with Finance and the Transformation programme, further consideration needs to be made what of this can be made public  <b>Update May 2017</b>                      Included in Quarterly Financial Reports</p> <p>Agree, new process in place to review with Assistant Directors all income streams on a regular basis  <b>Update May 2017</b>                      In Place</p>	<p>S151 Officer</p>	<p>March 2017                      Completed</p>

CONCLUSIONS FROM WORK	RECOMMENDATIONS	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	TIMING
<p><b>5</b> The Council has not complied with Section 5 of the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 by not undertaking an effective internal audit to evaluate the effectiveness of its risk management and governance processes. Internal Audit has not complied with the UK Public Sector Internal Audit Standards in a number of significant areas during 2015/16. The Council did not appoint a Chief Audit Executive with the qualifications or experience required by the Standards from September 2015 to 31 March 2016 and did not put in place alternative arrangements to deliver the same impact as indicated within CIPFA Statement on the Role of the Head of Internal Audit.</p>	<p>We note that the Council has reported publicly the weaknesses described and is addressing in the 2016/17 financial year. The Council is in the process of appointing a new Chief Audit Executive (CAE) and is intending to develop an internal audit programme to ensure that sufficient work will be carried out to enable an overall opinion to be given in 2016/17 on the Councils systems of governance, risk management and internal control</p>	<p>Agree. Rochford District Council has recognised this issue, which is now being addressed by the new Chief Audit Executive agreement with Essex County Council, the updated Audit plan and the large changes in the Internal Audit approach</p> <p><b>Update May 2017</b> The CAE role was filled for 2016/17 and CAE arrangements are in place on an on-going basis.</p> <p>An Internal audit programme was put in place to enable an Internal Audit Opinion to be given for 2016/17</p>	<p>Assistant Director, Democratic Services</p>	<p>March 2017  Completed</p>
<p><b>6</b> The Historical Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) is not detailed</p>	<p>To review the historic balances here and update for 2016/17 year end</p>	<p>The RDC finance team have this in progress and will have something in place for March 2017.</p> <p>Note, the MRP is basically an</p>	<p>S151 Officer</p>	<p>March 2017  Revised to end May 2017</p>

CONCLUSIONS FROM WORK	RECOMMENDATIONS	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	TIMING
		<p>annual amount of spend which has to be recognised if the Council has borrowed any money. As RDC has no borrowings, then we should have no MRP. EY agree with this, but would like us to confirm the calculation for the last few years. Its good house keeping and I am more than happy to oblige.</p> <p><b>Update May 2017</b> In line with timetable detailed in Conclusion 1</p>		
<p><b>7</b> The classification of provisions and contingent liabilities is not detailed</p>	<p>To review our notes and disclosures in this section of the accounts.</p>	<p>The RDC finance team are happy to do this and it will be ready for the year end accounts process which kicks off in March/April.</p> <p><b>Update May 2017</b> In line with timetable detailed in Conclusion 1</p>	<p>S151 Officer</p>	<p>March 2017  Revised to end May 2017</p>