

North Hertfordshire District Council

Report to the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee

DRAFT

Indicative External Audit Plan & Strategy for the
year ended 31 March 2025

28 May 2025

Introduction

To the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee of North Hertfordshire District Council

We are pleased to have the opportunity to meet with you on 11 June 2025 to discuss our audit of the financial statements of North Hertfordshire District Council for the year ended 31 March 2025.

This report provides the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee with an opportunity to review our planned audit approach and scope for the 2024/25 audit. The audit is governed by the provisions of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 and in compliance with the NAO's 2024/25 Code of Audit Practice, auditing standards and other professional requirements.

This report outlines our risk assessment and planned audit approach. Our planning activities are still ongoing and we will communicate any significant changes to the planned audit approach.

We provide this report to you in advance of the meeting to allow you sufficient time to consider the key matters and formulate your questions.

Contents	Page
Impact of backstop on our audit	3
Overview of planned scope including materiality	4
Significant risks and Other audit risks	6
Audit Risks and our audit approach	7
Mandatory communications	14
Value for Money Risk assessment – Our approach	16
Appendices	19

The engagement team

Salma Younis (ACA) is the engagement director on the audit. She has over 20 years of industry experience.

Salma Younis shall lead the engagement and is responsible for the audit opinion.

Other key members of the engagement team include Henry Lau, Manager, and Marshal Ngwarai, Assistant Manager, with 6 years and 8 years of experience respectively.

Yours sincerely,

Salma Younis,
Director - KPMG LLP

28 May 2025

How we deliver audit quality

Audit quality is at the core of everything we do at KPMG and we believe that it is not just about reaching the right opinion, but how we reach that opinion. We consider risks to the quality of our audit in our engagement risk assessment and planning discussions.

We define 'audit quality' as being the outcome when audits are:

- Executed consistently, in line with the requirements and intent of applicable professional standards within a strong system of quality controls and
- All of our related activities are undertaken in an environment of the utmost level of objectivity, independence, ethics and integrity.

We depend on well planned timing of our audit work to avoid compromising the quality of the audit. This is also heavily dependent on receiving information from management and those charged with governance in a timely manner.

We aim to complete all audit work no later than 2 days before audit signing. As you are aware, we will not issue our audit opinion until we have completed all relevant procedures, including audit documentation.

We are committed to providing you with a high-quality service. If you have any concerns or are dissatisfied with any part of KPMG's work, in the first instance you should contact Salma Younis (salma.younis@kpmg.co.uk), the engagement lead to the Authority, who will try to resolve your complaint. If you are dissatisfied with the response, please contact the national lead partner for all of KPMG's work under our contract with Public Sector Audit Appointments Limited, Tim Cutler (tim.culter@kpmg.co.uk). After this, if you are still dissatisfied with how your complaint has been handled you can raise your complaint as per the following process [Complaints](#).

Impact of backstop on our audit

Ongoing measures to resolve the backlog

As previously reported the Government has introduced measures to resolve the legacy local government financial reporting and audit backlog.

Last year amendments were made to the Accounts and Audit Regulations and NAO's Code of Audit Practice which allowed auditors to give disclaimed opinions over any open, incomplete audits up to the period ending 31 March 2023. These were required to be delivered by 13th December 2024. For the Council this had the impact of our disclaimed audit opinion for 2022/23 financial year (as issued by the previous auditors). We issued a disclaimed audit opinion for 2023/24 on 20th February 2025 to comply with the backstop date relevant to our audit.

Impact on our audit of the financial statements

As explained in previous reporting to the audit committee the level of rebuilding assurance related to the years prior to our appointment was limited in 2023/24. This was because we concluded there was insufficient time before the February 2025 backstop to complete our audit to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence, and, in our view, this was pervasive to the prior year financial statements as a whole.

The impact of the above means that for the financial year 2024/25 elements of the opening balances and 2023/24 comparatives are still impacted by previous disclaimers and as such our audit opinion is likely to be modified in relation to this matter.

Work is ongoing in the sector to develop guidance to help support appropriate audit procedures for audits where further work on is required to build back assurance.

Value for Money

The amendments to the Accounts and Audit Regulations do not impact on our responsibilities in relation to the Authority's Value for Money arrangements. We are responsible for forming a view on the arrangements that the Authority has in place to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources and as such our work will proceed as normal.

Overview of planned scope including materiality

Our materiality levels

We determined materiality for the Council financial statements at a level which could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements. We used a benchmark of expenditure which we consider to be appropriate given the sector in which the entity operates, its ownership and financing structure, and the focus of users. We considered qualitative factors such as stability of legislation, lack of shareholders and limited debt arrangements when determining materiality for the financial statements as a whole.

To respond to aggregation risk from individually immaterial misstatements, we design our procedures to detect misstatements at a lower level of materiality (£1.1m / 65% of materiality) driven by our expectations of increased level of undetected or uncorrected misstatements in the period.

We will report misstatements to the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee including:

- Corrected and uncorrected audit misstatements above £85k.
- Errors and omissions in disclosure (Corrected and uncorrected) and the effect that they, individually in aggregate, may have on our opinion.
- Other misstatements we include due to the nature of the item.

Materiality

Materiality for the financial statements as a whole

£1.7m

2.5% of total expenditure
(2023/24: £1.85m
3% of total expenditure)

Performance Materiality

£1.1m

65% of materiality
(2023/24: £1.2m)

Misstatements reported to the audit committee

£85k

(2023/24: £92.5k)

Materiality

£1.7m

2.5% of Council's total 23/24 expenditure £68.3m

Overview of planned scope including materiality (cont.)

Timing of our audit and communications

- We will maintain communication led by the engagement partner and manager throughout the audit. We set out below the form, timing and general content of our planned communications:
- Kick-off meeting with management in April 2025 where we discussed management's progress in key areas;
- Finance, Audit and Risk Committee meeting on 11 June 2025* where we present our final audit plan;
- Status meetings with management throughout the audit where we communicate progress on the audit plan, any misstatements, control deficiencies and significant issues;
- Closing meeting with management in December 2025* where we discuss the auditor's report and any outstanding deliverables;
- Finance, Audit and Risk Committee meeting in February 2026* where we communicate audit misstatements and significant control deficiencies; and
- Biannual private meetings can also be arranged with the Committee Chair if there is interest.

Using the work of others and areas requiring specialised skill

We outline below where, in our planned audit response to audit risks, we expect to use the work of others such as Internal Audit or require specialised skill/knowledge to perform planned audit procedures and evaluate results.

Others	Extent of planned involvement or use of work
Internal Audit	We will review the reporting prepared by Internal Audit, however we do not plan to place any reliance on their work.
KPMG Pensions Centre of Excellence (PCoE) and KPMG Actuaries	We involve KPMG Pensions Centre of Excellence and KPMG Actuaries to assist the audit team in assessing the valuation of the Local Government Pension Scheme's gross liability. They will undertake all relevant procedures as outlined on page 9 and liaise directly with management.
KPMG IT Audit Team	We will involve KPMG specialist IT Auditors to undertake walkthroughs and document relevant processes and controls with regard to the Council's General ledger migration, IT environment and any automated controls which could impact on the financial statements audit.

* Dates for issuing deliverables are preliminary and based on information available at planning. They are therefore subject to change.

Significant risks, Higher assessed risks and Other audit risks

Our risk assessment draws upon our understanding of the applicable financial reporting framework, knowledge of the business, the sector and the wider economic environment in which North Hertfordshire District Council operates.

We also use our regular meetings with senior management to update our understanding and take input from sector and internal audit reports.

Due to the current levels of uncertainty there is an increased likelihood of significant risks emerging throughout the audit cycle that are not identified (or in existence) at the time we planned our audit. Where such items are identified we will amend our audit approach accordingly and communicate this to the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee.

Value for money

We are required to provide commentary on the arrangements in place for ensuring Value for Money is achieved at the Council and report on this via our Auditor's Annual Report. This will be published on the Council's website and include a commentary on our view of the appropriateness of the Council's arrangements against each of the three specified domains of Value for Money: financial sustainability; governance; and improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

Our risk assessment procedures are ongoing and we will report the findings at a later Committee meeting.


Significant risks

1. Valuation of land and buildings
2. Valuation of investment property
3. Valuation of post retirement benefit obligations
4. Management override of controls

Other audit risks

5. General ledger migration

Key: # Significant financial statement audit risks
Other audit risk



Audit risks and our audit approach (cont.)

1

Valuation of land and buildings

The carrying amount of revalued Land & Buildings differs materially from the fair value



Significant audit risk

The Code requires that where assets are subject to revaluation, their year end carrying value should reflect the appropriate current value at that date. The Council has adopted a rolling revaluation model which sees all land and buildings revalued over a five-year cycle.

This creates a risk that the carrying value of assets not revalued in year differs materially from the year end current value.

A further risk is presented for those assets that are revalued in the year, which involves significant judgement and estimation on behalf of the engaged valuers (Lambert Smith Hampton for operational assets and Reynolds Butler for surplus assets).



Planned response

We will perform the following procedures designed to specifically address the significant risk associated with the valuation:

- We will critically assess the independence, objectivity and expertise of the valuers (Lambert Smith Hampton and Reynolds Butler) used in developing the valuation of the Council's properties at 31 March 2025;
- We will inspect the instructions issued to the valuers for the valuation of land and buildings to verify they are appropriate to produce a valuation consistent with the requirements of the CIPFA Code.
- We will compare the accuracy of the data provided to the valuers for the development of the valuation to underlying information;
- We will evaluate the design and implementation of controls in place for management to review the valuation and the appropriateness of assumptions used;
- We will challenge the appropriateness of the valuation of land and buildings; including any material movements from the previous revaluations. We will challenge key assumptions within the valuation as part of our judgement;
- We will agree the calculations performed of the movements in value of land and buildings and verify that these have been accurately accounted for in line with the requirements of the CIPFA Code;
- We will review the valuation report prepared by the Council's valuers to confirm the appropriateness of the methodology utilised; and
- Disclosures: We will consider the adequacy of the disclosures concerning the key judgements and degree of estimation involved in arriving at the valuation.

Audit risks and our audit approach (cont.)

2

Valuation of investment property

The carrying amount of revalued investment property differs materially from the fair value



Significant audit risk

The Code defines an investment property as one that is used solely to earn rentals or for capital appreciation or both. Property that is used to facilitate the delivery of services or production of goods as well as to earn rentals or for capital appreciation does not meet the definition of an investment property. The portfolio had a value of £26.8m as at 31 March 2024.

There is a risk that investment properties are not being held at fair value, as is required by the Code. At each reporting period, the valuation of the investment property must reflect market conditions. Significant judgement is required to assess fair value and management experts are often engaged to undertake the valuations.



Planned response

We will perform the following procedures designed to specifically address the significant risk associated with the valuation:

- We will critically assess the independence, objectivity and expertise of the valuers (Lambert Smith Hampton and Reynolds Butler) used in developing the valuation of the Council's investment property as at 31 March 2025;
- We will inspect the instructions issued to the valuers to verify they are appropriate to produce a valuation consistent with the requirements of the CIPFA Code.
- We will compare the accuracy of the data provided to the valuers for the development of the valuation to underlying information;
- We will evaluate the design and implementation of controls in place for management to review the valuation and the appropriateness of assumptions used;
- We will challenge the appropriateness of the valuation; including any material movements from the previous revaluations. We will challenge key assumptions within the valuation as part of our judgement;
- We will agree the calculations performed of the movements and verify that these have been accurately accounted for in line with the requirements of the CIPFA Code;
- We will review the valuation report prepared by the Council's valuers to confirm the appropriateness of the methodology utilised; and
- Disclosures: We will consider the adequacy of the disclosures concerning the key judgements and degree of estimation involved in arriving at the valuation.

Audit risks and our audit approach (cont.)

3

Valuation of post retirement benefit obligations

An inappropriate amount is estimated and recorded for the defined benefit obligation



Significant audit risk

- The valuation of the post retirement benefit obligations involves the selection of appropriate actuarial assumptions, most notably the discount rate applied to the scheme liabilities, inflation rates and mortality rates. The selection of these assumptions is inherently subjective and small changes in the assumptions and estimates used to value the Council's pension liability could have a significant effect on the financial position of the Council.
- The effect of these matters is that, as part of our risk assessment, we determined that post retirement benefits obligation has a high degree of estimation uncertainty. The financial statements disclose the assumptions used by the Council in completing the year end valuation of the pension deficit and the year-on-year movements.
- We have identified this in relation to the following pension scheme memberships: Local Government Pension Scheme
- Also, recent changes to market conditions have meant that more councils are finding themselves moving into surplus in their Local Government Pension Scheme (or surpluses have grown and have become material). The requirements of the accounting standards on recognition of these surplus are complicated and requires actuarial involvement.



Planned response

We will perform the following procedures designed to specifically address the significant risk associated with the valuation:

- Understand the processes the Council has in place to set the assumptions used in the valuation;
- Evaluate the competency, objectivity of the actuaries to confirm their qualifications and the basis for their calculations;
- Perform inquiries of the accounting actuaries to assess the methodology and key assumptions made, including actual figures where estimates have been used by the actuaries, such as the rate of return on pension fund assets;
- Agree the data provided by the audited entity to the Scheme Administrator for use within the calculation of the scheme valuation;
- Evaluate the design and implementation of controls in place for the Council to determine the appropriateness of the assumptions used by the actuaries in valuing the liability;
- Challenge, with the support of our own actuarial specialists, the key assumptions applied, being the discount rate, inflation rate and mortality/life expectancy against externally derived data;
- Confirm that the accounting treatment and entries applied by the Group are in line with IFRS and the CIPFA Code of Practice;
- Consider the adequacy of the Council's disclosures in respect of the sensitivity of the deficit or surplus to these assumptions; and
- Where applicable, assess the level of surplus that should be recognised by the entity.

Audit risks and our audit approach (cont.)

4 Management override of controls(a)

Fraud risk related to unpredictable way management override of controls may occur



Significant audit risk

- Professional standards require us to communicate the fraud risk from management override of controls as significant.
- Management is in a unique position to perpetrate fraud because of their ability to manipulate accounting records and prepare fraudulent financial statements by overriding controls that otherwise appear to be operating effectively.
- We have not identified any specific additional risks of management override relating to this audit.

Note: (a) Significant risk that professional standards require us to assess in all cases.



Planned response

Our audit methodology incorporates the risk of management override as a default significant risk.

We will perform the following procedures designed to specifically address the significant risk associated with management override of controls:

- Assess accounting estimates for biases by evaluating whether judgements and decisions in making accounting estimates, even if individually reasonable, indicate a possible bias;
- Evaluate the selection and application of accounting policies;
- In line with our methodology, evaluate the design and implementation of controls over journal entries and post closing adjustments;
- Assess the appropriateness of changes compared to the prior year to the methods and underlying assumptions used to prepare accounting estimates;
- Assess the business rationale and the appropriateness of the accounting for significant transactions that are outside the Council's normal course of business, or are otherwise unusual; and
- We will analyse all journals through the year using data and analytics and focus our testing on those with a higher risk, such as journals impacting revenue, cash or borrowings.

Audit risks and our audit approach (cont.)

5

General Ledger Migration

The data migrated from the old to new general ledger system is incomplete or inaccurate



Other audit risk

The Council migrated its general ledger software in August 2024.

This migration poses a risk of incomplete or inaccurate data having been migrated over and therefore a risk of there being inaccurate ledger balances and inaccurate preparation of the year-end financial statements.

As the timing of the migration was during the financial year, there is also an increased risk relating to the control environment as different processes will have been in operation before and after the migration.



Planned response

We will perform the following procedures:

- We will understand and evaluate the design and implementation of controls in place around the migration to ensure the complete and accurate transfer of data;
- We will consider the impact the migration will have on our understanding of the business processes and perform additional risk assessment procedures to ensure that we have appropriately and sufficiently documented its impact;
- We will understand the changes to the IT environment and involve KPMG IT audit specialists where applicable;
- We will test the migration of data to ensure completeness and accuracy of the transferred data; and
- We will verify the accuracy of the opening trial balance of the new general ledger system and reconcile it to the closing trial balance of the old general ledger system to confirm that the ledger balances have accurately transferred across.

Audit risks and our audit approach

Revenue – Rebuttal of Significant Risk

Professional standards require us to make a rebuttable presumption that the fraud risk from revenue recognition is a significant risk. Due to the nature of the revenue within the sector we have rebutted this significant risk. We have set out the rationale for the rebuttal of key types of income in the table below.

Description of Income	Nature of Income	Rationale for Rebuttal
Council tax	This is the income received from local residents paid in accordance with an annual bill based on the banding of the property concerned.	The income is highly predictable and is broadly known at the beginning of the year, due to the number of properties in the area and the fixed price that is approved annually based on a band D property. We do not deem there to be any incentive or opportunity to manipulate the income.
Business rates	Revenue received from local businesses paid in accordance with an annual demand based on the rateable value of the business concerned.	The income is highly predictable and is broadly known at the beginning of the year, due to the number of businesses in the area and the fixed amount that is approved annually. We do not deem there to be any incentive or opportunity to manipulate the income.
Fees and charges	Revenue recognised from receipt of fixed fee services, in line with the fees and charges schedules agreed and approved annually.	The income stream represents high volume, low value sales, with simple recognition. Fees and charges values are agreed annually. We do not deem there to be any incentive or opportunity to materially manipulate the income.
Grant income	Predictable income receipted primarily from central government, including for housing benefits.	Grant income at a local authority typically involves a small number of high value items and an immaterial residual population. These high value items frequently have simple recognition criteria and can be traced easily to third party documentation, most often from central government source data. There is limited incentive or opportunity to manipulate these figures.

Expenditure – rebuttal of Significant Risk

Practice Note 10 states that the risk of material misstatement due to fraudulent financial reporting may arise from the manipulation of expenditure recognition is required to be considered. Having considered the risk factors relevant to the Council and the nature of expenditure within the Council, we have determined that a significant risk relating to expenditure recognition is not required.

Specifically, the financial position of the Council, (whilst under pressure) is not indicative of a position that would provide an incentive to manipulate expenditure recognition, and the nature of expenditure has not identified any specific risk factors. In 2024/25, the Council are forecasting a deficit but has sufficient reserves.

Mandatory communications - additional reporting

Going concern

Under NAO guidance, including Practice Note 10 - A local authority's financial statements shall be prepared on a going concern basis; this is, the accounts should be prepared on the assumption that the functions of the authority will continue in operational existence for the foreseeable future. Transfers of services under combinations of public sector bodies (such as local government reorganization) do not negate the presumption of going concern.






However, financial sustainability is a core area of focus for our Value for Money opinion.

Additional reporting

Your audit is undertaken to comply with the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 which gives the NAO the responsibility to prepare an Audit Code (the Code), which places responsibilities in addition to those derived from audit standards on us. We also have responsibilities which come specifically from acting as a component auditor to the NAO. In considering these matters at the planning stage we indicate whether:

Work is completed throughout our audit and we can confirm the matters are progressing satisfactorily 	We have identified issues that we may need to report 	Work is completed at a later stage of our audit so we have nothing to report 
--	--	--

We have summarised the status of all these various requirements at the time of planning our audit below and will update you as our work progresses:

Type	Status	Response
Our declaration of independence		No matters to report. The engagement team and others in the firm, as appropriate, have complied with relevant ethical requirements regarding independence.
Issue a report in the public interest		We are required to consider if we should issue a public interest report on any matters which come to our attention during the audit. We have not identified any such matters to date.
Provide a statement to the NAO on your consolidation schedule		This "Whole of Government Accounts" requirement is fulfilled when we complete any work required of us by the NAO to assist their audit of the consolidated accounts of DLUHC.
Provide a summary of risks of significant weakness in arrangements to provide value for money		We are required to report significant weaknesses in arrangements. Work to be completed at a later stage.
Certify the audit as complete		We are required to certify the audit as complete when we have fulfilled all of our responsibilities relating to the accounts and use of resources as well as those other matters highlighted above.

Mandatory communications

Type	Statements
Management's responsibilities (and, where appropriate, those charged with governance)	<p>Prepare financial statements in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.</p> <p>Provide the auditor with access to all information relevant to the preparation of the financial statements, additional information requested and unrestricted access to persons within the entity.</p>
Auditor's responsibilities	Our responsibilities set out through the NAO Code (communicated to you by the PSAA) and can be also found on their website, which include our responsibilities to form and express an opinion on the financial statements that have been prepared by management with the oversight of those charged with governance. The audit of the financial statements does not relieve management or those charged with governance of their responsibilities.
Auditor's responsibilities – Fraud	This report communicates how we plan to identify, assess and obtain sufficient appropriate evidence regarding the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements due to fraud and to implement appropriate responses to fraud or suspected fraud identified during the audit.
Auditor's responsibilities – Other information	Our responsibilities are communicated to you by the PSAA and can be also found on their website, which communicates our responsibilities with respect to other information in documents containing audited financial statements. We will report to you on material inconsistencies and misstatements in other information.
Independence	Our independence confirmation at page 24 discloses matters relating to our independence and objectivity including any relationships that may bear on the firm's independence and the integrity and objectivity of the audit engagement partner and audit staff.

Value for money

Our approach

Value for money

Our value for money reporting requirements have been designed to follow the guidance in the Audit Code of Practice.

Our responsibility is to conclude on significant weaknesses in value for money arrangements.

The main output is a narrative on each of the three domains, summarising the work performed, any significant weaknesses and any recommendations for improvement.

We have set out the key methodology and reporting requirements on this slide and provided an overview of the process and reporting on the following page.

Risk assessment processes

Our responsibility is to assess whether there are any significant weaknesses in the Council's arrangements to secure value for money. Our risk assessment will consider whether there are any significant risks that the Council does not have appropriate arrangements in place.

In undertaking our risk assessment we will be required to obtain an understanding of the key processes the Council has in place to ensure this, including financial management, risk management and partnership working arrangements. We will complete this through review of the Council's documentation in these areas and performing inquiries of management as well as reviewing reports, such as internal audit assessments.

Reporting

Our approach to value for money reporting aligns to the NAO guidance and includes:

- A summary of our commentary on the arrangements in place against each of the three value for money criteria, setting out our view of the arrangements in place compared to industry standards;
- A summary of any further work undertaken against identified significant risks and the findings from this work; and
- Recommendations raised as a result of any significant weaknesses identified and follow up of previous recommendations.

The Council will be required to publish the commentary on its website at the same time as publishing its annual report online.

Financial sustainability

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

Governance


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

Improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness

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

Value for money

Approach we take to completing our work to form and report our conclusion:



Our risk assessment procedures are ongoing and we will report the findings at a later Committee.

Appendices

	Page
A Audit team and rotation	19
B Audit cycle & timetable	20
C Fees	21
D Confirmation of independence	22
E Understanding of IT	25
F ISA (UK) 600 Revised: Summary of changes	26
G FRC's Areas of Focus	27

Audit team and rotation

Your audit team has been drawn from our specialist local government audit department and is led by key members of staff who will be supported by auditors and specialists as necessary to complete our work. We also ensure that we consider rotation of your audit director and firm.



Salma Younis is the director responsible for our audit. She will lead our audit work, attend the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee and be responsible for the opinions that we issue.



Henry Lau is the manager responsible for our audit. He will co-ordinate our audit work, attend the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee and ensure we are co-ordinated across our accounts and VFM work.



Marshal Ngwarai is the in-charge responsible for our audit for the second year. He will be responsible for our on-site fieldwork. He will complete work on more complex sections of the audit.

To comply with professional standard we need to ensure that you appropriately rotate your external audit director. There are no other members of your team which we will need to consider this requirement for:



This will be Salma's first year as your engagement lead. She is required to rotate every five years, extendable to seven with PSAA approval.

Appendix B

Audit timeline

We have developed our audit timeline based on management's financial reporting timetable. If we need to make significant changes to the audit timeline below, then we will communicate the reasons to you on a timely basis.

	2025											
Activity	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Risk assessment and planning												
VFM risk assessment*												
Audit plan discussed and approved												
Year-end audit fieldwork*												
Clearance meeting *												
Approval of accounts by FARC*												
Audit report issued by Feb 2026												
Audit debrief *												

* Dates for issuing deliverables are preliminary and based on information available at planning. They are therefore subject to change.

Fees

Audit fee

Our fees for the year ended 31 March 2025 are set out in the PSAA Scale Fees communication and are shown below.

Entity	2024/25 (£'000)	2023/24 (£'000)
Statutory audit	164,329	149,516
Agreed PY fee variations	-	36,345*
TOTAL	164,329	185,861

**subject to PSAA final review and confirmation*

The fees also assume no significant risks are identified as part of the Value for Money risk assessment. Additional fees in relation to these areas will be subject to the fees variation process as outlined by the PSAA.

Billing arrangements

Fees will be billed in accordance with the milestone completion phasing that has been communicated by the PSAA.

Basis of fee information

Our fees are subject to the following assumptions:

- The Council's audit evidence files are completed to an appropriate standard (we will liaise with you separately on this);
- Draft statutory accounts are presented to us for audit subject to audit and tax adjustments;
- Supporting schedules to figures in the accounts are supplied;
- The Council's audit evidence files are completed to an appropriate standard (we will liaise with management separately on this);
- A trial balance together with reconciled control accounts are presented to us;
- All deadlines agreed with us are met;
- We find no weaknesses in controls that cause us to significantly extend procedures beyond those planned;
- Management will be available to us as necessary throughout the audit process; and
- There will be no changes in deadlines or reporting requirements.

We will provide a list of schedules to be prepared by management stating the due dates together with pro-formas as necessary.

Our ability to deliver the services outlined to the agreed timetable and fee will depend on these schedules being available on the due dates in the agreed form and content.

Any variations to the above plan will be subject to the PSAA fee variation process.

Confirmation of Independence

We confirm that, in our professional judgement, KPMG LLP is independent within the meaning of regulatory and professional requirements and that the objectivity of the Director and audit staff is not impaired.

To the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee members

Assessment of our objectivity and independence as auditor of North Hertfordshire District Council

Professional ethical standards require us to provide to you at the planning stage of the audit a written disclosure of relationships (including the provision of non-audit services) that bear on KPMG LLP's objectivity and independence, the threats to KPMG LLP's independence that these create, any safeguards that have been put in place and why they address such threats, together with any other information necessary to enable KPMG LLP's objectivity and independence to be assessed.

This letter is intended to comply with this requirement and facilitate a subsequent discussion with you on audit independence and addresses:

- General procedures to safeguard independence and objectivity;
- Independence and objectivity considerations relating to the provision of non-audit services; and
- Independence and objectivity considerations relating to other matters.

General procedures to safeguard independence and objectivity

KPMG LLP is committed to being and being seen to be independent. As part of our ethics and independence policies, all KPMG LLP partners, directors and staff annually confirm their compliance with our ethics and independence policies and procedures including in particular that they have no prohibited shareholdings.

Our ethics and independence policies and procedures are fully consistent with the requirements of the FRC Ethical Standard. As a result we have underlying safeguards in place to maintain independence through:

- Instilling professional values.
- Communications.
- Internal accountability.
- Risk management.
- Independent reviews.

We are satisfied that our general procedures support our independence and objectivity except for those detailed below where additional safeguards are in place.

Independence and objectivity considerations relating to the provision of non-audit services

Summary of non-audit services

Facts and matters related to the provision of non-audit services and the safeguards put in place that bear upon our independence and objectivity, are set out on the table overleaf.

Confirmation of Independence (cont.)

Disclosure	Description of scope of services	Principal threats to Independence	Safeguards Applied	Basis of fee	Value of Services Delivered in the year ended 31 March 2025 £k	Value of Services Committed but not yet delivered £k
1	Housing benefit grant certification	Management Self review Self interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate teams • Standard language on non-assumption of management responsibilities is included in our engagement letter. • The engagement contract makes clear that we will not perform any management functions. • The work is performed after the audit is completed and the work is not relied on within the audit file. • Our work does not involve judgement and are statements of fact based on agreed upon procedures. 	Fixed	£32.3	TBC

Confirmation of Independence (cont.)

Summary of fees

We have considered the fees charged by us to the Group and its affiliates for professional services provided by us during the reporting period.

Fee ratio

The ratio of non-audit fees to audit fees for the year is anticipated to be 0.2: 1. We do not consider that the total non-audit fees create a self-interest threat since the absolute level of fees is not significant to our firm as a whole.

	2024/25
	£'000
Statutory audit	164.3
Other Assurance Services	32.3
Total Fees	196.6

Independence and objectivity considerations relating to other matters

There are no other matters that, in our professional judgment, bear on our independence which need to be disclosed to the Audit and Risk Committee.

Confirmation of audit independence

We confirm that as of the date of this letter, in our professional judgment, KPMG LLP is independent within the meaning of regulatory and professional requirements and the objectivity of the partner and audit staff is not impaired.

This report is intended solely for the information of the Audit and Risk Committee of the Group and should not be used for any other purposes.

We would be very happy to discuss the matters identified above (or any other matters relating to our objectivity and independence) should you wish to do so.

Yours faithfully

KPMG LLP

Understanding of IT

Effect on audit effort



Summary

The release of ISA 315 (UK) revised brought an increased focus on Understanding of IT in the audit, and it continues to be an area of focus.

Stakeholders now expect auditors to not only understand IT in detail, but also to consider the impact of the findings from their risk assessment procedures on their planned audit approach.

Why is Understanding of IT so important?

Businesses continue to embrace increasingly complex and sophisticated IT systems and place more and more reliance on automated IT processing not simply for a competitive advantage, but also for "business as usual" operations.

This increased reliance means that to effectively audit accounts, balances and transactions, auditors are required to understand and challenge more around how those IT system and process work.

Therefore, Understanding of IT is a crucial building block of our audit strategy and influences our planned audit approach at every stage.

This is true regardless of whether controls reliance is planned or the audit is expected to be fully substantive in nature.

What kind of things might we identify?

As part of our risk assessment procedures, we perform:

- An assessment of the formality, or otherwise, of certain financially relevant IT processes
- An evaluation of the design and implementation of related general IT controls
- An evaluation of the design and implementation of automated process level controls

As a result of these procedures, we may identify IT control deficiencies or IT process informalities that may have an impact on our planned audit approach.

Additionally, we may identify findings related to the wider control environment or threats to the accuracy or completeness of the information used by both entity management and auditors alike.

What does this mean for our audits?

Auditors are being asked to consider the findings from their risk assessment procedures over IT in relation to the planned audit approach.

The findings may impact any area of the audit, however there are three main areas of focus where we anticipate that most impact as a result of identifying IT deficiencies or IT process informality;

- Increased risk to data integrity
- Additional fraud risk factors
- Additional high-risk criteria to be used in journals analysis

It is important to understand that these findings may have an impact regardless of planned reliance on automated controls and general IT controls.

Appendix F ISA (UK) 600 Revised: Summary of changes



Summary

ISA (UK) 600 (Revised): Special Considerations—Audits of Group Financial Statements (Including the Work of Component Auditors) is effective for periods commencing on or after 15 December 2023.

The new and revised requirements better aligns the standard with recently revised standards such as ISQM 1, ISA (UK) 220 (Revised) and ISA (UK) 315 (Revised). The revisions also strengthen the auditor's responsibilities related to professional skepticism, planning and performing a group audit, two-way communications between the group auditor and component auditors, and documentation.

Area	Summary of changes and impact	Effect on audit effort
Risk-based approach	The nature and extent of risk assessment procedures performed by the group auditor at group level may increase, which may include further inquires of group and/or component management and those charged with governance; analytical procedures, attendance of walkthroughs at components, and inspection and/or observation of additional component information. Consequently, while we will continue to work across the group audit to be as efficient in our interactions with you as possible, group and component management will typically receive additional, and more specific/granular requests, for information from both the group and component auditors.	
Group auditor responsibilities	Through a more targeted audit response to address the group Risks of Material Misstatement, we may perform audit work and communicate with component management at a greater number of components within the group, and we may request less information from component management at certain components where we previously performed full scope audits for the Group audit, if we determine that a full scope audit is no longer necessary. While statutory audit requirements will still apply, this change may be beneficial for overall audit effort where a statutory audit is not required.	
Flexibility in defining components	You may also see changes in the planned scope and timing of the audit in communications to group management and those charged with governance, such as changes to the identification of components and the work to be performed on their financial information, and/or changes to the nature of the group auditor's planned involvement in the work to be performed by component auditors. The impact will be greater where there are more components.	
Quality management	Enhanced leadership, direction, supervision and review responsibilities of the group engagement partner may result in the group engagement partner needing to engage more extensively with group management, your component management and component auditors throughout the audit.	
Robust communication	If the group auditor determines that the increased work effort is needed, this determination will impact how much, and the type of, information you will need to provide to the group auditor or component auditors. The group auditor is required to prescribe required work at a more granular level. This may mean there is increased work for component auditors, particularly in year one, to align the requirements of the group audit and local statutory audits. We will continue to work closely to minimise this.	
Application of materiality and aggregation risk	Changes in component performance materiality may result in changes to the nature, timing and extent of component auditor's work. If so, this may impact how much, and the type of, information you will need to provide to the group auditor or component auditors.	
Revised independence principles	This may make it more challenging to address auditor rotation and other independence requirements for component auditors we may plan to involve in the group audit and mean more matters impacting independence may need to be communicated to you. Potential changes to the component auditor firms engaged to perform work on financial information of components.	

FRC's areas of focus

The FRC released their **Annual Review of Corporate Reporting 2023/24** ('the Review') in September 2024 having already issued three thematic reviews during the year.

The Review and thematic reviews identify where the FRC believes companies can improve their reporting. These slides give a high level summary of the key topics covered. We encourage management and those charged with governance to read further on those areas which are significant to their entity.



Key expectations for 2024/25 annual reports

Overview

The Review identifies that the quality of reporting across FTSE 350 companies has been maintained this year, but there is a widening gap in standards between FTSE 350 and non-FTSE 350 companies. This is noticeable in the FRC's top two focus areas, 'Impairment of assets' and 'Cash Flow Statements'.

'Provisions and contingencies' has fallen out of the top ten issues for the first time in over five years. This issue is replaced by 'Taskforce for Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) and climate-related narrative reporting'.

The FRC re-iterates that companies should apply careful judgement to tell a consistent and coherent story whilst ensuring the annual report is clear, concise and company-specific.

Pre-issuance checks and restatements

The FRC expects companies to have in place a sufficiently robust self-review process to identify common technical compliance issues. The FRC continues to be frustrated by the increasing level of restatements affecting the presentation of primary statements. This indicates that thorough, 'step-back' reviews are not happening in all cases.

Risks and uncertainties

Geopolitical tensions continue and low growth remains a concern in many economies, particularly with respect to going concern, impairment and recognition/recoverability of tax assets and liabilities. The FRC continue to push for enhanced disclosures of risks and uncertainties. Disclosures should be sufficient to allow users to understand the position taken in the financial statements, and how this position has been impacted by the wider risks and uncertainties discussed elsewhere in the annual report.

Financial reporting framework

The FRC reminds preparers to consider the overarching requirements of the UK financial reporting framework in determining the information to be presented. In particular the requirements for a true and fair view, along with a fair, balanced, and comprehensive review of the company's development, position, performance, and future prospects.

The FRC does not expect companies to provide information that is not relevant and material to users, and companies should exercise judgement in determining what information to include.

Companies should also consider including disclosures beyond the specific requirements of the accounting standards where this is necessary to enable users to understand the impact of particular transactions or other events and conditions on the entities financial position, performance and cash flows.

FRC's areas of focus (cont.)



Impairment of assets

Impairment remains a key topic of concern, exacerbated in the current year by an increase in restatements of parent company investments in subsidiaries.

Disclosures should provide adequate information about key inputs and assumptions, which should be consistent with events, operations and risks noted elsewhere in the annual report and be supported by a reasonably possible sensitivity analysis as required.

Forecasts should reflect the asset in its current condition when using a value in use approach and should not extend beyond five years without explanation.

Preparers should consider whether there is an indicator of impairment in the parent when its net assets exceed the group's market capitalisation. They should also consider how intercompany loans are factored into these impairment assessments.

Cash flow statements

Cash flow statements remain the most common cause of prior year restatements.

Companies must carefully consider the classification of cash flows and whether cash and cash equivalents meet the definitions and criteria in the standard. The FRC encourage a clear disclosure of the rationale for the treatment of cash flows for key transactions.

Cash flow netting is a frequent cause of restatements and this was highlighted in the ['Offsetting in the financial statements'](#) thematic.

Preparers should ensure the descriptions and amounts of cash flows are consistent with those reported elsewhere and that non-cash transactions are excluded but reported elsewhere if material.

Climate

This is a top-ten issue for the first time this year, following the implementation of TCFD.

Companies should clearly state the extent of compliance with TCFD, the reasons for any non-compliance and the steps and timeframe for remedying that non-compliance. Where a company is also applying the Companies Act 2006 Climate-related Financial Disclosures, these are mandatory and cannot be 'explained', further the required location in the annual report differs.

Companies are reminded of the importance of focusing only on material climate-related information. Disclosures should be concise and company specific and provide sufficient detail without obscuring material information.

It is also important that there is consistency within the annual report, and that material climate related matters are addressed within the financial statements.

Financial instruments

The number of queries on this topic remains high, with Expected Credit Loss (ECL) provisions being a common topic outside of the FTSE 350 and for non-financial and parent companies.

Disclosures on ECL provisions should explain the significant assumptions applied, including concentrations of risk where material. These disclosures should be consistent with circumstances described elsewhere in the annual report.

Companies should ensure sufficient explanation is provided of material financial instruments, including company-specific accounting policies.

Lastly, the FRC reminds companies that cash and overdraft balances should be offset only when the qualifying criteria have been met.

Judgements and estimates

Disclosures over judgements and estimates are improving, however these remain vital to allow users to understand the position taken by the company. This is particularly important during periods of economic and geopolitical uncertainty.

These disclosures should describe the significant judgements and uncertainties with sufficient, appropriate detail and in simple language.

Estimation uncertainty with a significant risk of a material adjustment within one year should be distinguished from other estimates.

Further, sensitivities and the range of possible outcomes should be provided to allow users to understand the significant judgements and estimates.

FRC's areas of focus (cont.)

Revenue

Disclosures should be specific and, for each material revenue stream, give details of the timing and basis of revenue recognition, and the methodology applied. Where this results in a significant judgement, this should be clear.

Presentation

Disclosures should be consistent with information elsewhere in the annual report and cover company-specific material accounting policy information.

A thorough review should be performed for common non-compliance areas of IAS 1.

Income taxes

Evidence supporting the recognition of deferred tax assets should be disclosed in sufficient detail and be consistent with information reported elsewhere in the annual report.

The effect of Pillar Two income taxes should be disclosed where applicable.

Strategic report and Companies Act

The strategic report must be 'fair, balanced and comprehensive'. Including covering all aspects of performance, economic uncertainty and significant movements in the primary statements.

Companies should ensure they comply with all the statutory requirements for making distributions and repurchasing shares.

Fair value measurement

Explanations of the valuation techniques and assumptions used should be clear and specific to the company.

Significant unobservable inputs should be quantified and the sensitivity of the fair value to reasonably possible changes in these inputs should provide meaningful information to readers.

Thematic reviews

The FRC has issued three thematic reviews this year: 'Reporting by the UK's largest private companies' (see below), 'Offsetting in the financial statements', and 'IFRS 17 Insurance contracts – Disclosures in the first year of application'. The FRC have also performed Retail sector research (see below).

UK's largest private companies

The quality of reporting by these entities was found to be mixed, particularly in explaining complex or judgemental matters. The FRC would expect a critical review of the draft annual report to consider:

- internal consistency
- whether the report as a whole is clear, concise, and understandable; notably with respect to the strategic report
- whether it omits immaterial information, or
- whether additional information is necessary for the users understanding particularly with respect to revenue, judgments and estimates and provisions

Retail sector focus



Retail is a priority sector for the FRC and the research considered issues of particular relevance to the sector including:

- Impairment testing and the impact of online sales and related infrastructure
- Alternative performance measures including like for like (LFL) and adjusted e.g. pre-IFRS 16 measures
- Leased property and the disclosure of lease term judgements, particularly for expired leases.
- Supplier income arrangements and the clarity of accounting policies and significant judgements around measurement and presentation of these.

2024/25 review priorities

The FRC has indicated that its 2024/25 reviews will focus on the following sectors which are considered by the FRC to be higher risk by virtue of economic or other pressures:

 Industrial metals and mining
 Retail

 Construction and materials
 Gas, water and multi-utilities

 Food producers
 Financial Services



kpmg.com/uk

© 2025 KPMG LLP, a UK limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved.