A decorative graphic on the left side of the page consists of a large blue triangle pointing right, and a cluster of smaller triangles in shades of grey, green, and blue, some pointing right and some pointing left, creating a sense of movement and integration.

Fife Integration Joint Board


External Audit Annual Plan

Year ended 31 March 2026

March 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Audit scope and general approach	5
IT Audit strategy	12
Financial statements - significant and other risks of material misstatement	13
Wider scope of public audit	17
Audit team, logistics and requirements	21
Independence, objectivity and other services provided	23
Audit Fees	24
Appendices	25



Introduction

Purpose

This audit plan highlights the key elements of our proposed audit strategy and provides an overview of the planned scope and timing of the statutory external audit of Fife Integration Joint Board (“the IJB”) for the year ended 31 March 2026 for those charged with governance.

The main elements of the audit include:

- an audit of the financial statements and an opinion on whether they give a true and fair view and are free from material misstatement;
- an audit opinion on other statutory information published with the financial statements in the annual accounts, including the Management Commentary, Annual Governance Statement, and the Remuneration Report;
- consideration of arrangements in relation to wider scope areas: financial management; financial sustainability; vision, leadership and governance; and use of resources to improve outcomes; and
- provision of an Independent Auditor’s Report expressing our opinions on the different elements of the annual accounts and an Annual Audit Report setting out conclusions on the wider scope areas.

Responsibilities of the auditor and the IJB

The [Code of Audit Practice](#) outlines the responsibilities of external auditors appointed by the Accounts Commission for Scotland and it is a condition of our appointment that we follow it.

Auditor responsibilities are derived from statute, International Standards on Auditing (UK) and the Ethical Standard for auditors, other professional requirements and best practice, the Code of Audit Practice and guidance from Audit Scotland.

The IJB has primary responsibility for ensuring the proper financial stewardship of public funds. This includes preparing a set of annual accounts that are in accordance with proper accounting practices. The IJB is also responsible for complying with legislation and putting arrangements in place for governance and propriety that enable it to successfully deliver its objectives.

[Appendix 2](#) provides further details of our respective responsibilities.

Adding Value through the Audit

All of our clients demand of us a positive contribution to meeting their ever-changing business needs. Our aim is to add value 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 promote improved standards of governance, better management and decision making and more effective use of resources.

Feedback

Any comments you may have on the service we provide, the quality of our work, and our reports would be greatly appreciated at any time. Comments can be reported directly to any member of your audit team.

This plan has been prepared for the sole use of those charged with governance and management and should not be relied upon by third parties. No responsibility is assumed by Azets Audit Services to third parties.

Openness and transparency

This report will be published on Audit Scotland's website <http://www.audit-scotland.gov.uk/>

Audit scope and general approach

Risk-based audit approach

Our objective when performing an audit is to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole are free from material misstatement and to issue an auditor's report that includes our auditor's opinion.

As part of our risk-based audit approach, we will:

- Perform risk assessment procedures including updating our understanding of the IJB, including its environment, the financial reporting framework and its system of internal control;
- Review the design and implementation of key internal controls;
- Identify and assess the risks of material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, at the financial statement level and the assertion level for classes of transaction, account balances and disclosures;
- Design and perform audit procedures responsive to those risks, to obtain audit evidence that is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our opinion; and
- Exercise professional judgment and maintain professional scepticism throughout the audit recognising that circumstances may exist that cause the financial statements to be materially misstated.

We will undertake a variety of audit procedures designed to provide us with sufficient evidence to give us reasonable assurance that the financial statements are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or error.

Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance but is not a guarantee that an audit conducted in accordance with ISAs (UK) will always detect a material misstatement when it exists. Misstatements can arise from fraud or error and are considered material if, individually or in the aggregate, they could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of these financial statements. The risk of not detecting a material misstatement resulting from fraud is higher than for one resulting from error, as fraud may involve collusion, forgery, intentional omissions, misrepresentations, or the override of internal control.

We include an explanation in the auditor's report of the extent to which the audit was capable of detecting irregularities, including fraud and respective responsibilities for prevention and detection of fraud.

Communication with those charged with governance

Auditing standards require us to make certain communications throughout the audit to those charged with governance. These communications will be through the Audit and Assurance Committee.

Partnership working

We coordinate our work with Audit Scotland, internal audit, other external auditors and relevant scrutiny bodies, recognising the increasing integration of service delivery and partnership working within the public sector.

Our Audit Scotland appointments include NHS Fife and Fife Council. Where practicable and appropriate we will share knowledge between our teams to generate efficiencies in the delivery of our audits.

Audit Scotland

Although we are independent of Audit Scotland and are responsible for forming our own views and opinions, we do work closely with Audit Scotland throughout the audit. This helps identify common priorities and risks, treat issues consistently across the sector, and improve audit quality and efficiency. We share information about identified risks, good practices and barriers to improvement so that lessons to be learnt and knowledge of what works can be disseminated to all relevant bodies.

Audit Scotland undertakes national performance audits on issues affecting the public sector. We may also be required to provide information to Audit Scotland to support the national performance audits and we may review the IJB's arrangements for taking action on any issues reported in the national performance reports which have a local impact. We also consider the extent to which the IJB uses the national performance reports as a means to help improve performance at the local level.

During the year we may also be required to provide information to Audit Scotland to support the national performance audits.

Shared systems and functions

The IJB relies on financial systems operating in Fife Council and NHS Fife to produce its financial reports. We will seek assurances from the Azets audit teams responsible for the external audits of Fife Council and NHS Fife in relation to the arrangements in place at those organisations for the provision of financial information to the IJB.

Delivering the audit

Hybrid audit approach

We adopt a hybrid approach to our audit which combines on-site visits with remote working; learning from the better practices developed during the pandemic.

All of our people have the equipment, technology and systems to allow them to work remotely or on-site, including secure access to all necessary data and information. All of our staff are fully contactable by email, phone call and video-conferencing. Meetings can be held over Microsoft Teams or by telephone.

We employ greater use of technology to examine evidence, but only where we have assessed both the sufficiency and appropriateness of the audit evidence produced.

Secure sharing of information

We use a cloud-based file sharing service 'Inflo' that enables users to easily and securely exchange documents and provides a single repository for audit evidence.

Regular contact

During the 'fieldwork' phases of our audit, we will arrange regular catch-ups with key personnel to discuss the progress of the audit. The frequency of these meetings will be discussed and agreed with management.

Materiality

We apply the concept of materiality both in planning and performing the audit, and in evaluating the effect of identified misstatements on the audit and of uncorrected misstatements.

Judgments about materiality are made in the light of surrounding circumstances and are affected by our perception of the financial information needs of users of the financial statements, and by the size or nature of a misstatement, or a combination of both.

Our determination of materiality:

- Informs the scope of our audit and audit procedures
- Informs the sample sizes required for substantive testing
- Informs our consideration in evaluation the effect of actual and projected misstatements in the financial statements

Materiality is revised as our audit progresses, should we become aware of any information that would have caused us to determine a different amount had we known about it during our planning. The basis for our assessment of materiality for the year is set out in [Appendix 1](#).

Planning Materiality: We have set our materiality at 2% of the IJB's forecast cost of delegated services, resulting in £16.17million.

Performance Materiality: Using our professional judgement, we have assessed performance materiality at 75% of planning materiality, resulting in £12.13million.

Reporting threshold: We are required to report to those charged with governance on all unadjusted misstatements more than the 'reporting threshold' amount. We have set this at approximately 5% of planning materiality, resulting in £0.808million.

Accounting systems and internal controls

The purpose of an audit is to express an opinion on the financial statements. We will follow a substantive testing approach to gain audit assurance rather than relying on tests of controls. As part of our work, we consider certain internal controls relevant to the preparation of the financial statements such that we are able to design appropriate audit procedures. However, this work does not cover all internal controls and is not designed for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal controls. If, as part of our consideration of internal controls, we identify significant deficiencies in controls, we will report these to you in writing.

Going Concern

Management responsibility

Management is required to make and document an assessment of whether the IJB is a going concern when preparing the financial statements. The review period should cover at least 12 months from the date of approval of the financial statements. Management are also required to make balanced, proportionate and clear disclosures about going concern within the financial statements where material uncertainties exist in order to give a true and fair view.

Auditor responsibility

Under ISA (UK) 570, we are required to consider the appropriateness of management's use of the going concern assumption in the preparation of the financial statements and consider whether there are material uncertainties about the IJB's ability to continue as a going concern that need to be disclosed in the financial statements.

In assessing going concern, we will consider the guidance published in the Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the UK 2025/26 and Practice Note 10 (PN10), which focuses on the anticipated future provision of services in the public sector rather than the future existence of the entity itself.

Prevention and detection of fraud or error

In order to discharge our responsibilities regarding fraud and irregularity we require any fraud or irregularity issues to be reported to us as they arise. In particular we require to be notified of all frauds which:

- Involve the misappropriation of theft of assets or cash which are facilitated by weaknesses in internal control and;
- Are over £5,000.

We also require a historic record of instances of fraud or irregularity to be maintained and a summary to be made available to us after each year end.

Wider audit scope work

The special accountabilities that attach to the conduct of public business, and the use of public money, mean that public sector audits must be planned and undertaken from a wider perspective than in the private sector. This means providing assurance, not only on the financial statements, but providing audit judgements and conclusions on the appropriateness, effectiveness and impact of corporate governance and performance management arrangements and financial sustainability. [Appendix 2](#) provides detail of the wider scope areas of public sector audit work. Our initial risk assessment and scope of work planned for 2025/26 is outlined in the “Wider scope of public audit” section of this plan.

National risk assessment

Where particular areas of national or sectoral risk have been identified by the Auditor General and Accounts Commission, they will request auditors to consider and report on those risks as they apply at a local level. For 2025/26 no such risks have been specified.

Best Value

Appointed auditors have a duty to be satisfied that bodies have made proper arrangements to secure best value. We undertake this duty in a way that is proportionate to the size and type of body. We give due regard to:

- How the IJB demonstrates that it is meeting its Best Value responsibilities.
- How our work on the wider-scope areas meets the Best Value responsibilities.

We will report on the IJB’s arrangements for meeting its Best Value responsibilities in our Annual Audit Report.

Reporting our findings

At the conclusion of the audit we will issue:

- an independent auditor's report setting out our formal audit opinions within the annual report and accounts, and;
- an annual audit report describing our audit findings, conclusions on key audit risks, judgements on the pace and depth of improvement on the wider scope areas, and any recommendations.

Definitions

We will use the following gradings to provide an overall assessment of the arrangements in place as they relate to the wider scope areas. The text provides a guide to the key criteria we use in the assessment, although not all of the criteria may exist in every case.



IT Audit strategy

In accordance with ISA (UK) 315, we are required to obtain an understanding of the IT environment related to all key business processes, identify all risks from the use of IT related to those walkthrough key controls judged relevant to our audit and assess the relevant IT general controls (ITGCs) in place to mitigate them.

Our audit will include completing an assessment of the design and implementation of ITGCs related to security management; technology acquisition, development and maintenance; and technology infrastructure.

We will consult internally with our Technology Risk team for them to support the audit team by assessing the information technology general controls (ITGC) of the following systems:

IT Application	Audit area	Planned level of IT audit assessment
Finance System (Oracle)	Financial Reporting	ITGC assessment (design and implementation effectiveness only)
Active Directory	Network Access	ITGC assessment (design and implementation effectiveness only)

Financial statements - significant and other risks of material misstatement

Significant risks are defined as risks that require special audit consideration and include risks of material misstatement that are close to the upper range of inherent risk due to their nature and a combination of the likelihood and potential magnitude of misstatement, or are required to be treated as significant risks due to requirements of auditing standards.

The table below summarises each significant risk. Detail behind each risk and the work undertaken is set out on the following pages.

Significant risk	Financial Statement/Assertion Level Risk	Fraud Risk	Approach to controls	Level of judgement / estimation uncertainty
Management override of controls	Financial Statement Level	Yes	Assess design and implementation	Low
Fraud in revenue recognition (Rebutted)	Assertion Level	No	Assess design and implementation	Low
Fraud in non-pay expenditure recognition (Rebutted)	Assertion Level	No	Assess design and implementation	Low

Significant risks at the financial statement level

The table below summarises significant risks of material misstatement identified at the financial statement level. These risks are considered to have a pervasive impact on the financial statements as a whole and potentially affect many assertions for classes of transaction, account balances and disclosures.

Management override of controls	Planned audit procedures
<p>Auditing Standards require auditors to treat management override of controls as a significant risk on all audits. This is because management is in a unique position to perpetrate fraud by manipulating accounting records and overriding controls that otherwise appear to be operating effectively. Although the level of risk of management override of controls will vary from entity to entity, the risk is nevertheless present in all entities. Due to the unpredictable way in which such override could occur, it is a risk of material misstatement due to fraud and thus a significant risk. Specific areas of potential risk include manual journals, management estimates and judgements and one-off transactions outside the ordinary course of the business.</p> <p>Risk of material misstatement: Very High</p>	<p>Procedures performed to mitigate risks of material misstatement in this area will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreeing balances and transactions to Fife Council and NHS Fife reports/ledger/correspondence; • Receiving assurances from constituent body auditors in relation to financial information provided, controls in place and results of testing at constituent bodies; • Reviewing financial monitoring reports during the year; • Reviewing the consolidation adjustments made to arrive at figures in IJB; and • Evaluating the rationale for any changes in accounting policies, estimates or significant unusual transactions.

Significant risks at the assertion level for classes of transaction, account balances and disclosures

Fraud in revenue recognition - Rebutted	Audit approach
<p>Material misstatement due to fraudulent financial reporting relating to revenue recognition is a presumed risk in ISA 240.</p> <p>The presumption is that the IJB could adopt accounting policies or recognise income in such a way as to lead to a material misstatement in the reported financial position.</p>	<p>Income recognised in the IJB's accounts are contributions received from the IJB's funding partners.</p> <p>Given the nature of income we have rebutted the risk. We will review our assessment during the fieldwork stage of our audit.</p>
Fraud in non-pay expenditure recognition - Rebutted	Audit approach
<p>We have also considered Practice Note 10, which comments that for certain public bodies, the risk of manipulating expenditure could exceed the risk of the manipulation of revenue. We have therefore also considered the risk of fraud in expenditure at the IJB.</p> <p>Given the financial pressures facing the public sector as a whole, there is an inherent fraud risk associated with the recording of expenditure around the year end leading to a material misstatement in the reported financial position.</p>	<p>As the IJB commissions services from the constituent bodies, the IJB does not exercise operational control of the staff and assets to deliver the services itself. The cost of commissioning the services is the expenditure recognised by the IJB rather than the expenditure incurred in delivering the services.</p> <p>Given the nature of expenditure reported in the IJB's annual accounts we have therefore rebutted this risk. We will review our assessment during the fieldwork stage of our audit.</p>

Other material balances and transactions

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

Wider scope of public audit

Introduction

The Code of Audit Practice frames a significant part of our responsibilities in terms of four wider scope audit areas:

- Financial sustainability
- Financial management
- Vision, leadership and governance
- Use of resources to improve outcomes.

Our audit approach to the wider scope audit areas

Appointed auditors are required to consider the wider scope areas when:

- identifying significant audit risks at the planning stage of the audit
- reaching conclusions on those risks
- making recommendations for improvement
- where appropriate, setting out conclusions on the audited body's performance.

When reporting on such arrangements, the Code of Audit Practice requires us to structure our commentary under the four areas identified above. [Appendix 2](#) provides further detail on the definition, scope and audit considerations under each wider scope area.

Our planned audit work against these four areas is risk based and proportionate. Our initial assessment builds upon our understanding of the IJB's key priorities and risks along with discussions with management and review of board and committee minutes and key strategy documents.

We have identified two significant risks in relation to financial sustainability and financial management as set out in the table below. At this stage, we have not identified any significant risks in relation to the other wider scope areas. Audit planning is a continuous process and we will report all identified significant risks, as they relate to the four wider scope areas, in our Annual Audit Report.

Wider scope significant risks

Financial sustainability

The IJB continues to face major risks to achieving financial balance where the need to focus on the pace of medium term transformational change, through collaboration with its partner bodies, is essential to reduce the risk to the IJB's medium and longer term financial sustainability.

The IJB's latest medium term financial plan was approved in March 2025. The financial plan shows a budget gap of £121.755million over the period 2025/26 to 2027/28 alongside a challenging savings target of £29.424million in 2025/26, rising to £40.862million in 2027/28. In recent years the IJB has not achieved its savings targets in full.

Work is currently ongoing to review planning assumptions to reflect the current financial environment in which the IJB operates, as part of development of the 2026/27 budget and revised medium term financial plan. The 2026/27 budget is due to be approved by the IJB in March 2026. It is essential that medium term financial plans reflect an achievable and sustainable financial position for the IJB and its partner bodies.

Our audit response:

During our audit we will review whether the IJB has appropriate arrangements in place to manage its future financial position. Our work will include an assessment of progress made in developing financially sustainable plans which reflect the medium and longer term impact of cost pressures and that continue to support the delivery of the IJB's statutory functions and strategic objectives.

Financial management

In March 2025, The IJB approved the 2025/26 financial plan which showed an initial projected budget gap of £40.577million, to be bridged by an ambitious identified savings target of £40.624million. An additional funding allocation of £14million was received from partners, which when off-set by off unachieved savings from 2024/25, subsequently reduced the 2025/26 savings target to £29.424million.

The latest forecast (November 2025) projected a forecast deficit of £8.615million at March 2026, alongside an anticipated delivery of 82% of the IJB's 2025/26 savings target.

The IJB no longer holds any useable reserves which can be utilised to reduce the forecast year end overspend position should this worsen. This presents a risk that, in line with the Integration Scheme, the risk share agreement will require to be implemented for the third consecutive year, to fund the overspend position. There is therefore a continued risk that achieving a balanced outturn position will present significant further financial challenge to the IJB and its partner bodies.

Our audit response:

During our audit we will consider the IJB's approach to identifying and responding to financial challenges that have occurred during the year, in collaboration with its partner bodies.

Vision, Leadership and Governance

We have not identified a significant risk in relation to the IJB's arrangements for vision, leadership and governance from our initial planning and risk assessment work.

Our audit response:

As part of our work on Vision, Leadership and Governance in 2025/26 we will review, conclude and report on:

- The progress made by the IJB in delivering its 2023-2026 Strategic Plan and developing the next iteration of its Strategic Plan;
 - Whether the IJB can demonstrate that the governance arrangements in place are appropriate and operating effectively;
 - The transparency of decision-making, financial reporting and performance data and;
 - Reasonableness and consistency of the annual governance statement in relation to other information gathered during our audit.
-

Use of resources to improve outcomes

We have not identified a significant risk in relation to the IJB's arrangements for use of resources to improve outcomes from our initial planning and risk assessment work.

Our audit response:

As part of our work on use of resources to improve outcomes in 2025/26 we will review, conclude and report on:

- Whether the IJB can evidence the achievement of value for money in the use of resources; and
 - How the IJB demonstrates a focus on continuous improvement in the context of continuing and significant financial and operational challenge.
-

Weaknesses or risks identified by auditors are only those which have come to their attention during their normal audit work in accordance with the Code of Audit Practice and may not be all that exist.

Duty of Best Value

Appointed auditors have a duty to be satisfied that bodies have made proper arrangements to secure best value. We undertake this duty in a way that is proportionate to the size and type of body. We give due regard to:

- How the IJB demonstrates that it is meeting its Best Value responsibilities
- How our work on the wider-scope areas meets the Best Value responsibilities

We will report on the IJB's arrangements for meeting its Best Value responsibilities in our Annual Audit Report.

Audit Scotland has requested that, at least once during the term of our audit appointment, we carry out audit work on the IJB's arrangements relating to the Best Value theme of fairness and equality. We will consider this in the context of our wider scope audit work in 2025/26 and include commentary in our Annual Audit Report.

Audit team, logistics and requirements

Your core audit team

Partner

Chris Brown

Chris.Brown@azets.co.uk

Chris is the key contact for senior management and has overall responsibility for the audit quality and the audit opinion.

Manager

Amy Hughes

Amy.Hughes@azets.co.uk

Amy is responsible for the overall management of the audit and quality assurance of audit work. She is the key contact for the finance team management.

Audit Senior

Charlotte Barber

Charlotte.Barber@azets.co.uk

Charlotte leads on the off-site audit visits. She is the key day-to-day contact for the finance team.

Audit Timetable

The following timetable indicates the key milestones of the audit.

Event	Date
Planning and risk assessment	February 2026
Reporting of plan to Audit and Assurance Committee	13 March 2026
Receipt of draft accounts and commencement audit fieldwork	July 2026
Audit and Assurance Committee to consider accounts and audit report	11 September 2026
Board meeting to approve accounts for signing	30 September 2026
Target date for submission of signed accounts to Scottish Government	30 September 2026

Our expectations and requirements

For us to be able to complete our work in line with the agreed fee and timetable, we require the following:

- Draft financial statements to be produced to a good quality by the deadlines agreed with us. These should be complete including all notes, the Management Commentary, Annual Governance Statement and the Remuneration Report;
- The provision of good quality working papers at the same time as the draft financial statements. These will be discussed in advance to ensure clarity over our expectations;
- Ensuring staff are available and on site (as agreed) during the period of the audit; and
- Prompt and sufficient responses to audit queries to minimise delays.

The audit process is underpinned by effective project management to co-ordinate and apply our resources efficiently to meet your deadlines. It is essential that the audit team and the IJB's finance team work closely together to achieve the above timetable.

Independence, objectivity and other services provided

The Ethical Standards and ISA (UK) 260 require us to give you full and fair disclosure of matters relating to our independence. In accordance with our profession's ethical requirements and further to our audit plan issued confirming audit arrangements we confirm that there are no further facts or matters that impact on our integrity, objectivity and independence as auditors that we are required or wish to draw to your attention. We consider an objective, reasonable and informed third party would take the same view.

We confirm that Azets Audit Services and the engagement team complied with the FRC's Ethical Standard. We confirm that all threats to our independence have been properly addressed through appropriate safeguards and that we are independent and able to express an objective opinion on the financial statements.

In particular:

- Non-audit services: No non audit services were provided by Azets to the IJB.
- Contingent fees: No contingent fee arrangements are in place for any services provided.
- Gifts and hospitality: We have not identified any gifts or hospitality provided to, or received from, any member of the IJB, senior management or staff.
- Relationships: We have no other relationships with the IJB, its directors, senior managers and affiliates, and we are not aware of any former partners or staff being employed, or holding discussions in anticipation of employment, as a director, or in a senior management role covering financial, accounting or control related areas.

Audit Fees

The quality of audit work is an essential requirement in successfully delivering a fully compliant ISA and Code of Audit Practice audit. Audit Scotland sets an expected audit fee that assumes the body has sound governance arrangements in place, has been operating effectively throughout the year, prepares comprehensive and accurate unaudited accounts and meets the agreed timetable for audit.

The expected fee is reviewed by Audit Scotland each year, based on Audit Scotland's overall budget proposals. The budget proposal and fee levels (for the 2025/26 audits) have been developed in the context of a challenging economic financial environment and the challenges facing public services.

The 2025/26 expected audit fee is based on applying a 4.3% increase to the 2024/25 expected audit fee. This increase is applied on a sector basis and reflects the conditions of the public sector market.

As auditors we negotiate a fee with the IJB during the planning process. The fee may be varied above the expected fee level to reflect the circumstances and local risks within the body.

For 2025/26, we propose setting the audit fee above the expected fee level. We propose setting the 2025/26 audit fee above the expected fee to reflect the following areas of work:


	Fee
The IJB's challenging financial sustainability and financial management position which will increase the amount of work we require to perform around our wider scope areas.	£3,939

It is our policy to bill for overruns or scope extensions e.g., where we have incurred delays, deliverables have been late or of poor quality, where key personnel have not been available, or we have been asked to do extra work.

Fee element	2025/26	2024/25
Auditor remuneration (expected fee level)	39,390	37,950
Auditor remuneration (above expected fee level for risk areas noted above)	3,939	3,795
Pooled costs	1,360	950
Contribution to PABV costs	7,340	7,280
Sectoral cap adjustment	(12,610)	(12,180)
Total fee	39,419	37,795

Appendices

Appendix 1: Materiality	26
Appendix 2: Responsibilities of the IJB and Auditors	28



Appendix 1: Materiality

Whilst our audit procedures are designed to identify misstatements which are material to our audit opinion, we also report to those charged with governance and management any uncorrected misstatements of lower value errors to the extent that our audit identifies these.

Under ISA (UK) 260 we are obliged to report uncorrected omissions or misstatements other than those which are 'clearly trivial' to those charged with governance. ISA (UK) 260 defines 'clearly trivial' as matters that are clearly inconsequential, whether taken individually or in aggregate and whether judged by any quantitative or qualitative criteria.

An omission or misstatement is regarded as material if it would reasonably influence the users of the financial statements. The assessment of what is material is a matter of professional judgement and is affected by our assessment of the risk profile of the IJB and the needs of the users.

When planning, we make professional judgements about the size of misstatements which we consider to be material, based on our knowledge of the IJB, considering factors such as financial stability, expectations of readers and stakeholders, sector developments and financial reporting requirements. In determining materiality we consider the level of misstatement that could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements.

Our assessment, at the planning stage, of materiality for the year ended 31 March 2026 was calculated as follows.

	£million
Overall materiality for the financial statements	16.170
Performance materiality (75% of materiality)	12.130
Trivial threshold	0.808
Materiality	Our initial assessment is based on approximately 2% of the IJB's forecasted cost of delegated services. We consider this to be the principal consideration for the users of the financial statements when assessing financial performance. The financial statements are considered to be materially misstated where total errors exceed this value.
Performance materiality	75% of materiality Performance materiality is the working level of materiality used throughout the audit. We use performance materiality to determine the nature, timing and extent of audit procedures carried out. We perform

	<p>audit procedures on all transactions, or groups of transactions, and balances that exceed our performance materiality. This means that we perform a greater level of testing on the areas deemed to be at significant risk of material misstatement.</p> <p>Performance materiality is set at a value less than overall materiality for the financial statements as a whole to reduce to an appropriately low level the probability that the aggregate of the uncorrected and undetected misstatements exceed overall materiality.</p>
Trivial threshold	<p>5% of overall materiality</p> <p>Trivial misstatements are matters that are clearly inconsequential, whether taken individually or in aggregate and whether judged by any quantitative or qualitative criteria.</p> <p>Individual errors above this threshold are communicated to those charged with governance.</p>

Appendix 2: Responsibilities of the IJB and Auditors

IJB responsibilities

The Code of Audit Practice (2021) sets out the following responsibilities:

Area	IJB responsibilities
Corporate governance	<p>The IJB is responsible for establishing arrangements to ensure the proper conduct of its affairs including the legality of activities and transactions, and for monitoring the adequacy and effectiveness of these arrangements. Those charged with governance should be involved in monitoring these arrangements.</p>
Financial statements and related reports	<p>The IJB has responsibility for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preparing financial statements which give a true and fair view of the financial position and its expenditure and income, in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework and relevant legislation; • maintaining accounting records and working papers that have been prepared to an acceptable professional standard and support the balances and transactions in its financial statements and related disclosures; • ensuring the regularity of transactions, by putting in place systems of internal control to ensure that they are in accordance with the appropriate authority; and • preparing and publishing, along with the financial statements, an annual governance statement, management commentary (or equivalent) and a remuneration report in accordance with prescribed requirements. <p>Management commentaries should be fair, balanced and understandable. Management is responsible, with the oversight of those charged with governance, for communicating relevant information to users about the entity and its financial performance, including providing adequate disclosures in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework. The relevant information should be communicated clearly and concisely.</p> <p>The IJB is responsible for developing and implementing effective systems of internal control as well as financial, operational and compliance controls. These systems should support the achievement of its objectives</p>

Area	IJB responsibilities
	and safeguard and secure value for money from the public funds at its disposal. The IJB is also responsible for establishing effective and appropriate internal audit and risk-management functions.
Standards of conduct for prevention and detection of fraud and error	The IJB is responsible for establishing arrangements to prevent and detect fraud, error and irregularities, bribery and corruption and also to ensure that its affairs are managed in accordance with proper standards of conduct by putting proper arrangements in place.
Financial position	<p>The IJB is responsible for putting in place proper arrangements to ensure the financial position is soundly based having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such financial monitoring and reporting arrangements as may be specified; • Compliance with statutory financial requirements and achievement of financial targets; • Balances and reserves, including strategies about levels and their future use; • Plans to deal with uncertainty in the medium and long term; and • The impact of planned future policies and foreseeable developments on the financial position.
Best value	<p>The IJB has a specific responsibility to make arrangements to secure Best Value. Best Value is defined as continuous improvement in the performance of the body's functions. In securing Best Value, the local government body is required to maintain an appropriate balance among:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quality of its performance of its functions • The cost to the body of that performance • The cost to persons of any service provided by it for them on a wholly or partly rechargeable basis. <p>In maintaining that balance, the IJB shall have regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency • Effectiveness • Economy • The need to meet the equal opportunity requirements. <p>The IJB should discharge its duties in a way which contributes to the achievement of sustainable development</p>

Auditor responsibilities

Code of Audit Practice

The Code of Audit Practice (the Code) describes the high-level, principles-based purpose and scope of public audit in Scotland.

The Code outlines the responsibilities of external auditors and it is a condition of our appointment that we follow it.

Our responsibilities

Auditor responsibilities are derived from the Code, statute, International Standards on Auditing (UK) and the Ethical Standard for auditors, other professional requirements and best practice, and guidance from Audit Scotland.

We are responsible for the audit of the accounts and the wider-scope responsibilities explained below. We act independently in carrying out our role and in exercising professional judgement. We report to the IJB and others, including Audit Scotland, on the results of our audit work.

Weaknesses or risks, including fraud and other irregularities, identified by auditors, are only those which come to our attention during our normal audit work in accordance with the Code and may not be all that exist.

Wider scope audit work

Reflecting the fact that public money is involved, public audit is planned and undertaken from a wider perspective than in the private sector.

The wider scope audit specified by the Code broadens the audit of the accounts to include additional aspects or risks in areas of financial management; financial sustainability; vision, leadership and governance; and use of resources to improve outcomes.

Financial management

Financial management means having sound budgetary processes. Audited bodies require to understand the financial environment and whether their internal controls are operating effectively.



Auditor considerations

Auditors consider whether the body has effective arrangements to secure sound financial management. This includes the strength of the financial management culture, accountability, and arrangements to prevent and detect fraud, error and other irregularities.

Financial sustainability

Financial sustainability means being able to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.



Auditor considerations

Auditors consider the extent to which audited bodies show regard to financial sustainability. They look ahead to the medium term (two to five years) and longer term (over five years) to consider whether the body is planning effectively so it can continue to deliver services.

Vision, leadership and governance

Audited bodies must have a clear vision and strategy and set priorities for improvement within this vision and strategy. They work together with partners and communities to improve outcomes and foster a culture of innovation.



Auditor considerations

Auditors consider the clarity of plans to implement the vision, strategy and priorities adopted by the leaders of the audited body. Auditors also consider the effectiveness of governance arrangements for delivery, including openness and transparency of decision-making; robustness of scrutiny and shared working arrangements; and reporting of decisions and outcomes, and financial and performance information.

Use of resources to improve outcomes



Audited bodies need to make best use of their resources to meet stated outcomes and improvement objectives, through effective planning and working with strategic partners and communities. This includes demonstrating economy, efficiency and effectiveness through the use of financial and other resources, and reporting performance against outcomes.

Auditor considerations

Auditors consider the clarity of arrangements in place to ensure that resources are deployed to improve strategic outcomes, meet the needs of service users taking account of inequalities, and deliver continuous improvement in priority services.

Audit quality

The Auditor General and the Accounts Commission require assurance on the quality of public audit in Scotland through comprehensive audit quality arrangements that apply to all audit work and providers. These arrangements recognise the importance of audit quality to the Auditor General and the Accounts Commission and provide regular reporting on audit quality and performance.

Audit Scotland maintains and delivers an [Audit Quality Framework](#).

The most recent audit quality report can be found at [Quality of public audit in Scotland: Annual report 2024/25 | Audit Scotland](#)



© Azets 2026. All rights reserved. Azets refers to Azets Audit Services Limited. Registered in England & Wales Registered No. 09652677. VAT Registration No. 219 0608 22. Registered to carry on audit work in the UK and regulated for a range of investment business activities by the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales.

Moving forward with confidence

