



Commissioner for Ethical Standards in Public Life in Scotland
Planning report to the Audit Advisory Board and Auditor General for
Scotland on the audit for the year ending 31 March 2018

February 2018

Deloitte Confidential: Public Sector

Contents

01 Planning report

| | |
|--|----|
| Director introduction | 4 |
| Responsibilities of the Audit Advisory Board | 6 |
| Our audit explained | 7 |
| Continuous communication and reporting | 8 |
| An audit tailored to you | 9 |
| Materiality | 10 |
| Scope of work and approach | 11 |
| Significant risks | 13 |
| Wider scope requirements | 16 |
| Audit quality | 20 |
| Purpose of our report and responsibility statement | 21 |

02 Technical update

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| IFRS 9 Financial Instruments | 23 |
| IFRS 16 Leases | 24 |
| General Data Protection Regulation | 25 |

03 Appendices

| | |
|--|----|
| Prior year audit adjustments | 27 |
| Fraud responsibilities and representations | 28 |
| Independence and fees | 30 |
| Our approach to quality | 31 |

Planning report



Director introduction

The key messages in this report:

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

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

We have pleasure in presenting our draft planning report to the Audit Advisory Board (AAB) for the year ending 31 March 2018 audit. We would like to draw your attention to the key messages of this draft audit plan:

Audit Plan

We have updated our understanding of the Commissioner's office including discussion with management and review of relevant documentation as well as Audit Scotland performance reports published during the year.

Based on these procedures, we have developed this plan in collaboration with the Commissioner's office to ensure that we provide an effective audit service that meets your expectations and focuses on the most significant areas of importance and risk to the Commissioner's office.

Key Risks

We have taken an initial view as to the significant audit risks the Commissioner's office faces. These are presented as a summary dashboard on page 13.

- As with other public sector bodies, the Commissioner's office continues to face financial challenges, due to uncertainty around future funding. From the October 2017 spend analysis, an overspend of £51k is forecast for 2017/18. £50k contingency funding for Investigative Officer costs is approved in principle with the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body (SPCB)

- Given the pressures across the whole of the public sector, there is an inherent risk associated with the accuracy and completeness of recording of expenditure within this limit, therefore this will be a key focus of our audit.
- Our significant audit risk is pinpointed to accruals and prepayments made at the year-end.
- In accordance with auditing standards, management override of controls has also been identified as a potential significant audit risk.
- In line with our prior year audit, having considered the risk factors set out in Auditing Standards and the nature of the revenue streams at the Commissioner's office, we have determined that the risk of fraud arising from revenue recognition can be rebutted. This is based on the fact that there is little incentive to manipulate revenue recognition with the majority of revenue being from the Scottish Parliament which can be agreed to confirmations supplied.

Director introduction (continued)

The key messages in this report (continued):

Audit Dimensions

The 2016 Code of Audit Practice sets our four audit dimensions which set a common framework for all public sector audits in Scotland. These are financial sustainability, financial management, governance and transparency and value for money. Due to the relative size and scale of the functions delivered by the Commissioner for Ethical Standards, we have concluded that the full wider scope of audit is not appropriate. In accordance with paragraph 53 of the Code, our work in this area will therefore be restricted to concluding on:

- the appropriateness of the disclosures in the governance statement; and
- the financial sustainability of the Commissioner's office and the services that it delivers over the medium to longer term.

The potential audit risks associated with the wider scope are detailed in page 16.

Other wider scope work

In accordance with Audit Scotland guidance, we will be requested to provide information to support national performance audits on Digital.

Regulatory Change

There are limited changes this year affecting the audit. We will share any guidance received from Audit Scotland when available.

We would highlight that new accounting standards on financial instruments will apply from 2018/19, and for leases from 2019/20 and it is important that the Commissioner's office considers their impact ahead of implementation. See pages 23-24 for more details.

Our Commitment to Quality

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

Adding value

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

Pat Kenny
Audit Director


Responsibilities of the Audit Advisory Board

Helping you fulfil your responsibilities

The primary purpose of the Auditor's interaction with the Audit Advisory Board:


- Clearly communicate the planned scope of the financial statements audit
- Provide timely observations arising from the audit that are significant and relevant to the Audit Advisory Board's responsibility to oversee the financial reporting process
- In addition, we seek to provide the Audit Advisory Board with additional information to help fulfil your broader responsibilities

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




Our audit explained

We tailor our audit to your office and your strategy



Continuous communication and reporting

Planned timing of the audit



An audit tailored to you

Focusing on your business and strategy

Risk

Impact on our audit

Performance against expenditure resource limit



There is a financial duty for the Commissioner for Ethical Standards to maintain its expenditure within the budget approved by the SPCB. As at October 2017, the Commissioner's office was projecting an overspend of £51.3k against its budget for the year. Public Appointment Advisors costs have increased due to an increase in the number of appointment rounds. It is anticipated 61 will be complete by 31 March 2018; this compares to 34 in 2016/17.



There is also the risk of possible austerity measure budget cuts by the Scottish Government during future spending reviews.

Our significant audit risk has been pinpointed to accruals and prepayments at the year end as these areas have a higher risk of management override as discussed further on page 15.

We will consider financial sustainability in the medium to longer term and consider whether the Commissioner's office is planning effectively to continue to deliver its services on a sustainable basis, as discussed further on page 16.



New significant risk



Continuing significant risk



Considered as part of wider scope audit requirements

Materiality

Our approach to materiality

Basis of our materiality benchmark

- The audit director has determined materiality as £17.8k (2016/17: £19k) and a performance materiality of £13.3k (2016/17: £14.3k), based on professional judgement and risk factors specific to office holders, the requirement of auditing standards and the financial measures most relevant to users of the financial statements.
- We have used 2% of forecast gross expenditure as the benchmark for determining materiality.
- This approach is consistent with our prior year materiality calculation.

Reporting to those charged with governance


- We will report to you all misstatements found in excess of £889 (2016/17: £191).
- We have increased this level to 5% (2016/17: 1%) of materiality based on our current methodology; any errors identified will be considered in the context of meeting the budget approved by the SPCB.

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

Our annual audit report

We will:

- Report the materiality benchmark applied in the audit of the Commissioner's office;
- Provide comparative data and explain any changes in materiality, compared to prior year, if appropriate; and
- Explain any normalised or adjusted benchmarks we use, if appropriate.



Although materiality is the judgement of the audit director, the Audit Advisory Board must satisfy themselves that the level of materiality chosen is appropriate for the scope of the audit.



Scope of work and approach

Our key areas of responsibility under the Code of Audit Practice

Core audit

Our core audit work as defined by Audit Scotland comprises:

- providing the **Independent Auditor's Report** on the annual accounts (and any assurance statement on consolidation packs);
- providing the **annual report** on the audit addressed to the Commissioner's office and the Auditor General for Scotland;
- communicating **audit plans** to those charged with governance;
- providing **reports to management**, as appropriate, in respect of the auditor's corporate governance responsibilities in the Code;
- preparing and submitting **fraud returns**, including nil returns, to Audit Scotland where appropriate;
- identifying significant matters arising from the audit, alert the Auditor General for Scotland and support Audit Scotland in producing statutory reports as required; and
- undertaking work requested by Audit Scotland or local performance audit work.

Wider scope requirements

The Code of Audit Practice sets out four audit dimensions which set a common framework for all public sector audits in Scotland:

- **Financial sustainability** – looking forward to the medium and longer term to consider whether the body is planning effectively to continue to deliver its services or the way in which they should be delivered.
- **Financial management** – financial capacity, sound budgetary processes and whether the control environment and internal controls are operating effectively.
- **Governance and transparency** – the effectiveness of scrutiny and governance arrangements, leadership and decision making, and transparent reporting of financial and performance information.
- **Value for money** – using resources effectively and continually improving services.

Due to the relative size and scale of the functions delivered by the Commissioner for Ethical Standards, we have concluded that the full wider scope of audit is not appropriate. In accordance with paragraph 53 of the Code, our work in this area will therefore be restricted to concluding on:

- the appropriateness of the disclosures in the governance statement; and
- The financial sustainability of the Commissioner's office and the services that it delivers over the medium to longer term.

Scope of work and approach (continued)

Our approach

Approach to controls testing

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

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

Promoting high quality reporting to stakeholders

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

The National Audit Office prepare a checklist each year designed to ensure that entities covered by the Government financial reporting manual (FRoM) have prepared their annual accounts in the appropriate form and have complied with all disclosure requirements. We would recommend the Commissioner's office consider this during drafting the annual accounts.

Obtain an understanding of the Commissioner's office and its environment including the identification of relevant controls.

Identify risks and controls that address those risks.

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

If considered necessary, test the operating effectiveness of selected controls

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

Significant risks Dashboard



| Risk | Material | Fraud risk | Planned approach to controls testing | Level of management judgement | Slide no. |
|--|----------|------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Achievement of expenditure resource limits | | | Design and implementation | | 14 |
| Management override of controls | | | Design and implementation | | 15 |



Some degree of management judgement



Limited management judgement

Significant risks (continued)

Risk 1 – Achievement of expenditure resource limits

Key focus for management

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Risk identified | <p>The key financial duty for the Commissioner's office is to comply with the budget approved by the SPCB to cover cash expenditure and non-cash costs such as depreciation and amortisation. Given the pressures across the whole of the public sector, there is an inherent risk associated with the accuracy and completeness of recording of expenditure as there is an incentive for management to either over or under accrue expenditure at the year-end, depending on the forecast position, in order to meet the allocation. The significant risk is therefore pinpointed to accruals and prepayments made by management at the year end and invoices processed around the year end as this is the area where there is scope to manipulate the final results.</p> |
| Our response | <p>We will evaluate the results of our audit testing in the context of the achievement of the target set by the Scottish Parliament.</p> <p>Our work in this area will include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Obtain independent confirmation of resource limits allocated to the Commissioner's office by the Scottish Parliament;• Perform focused testing of accruals and prepayments made at the year end; and• Performing focused cut-off testing of invoices received and paid around the year end. |
| Deloitte Comment | <p>In 2016/17, the Commissioner's office remained within its cash target, drawing down £953k of the £958k allocated. The allocation included £146k of contingency funding to cover additional Investigating Officer days.</p> <p>For 2017/18, as at October 2017, the Commissioner's office is projecting an overspend of £51.3k against its budget. £50k of contingency funding is approved in principle with the SPCB. We will consider the final position as part of our year end audit procedures.</p> |

Significant risks (continued)

Risk 2 – Management override of controls

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

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Risk identified | <p>In accordance with ISA 240 (UK and Ireland) management override is a significant risk. This risk area includes the potential for management to use their judgement to influence the financial statements as well as the potential to override the Commissioner's controls for specific transactions.</p> <p>The key judgments in the financial statements are those which we have selected to be the significant audit risk around expenditure recognition. This is inherently the area in which management has the potential to use their judgment to influence the financial statements.</p> |
| Planned audit challenge | <p>In considering the risk of management override, we plan to perform the following audit procedures that directly address this risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We will test journals, using our data analytics tool, to focus our testing on higher risk journals;• We will review accounting estimates for bias that could result in material misstatements due to fraud;• We will obtain an understanding of the business rationale of significant transactions that we become aware of that are outside of the normal course of business for the entity, or that otherwise appear to be unusual, given our understanding of the entity and its environment. |
| Deloitte Comment | <p>We did not identify in our prior year audit work any transactions which appeared unusual or outside the normal course of business.</p> |

Wider scope requirements

Audit dimensions

The Code of Audit Practice sets our four audit dimensions which set a common framework for all public sector audits in Scotland. These are financial sustainability, financial management, governance and transparency and value for money. Due to the relative size and scale of the functions delivered by the Commissioner for Ethical Standards, we have concluded that the full wider scope of audit is not appropriate. In accordance with paragraph 53 of the Code, our work in this area will therefore be restricted to concluding following:

| Audit dimension | Areas to be considered | Impact on the 2017/18 Audit |
|---|--|--|
| <p>The appropriateness of the disclosures in the governance statement.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The completeness of the disclosures in meeting the requirements of the essential features, as specified in the Scottish Public Finance Manual (SPFM). Inconsistencies between the disclosures or between the disclosures and audit knowledge. | <p>We will review the draft governance statement and assess whether there are any inconsistencies or omissions based on other audit evidence obtained throughout the audit.</p> <p>Audit Risk: The governance statement is not consistent with the wider direction of the accounts or compliant with the SPFM.</p> |
| <p>Financial sustainability looks forward to the medium and longer term to consider whether the body is planning effectively to continue to deliver its services or the way in which they should be delivered.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The financial planning systems in place across the shorter and longer terms. The arrangements to address any identified funding gaps. The affordability and effectiveness of funding and investment decisions made. | <p>We will monitor the Commissioner's actions in respect of its short, medium and longer term financial plans, including progress towards outcome based planning/ budgeting.</p> <p>Audit Risk: A lack of forward financial planning, leading to Commissioner's projects being delayed or cancelled.</p> <p>Long-term financial plans are high level due to the inherent uncertainty in future funding. Funding is not approved beyond the next financial year.</p> |

Wider scope requirements (continued)

Specific risks

As part of the 2017/18 planning guidance, Audit Scotland have identified the following areas as significant risks faced by the public sector. While we have not identified any specific risks in relation to these areas for the Commissioner for Ethical Standards, we will continue to monitor these areas as part of our audit work.

| Risk | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| EU withdrawal | <p>There remains significant uncertainty about the detailed implications of EU withdrawal. Nonetheless, given the potential timetables involved, it is critical public sector bodies are working to understand, assess and prepare for the impact on their business. Key aspects of this are likely to include three broad areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Workforce- Funding- Regulation |
| New Financial Powers | <p>The provisions of the 2012 and 2016 Scotland Acts and the accompanying Fiscal Framework agreement are leading to fundamental changes to the Scottish public finances. New tax raising, borrowing and social security powers provide the Scottish Parliament with more policy choice, but also mean the Scottish budget is subject to greater volatility, uncertainty and complexity. There is also a stronger link between the performance of the Scottish economy (relative to the rest of the UK) and available funding.</p> <p>The changes are likely to impact across public sector bodies to varying degrees, both directly (for example where an organisation's activities include additional responsibilities as a result of the new powers) and indirectly (for example as a result of potential changes to the way the Scottish Government manages its overall budget).</p> |

Wider scope requirements (continued)

Specific risks (continued)

As part of the 2017/18 planning guidance, Audit Scotland have identified the following areas as significant risks faced by the public sector. While we have not identified any specific risks in relation to these areas for the Commissioner for Ethical Standards, we will continue to monitor these areas as part of our audit work.

| Risk | |
|---|--|
| Ending of public sector pay cap | <p>Pay increases in the public sector have been frozen and then capped at 1% for seven years. Politicians in both Westminster and Holyrood are talking about ending the public sector pay cap.</p> <p>When introducing the Programme for Government 2017-18, the First Minister confirmed that the Scottish Government will lift the 1% public sector pay cap. It remains unclear which public sector workers will benefit from lifting the cap, when the increases will take effect, and how such increases will be funded.</p> <p>All public bodies need to consider the potential impact of the ending the pay cap as they prepare their budgets and consider their financial sustainability.</p> |
| Response to cyber security risks | <p>Audit Scotland will issue further guidance in relation to this risk, setting out the risk context for public bodies, the new cyber resilience requirements being introduced by the Scottish Government and questions that auditors can pose to bodies to understand the risk and mitigating action in a local context. We will share this with management when this is available.</p> |
| Openness and transparency | <p>There are signals of changing and more challenging expectations for openness and transparency in public business. In view of this direction of travel, Audit Scotland noted that 2016/17 annual audit reports highlighted the need for public bodies to keep this area under review and to consider whether there is scope to enhance transparency.</p> |

Wider scope requirements (continued)

Performance audits

Performance Audit

In accordance with Audit Scotland planning guidance, we will be requested to provide information to support performance audits on the following subjects during the year:

| Performance audit title | Appointed auditor input |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Digital – cross cutting | No formal return. Audit Scotland will provide information and guidance on current issues and risks to consider as part of planning process. |

Audit Quality

Our commitment to audit quality



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

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

We will apply professional scepticism on material issues and significant judgements identified, by using our expertise in the central government sector and elsewhere to provide robust challenge to management.

We have obtained a deep understanding of your business, its environment and of your processes in expenditure recognition, payroll expenditure and capital expenditure enabling us to develop a risk-focused approach tailored to the Commissioner for Ethical Standards.

Our engagement team is selected to ensure that we have the right subject matter expertise and industry knowledge. We will involve specialists to support the audit team in our work.

In order to deliver a quality audit to you, each member of the core audit team has received tailored learning to develop their expertise in audit skills, delivered by Pat Kenny, Audit Director. This is a director led programme encouraging teams from across our practice to engage and discuss current sector and audit issues, sharing best practice and expertise. This is in addition to a practice wide public sector training day held prior to the end of the financial year to share key issues from across the country, to update on regulatory changes and provide early warning of issues other teams may have faced at the interim testing phase.



Engagement Quality Control Review

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

Purpose of our report and responsibility statement

Our report is designed to help you meet your governance duties

What we report

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

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

What we don't report

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

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


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

Other relevant communications

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

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

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



Pat Kenny, CPFA

for and on behalf of Deloitte LLP

Glasgow

22 February 2018

Technical update

Information on sector developments



IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments*

In a nutshell

- In July 2014, the IASB published a final version of IFRS 9. This version supersedes all previous versions.
- IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* will replace IAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement*, and has three main impacts
 - *Classification and measurement* - introduces new approach for the classification of financial assets driven by cash flow characteristics and the business model in which an asset is held. This classification determines how financial assets are accounted for in financial statements and, in particular, how they are measured on an ongoing basis.
 - *Amortised cost and impairment of financial assets* - introduces an “expected losses” impairment model where entities are required to account for expected credit losses from when financial instruments are first recognised.
 - *Hedge accounting* - introduces new general hedge accounting model that aligns the accounting treatment with risk management activities and allows for better reflection of the hedging activities in the financial statements.
- HM Treasury proposes to apply IFRS 9 from 2018/19 onward, with a number of interpretations and adaptations for the public sector, generally simplifying the requirements. Although the 2018/19 HM Treasury Financial Reporting Manual (“FRm”) has not been published, HMT papers set out the proposed approach.
- The key practical change in IFRS 9 for most central government bodies is the introduction of a new approach to recognising impairments of debtors and other financial instruments.
- HMT’s proposed adaptations are principally to simplify the accounting for balances with core central government departments (but not most Arm’s Length Bodies).

Potential impact on the Commissioner’s office

IFRS 9 is expected to have relatively limited impact on most Scottish Parliamentary office holders, but will at least affect the process of assessing impairment of debtors and other financial assets. As part of the process of adoption, the Commissioner’s office will need to consider the impact on policies, processes, systems and people.

Effective date

The Standard has a mandatory effective date for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2018, with earlier application permitted.

HM Treasury proposes to apply IFRS 9 from 2018/19 onward.

HM Treasury is proposing that on transition there will be no restatement of comparatives, and any impact of transition will be recognised as a reserves movement in 2018/19.



Find out more on our
website UK Accounting
Plus by clicking [here](#)
Navigate to: Standards/
IFRS 9

IFRS 16 *Leases*

In a nutshell

- The new Standard supersedes IAS 17 *Leases* and its associated interpretative guidance.
- For lessees the distinction between operating and finance leases disappears.
- A lease conveys the right to control an identified asset for a period of time in exchange for consideration.
- The accounting for all leases is similar to finance lease accounting in IAS 17, which means all leases are recognised on the balance sheet (with some exceptions).
- The lease liability is measured at the present value of the future lease payments, using a lease term that includes periods covered by extension options if exercise is reasonably certain. Variable lease payments are only included in the liability if based on an index or rate.
- That right-of-use asset is initially measured at the amount of the lease liability, plus initial direct costs and adjustments for lease incentives, payments at or prior to commencement and dilapidations provisions.
- The right-of-use asset is subsequently accounted for by applying IAS 16 *Property, Plant and Equipment*, at cost less depreciation and impairment (unless it is an investment property that is fair valued or it belongs to a class of property, plant and equipment that is revalued).
- A lessee can elect to keep the following leases off-balance sheet and typically straight line the expense:
 - leases with a lease term of 12 months or less and containing no purchase option – this election is made by class of underlying asset; and
 - leases where the underlying asset has a low value when new, such as personal computers or small office furniture – this election is made on a lease-by-lease basis.
- Operating lease expenses, typically straight line, will be replaced with interest on the liability and depreciation of the asset, producing a front-loaded expense profile but boosting metrics such as EBITDA.
- Although any individual lease will have a front-loaded expense, portfolios of leases containing both new and mature leases may produce an overall expense profile similar to straight line expensing.
- HM Treasury has consulted across government and is considering specific interpretations and adaptations for consistency across the public sector, but which will follow the overall principles of IFRS 16.

Potential impact on the Commissioner's office

The Commissioner's office leases office space. The current lease runs for 5 years to 31 March 2021. Either party may give one year's notice. The cost for the period 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2018 is £68.8k. IFRS 16 will have relatively little impact for the Commissioner for Ethical Standards.

Effective date

Periods commencing on or after 1 January 2019. HMT is planning to adopt for 2019/20 in the public sector.



Find out more on our website UK Accounting Plus by following the links to Standards -> IFRS 16

General Data Protection Regulation

The EU GDPR will come into effect from 25 May 2018, and will effectively supercede the existing Data Protection Act.

Issue

The EU General Data Protection Regulation (“GDPR”) will come into effect in 2018, replacing the Directive that formed the basis for the Data Protection Act. The GDPR is expected to remain in effect for the foreseeable future, notwithstanding Brexit.

The key new concept is of “accountability” – being able to **demonstrate** compliance, with specific actions required with an evidence trail.

- Data Protection Impact Assessments are required for high risk processing of data, and there are specific requirements for transparency and fair processing of data. There are tighter rules where consent is the basis for processing data.
- There are requirements to keep records of data processing activities, with the removal of most charges for providing copies of records to patients or staff who request them.
- Penalties for breaches of the regulation are significantly higher than existing arrangements (up to €10m for data breaches and up to €20m for breaches of the principles), and apply to any breach of the regulation, not just data breaches.
- All public authorities, including NHS bodies, are required to appoint a suitably qualified and experienced Data Protection Officer.
- There is a legal requirement to notify security breaches to the Information Commissioner within 72 hours.

Getting ready to comply with the GDPR can start with reducing the risk of the data breaches – and reducing that risk doesn’t need to be complicated. The biggest causes of data breaches can be avoided by making sure the basics are in place: keep all operating systems and software up to date, implement encryption for sensitive data, and educate all employees about the risk of phishing and other social engineering attacks.

Your organisation might also consider the [Cyber Essentials scheme](#) and the [10 Steps to Cyber Security](#), both developed by Government to ensure any organisation can protect themselves from common cyber-attacks.

The Information Commissioner’s office has also developed a useful [12 step guide](#) to help organisations consider their current data protection activities and what needs to be done to comply with the new regulations. They will be developing guidance over the coming months so keep an eye on [their website](#) for more information.

Deloitte View

Privacy as a concept is broad and far-reaching. The GDPR impacts many areas of an organisation, and is not just a legal/compliance issue. The GDPR brings specific rights to the public, including the “right to be forgotten” and data portability.

The emphasis on organisational accountability will require proactive, robust privacy governance. A key challenge is the need to identify a suitably qualified Data Protection Officer, with an estimated need for 28,000 DPOs across Europe.

The requirements will change how information technologies are designed and managed, with a requirement for documented privacy risk assessments when implementing major new systems, with “Privacy by Design” now enshrined in law.

The requirement to notify security breaches within 72 hours will require new or enhanced incident response procedures.

Teams tasked with information management will need to provide clearer oversight on data storage, journeys and lineage. Greater clarity on what data is collected and where it is stored will make it easier to comply with the new data subject rights.

Next steps

The Audit Advisory Board should consider how it is obtaining assurance over the adequacy of the Commissioner’s action plans to ensure compliance with the GDPR.

Appendices



Prior year audit adjustments

Uncorrected and disclosure misstatements

Uncorrected misstatements

An over-accrual of running costs to the value of £802 was identified during the course of our prior year audit. It led to the following factual adjustment:

| | |
|-------------------------------|------|
| DR Accruals | £802 |
| CR Other Administration Costs | £802 |

This finding led to the following projected adjustment, based on the percentage error found in the sample of accruals tested extrapolated across the full population:

| | |
|-------------------------------|------|
| DR Accruals | £338 |
| CR Other Administration Costs | £338 |

Disclosure misstatements

There were no material disclosure deficiencies identified during the course of our prior year audit

Fraud responsibilities and representations

Responsibilities explained



Your Responsibilities:

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



Our responsibilities:

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



Fraud Characteristics:

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

We will request the following to be stated in the representation letter signed on by the Commissioner:

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



Fraud responsibilities and representations

Inquiries

We will make the following inquiries regarding fraud:



Management:

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



Those charged with governance

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



Independence and fees



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

Independence confirmation We confirm the audit engagement team, and others in the firm as appropriate, Deloitte LLP and, where applicable, all Deloitte network firms are independent of the Commissioner's office and will reconfirm our independence and objectivity to the Audit Advisory Board for the year ending 31 March 2018 in our final report to the Audit Advisory Board.

Fees Fee range for the 2017/18 audit in line with the fee letter from Audit Scotland dated 13 December 2017 is £13,125 as analysed below:

| | £ |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Auditor Remuneration | 10,175 |
| Audit Scotland Fixed Charges: | |
| Pooled Costs | 2,360 |
| Audit Support Costs | 590 |
| Total Fee | 13,125 |

Details of any non-audit fees for the period will be presented in our final report.

Non-audit services We continue to review our independence and ensure that appropriate safeguards are in place in relation to any non-audit services provided including, but not limited to, the rotation of senior partners and professional staff and the involvement of additional partners and professional staff to carry out reviews of the work performed and to otherwise advise as necessary.

Relationships We have no other relationships with the Commissioner's office, its directors, senior managers and affiliates, and have not supplied any services to other known connected parties.

Our approach to quality

AQR team report and findings



We maintain a relentless focus on quality and our quality control procedures and continue to invest in and enhance our overall firm Audit Quality Monitoring and Measuring programme.

In June 2017 the Financial Reporting Council ("FRC") issued individual reports on each of the six largest firms, including Deloitte, on Audit Quality Inspections which provides a summary of the findings of its Audit Quality Review ("AQR") team for the 2016/17 cycle of reviews.

The review performed by the AQR forms an important part of our overall inspection process. We perform causal factor analysis on each significant finding arising from both our own internal quality review and those of our regulators to identify the underlying cause. This provides insight which drives the developments in our quality agenda.

18 of the audits reviewed by the AQR were performed to a good standard with limited improvements required. We were disappointed that, despite the high standards we set and many areas of improvement in our quality record, the percentage of audits rated as requiring more than limited improvements has remained broadly similar to the previous year and that two reviews were identified as requiring significant improvement.

We have taken swift and decisive action to respond to the matters identified and will continue to monitor the implementation of these. We are firmly committed to achieving, and indeed exceeding, the FRC's objective that by 2019 90% of FTSE 350 audits reviewed will be assessed as requiring no more than limited improvements.

All the AQR public reports are available on its website.

The AQR's 2016/17 Audit Quality Inspection Report on Deloitte LLP

"We reviewed selected aspects of 23 individual audits in 2016/17. In selecting which aspects of an audit to inspect, we took account of those areas identified to be of higher risk by the auditors and Audit Committees, our knowledge and experience of audits of similar entities and the significance of an area in the context of the audited financial statements. The communications with the Audit Committee and the audit of revenue were reviewed on nearly all of these audits..."

"The firm has taken the actions they committed to take following our last inspection. Some of the issues driving more adverse quality assessments this year are in similar areas to those reported last year, although some audits reviewed were undertaken before these actions had been carried out. Our main concern continues to be the adequacy of audit teams' challenge of management in key areas of judgment (particularly goodwill impairment) and further immediate action is required to improve audit quality in this area.

The firm has enhanced its policies and procedures in the following areas:

- Strengthened the evidence of the Engagement Quality Control Review ("EQCR") partner and audit technical reviewer involvement.
- Updated Deloitte's audit methodology to include additional focus on risk assessment and the related audit response (effective from 31 December 2016 year-end audits).
- Introduced more focused coaching for audit teams throughout the audit process.
- Issued more timely and focused guidance and reminders to the audit practice on key audit matters, to facilitate appropriate consideration by audit teams at the key stages of the audit.
- Increased mandatory technical training for qualified staff through to partner level

Our key findings in the current year requiring action by the firm, which are elaborated further in section 2 together with the firm's actions to address them, are that the firm should:

- Improve the extent of challenge of management in key areas of judgment, in particular impairment reviews and valuation of acquired intangible assets.
- Strengthen the firm's audit of revenue recognition.
- Make further improvements to the audit of defined benefit pension scheme balances in corporate entities.
- Continue to seek to improve the consistency of the quality of communications with Audit Committees."

Our approach to quality

| Areas identified for particular attention | How we have addressed these as a firm | How addressed in our audit |
|---|--|---|
| Strengthen the firm's audit of revenue recognition. | <p>A key theme of the enhancements to our methodology in 2016, (deployed after these engagements reviewed by the AQR were complete), was to enhance our risk assessment procedures and, as a result, encourage our auditors to develop more robust responses to the largest most critical account balances, with a natural focus on revenue.</p> <p>This included the removal of capped sample sizes for very large balances and facilitation of a combination of test of details and substantive analytical procedures to enable more comprehensive audit responses to be designed.</p> <p>This theme has continued in 2017 when our Summer Technical Training showcased our investment in analytic tools applied to the audit of revenue, as well as training on the accounting and auditing of revenue as we prepare to audit the implementation of the new revenue standard IFRS 15 'Revenue from Contracts with Customers' which is effective for periods beginning on or after 1 January 2018.</p> | <p>We have determined that the risk of fraud arising from revenue recognition can be rebutted for the Commissioner for Ethical Standards.</p> <p>This is based on the fact that there is little incentive to manipulate revenue recognition with the majority of revenue being from the Scottish Parliament which can be agreed to confirmations supplied.</p> <p>There is a risk however that the Commissioner materially misstates expenditure in relation to year end transactions, in an attempt to align with its tolerance target or achieve a breakeven position.</p> <p>This is a significant audit risk and is addressed in page 15 of this paper.</p> |
| Continue to seek to improve the consistency of the quality of communications with the Audit Advisory Board. | <p>We take our responsibilities for reporting to the Audit Advisory Board very seriously. There is a natural follow on that if there is a failure in the underlying audit work we will inevitably fall short in our reporting on those areas. The majority of issues noted in the report linked directly to the review findings.</p> <p>We continue to stress the critical importance of reporting matters to the Audit Advisory Board in the training we deliver and in the enhanced procedures we have established, in particular around key management estimates and judgments. We have issued refreshed Audit Committee reporting templates to the practice reflecting the observations of the reviews to ensure audit practitioners continue to focus on this critical aspect of our role.</p> | <p>We have reported to you in page 12 and 13 of this paper the Scope of work and the planned approach to the audit.</p> <p>We would welcome any feedback on our approach to communicating with you.</p> |



Our approach to quality

| Areas identified for particular attention | How we have addressed these as a firm | How addressed in our audit |
|---|---|--|
| Improve the extent of challenge of management in key areas of judgment, in particular impairment reviews and valuation of acquired intangible assets. | <p>We have developed an Impairment Centre of Excellence and have mandated its involvement in all public interest entity audits with a material goodwill or intangibles balance for years ending on or after 15 December 2016. The specialists within the Impairment Centre of Excellence, in addition to having significant experience auditing complex impairment issues, have had specialist training to be able to identify and respond to the issues raised in the AQR report.</p> <p>Our Summer Technical Training in 2017 included interactive workshops on this area including sharing anonymised findings from internal and external review to illustrate the types of challenge and extent of audit evidence that teams should seek to achieve in this area.</p> | The Commissioner's office does not have a goodwill balance or a material intangible asset balance, and so this is not applicable for the Board's audit. |
| Make further improvements to the audit of defined benefit pension scheme balances in corporate entities. | <p>We have improved our procedures to ensure confirmations are obtained from asset custodians where appropriate. In December 2015 we introduced a detailed practice aid dedicated to all areas of corporate pension balance auditing together with increased training.</p> <p>We have also mandated consultation with our Pension Audit Centre of Excellence for years ending on or after 15 December 2016 and refreshed the practice aid. This ensures our corporate audit teams have access to our experts in the audit of pension balances.</p> | The Commissioner's office does not have an on-balance sheet defined benefit pension scheme, and so this is not applicable for the Commissioner's office audit. |





This document is confidential and it is not to be copied or made available to any other party. Deloitte LLP does not accept any liability for use of or reliance on the contents of this document by any person save by the intended recipient(s) to the extent agreed in a Deloitte LLP engagement contract.

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

Deloitte LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC303675 and its registered office at 2 New Street Square, London, EC4A 3BZ, United Kingdom.

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