The Police & Crime Commissioner for Cambridgeshire and the Chief Constable of Cambridgeshire

Year ending 31 March 2017

Ernst & Young LLP

Audit Plan

March 2017

Building a better working world

Ernst & Young LLP
Tel: 01582 643000
400 Capability Green
Luton ey.com
Bedfordshire
LU1 3LU

Tel: + Tel: 01582 643000
Fax: + 01582 643001
ey.com

Jason Ablewhite
The Police & Crime Commissioner for Cambridgeshire
South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
CB23 6EA

16 March 2017

Alec Wood
The Chief Constable of Cambridgeshire Constabulary
Hinchingbrooke Business Park
Huntingdon
PE29 6NP

Dear Jason and Alec,

Audit Plan

We are pleased to attach our Audit Plan for the Police and Crime Commissioner for Cambridgeshire (the PCC) and the Chief Constable of Cambridgeshire (the CC). Its purpose is to provide the Joint Audit Committee with a basis to review our proposed audit approach and scope for the 2016/17 audit in accordance with the requirements of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014, the National Audit Office's 2015 Code of Audit Practice, the Statement of Responsibilities issued by Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA) Ltd, auditing standards and other professional requirements. It is also to ensure that our audit is aligned with the Committee's service expectations.

This plan summarises our initial assessment of the key risks driving the development of an effective audit for the PCC and CC, and outlines our planned audit strategy in response to those risks.

We welcome the opportunity to discuss this Audit Plan with you on 30 March 2017 and to understand whether there are other matters which you consider may influence our audit.

Yours faithfully

Neil A Harris
Audit Director
For and behalf of Ernst & Young LLP
Enc

Contents

In April 2015 Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA) issued ''Statement of responsibilities of auditors and audited bodies '. It is available from the Chief Executive of each audited body and via the PSAA website (www.psaa.co.uk).

The Statement of responsibilities serves as the formal terms of engagement between appointed auditors and audited bodies. It summarises where the different responsibilities of auditors and audited bodies begin and end, and what is to be expected of the audited body in certain areas.

The 'Terms of Appointment from 1 April 2015' issued by PSAA sets out additional requirements that auditors must comply with, over and above those set out in the National Audit Office Code of Audit Practice (the Code) and statute, and covers matters of practice and procedure which are of a recurring nature.

This Audit Plan is prepared in the context of the Statement of responsibilities. It is addressed to the Joint Audit Committee, and is prepared for the sole use of the audited body. We, as appointed auditor, take no responsibility to any third party.

Our Complaints Procedure – If at any time you would like to discuss with us how our service to you could be improved, or if you are dissatisfied with the service you are receiving, you may take the issue up with your usual partner or director contact. If you prefer an alternative route, please contact Steve Varley, our Managing Partner, 1 More London Place, London SE1 2AF. We undertake to look into any complaint carefully and promptly and to do all we can to explain the position to you. Should you remain dissatisfied with any aspect of our service, you may of course take matters up with our professional institute. We can provide further information on how you may contact our professional institute.

1. Overview

Background

The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act created two corporations sole, the:

- ► Police & Crime Commissioner for Cambridgeshire (the PCC); and
- ► Chief Constable of Cambridgeshire (the CC).

We recognise the manner in which these two bodies are inter-linked and operate, based on the governance documents and schemes of governance, and consent that have been adopted.

Therefore, whilst each is a separate audit engagement, we have drafted one joint audit plan to set out our approach to the two engagements, recognising that the audit risks inherent in both engagements and the programme of work required have much in common.

Where relevant, we set out separately any risks which are solely pertinent to one of the bodies.

The PCC is responsible for preparing and publishing the Group's financial statements. The Group comprises the accounts of both the single entity PCC and the single entity CC. The CC is responsible for preparing and publishing the CC's single entity financial statements.

Context for the audit

This Audit Plan covers the work that we plan to perform to provide you with:

- ► Our audit opinion on whether the financial statements of the Group, the PCC and the CC give a true and fair view of the financial position as at 31 March 2017 and of the income and expenditure for the year then ended; and
- ► Our conclusion on the PCC's and the CC's arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

We will also review and report to the National Audit Office (NAO), to the extent and in the form required by them, on the Group's Whole of Government Accounts return.

Our audit will also include the mandatory procedures that we are required to perform in accordance with applicable laws and auditing standards.

When planning the audit we take into account several key inputs:

- ► Strategic, operational and financial risks relevant to the financial statements;
- ► Developments in financial reporting and auditing standards;
- ► The quality of systems and processes;
- ► Changes in the business and regulatory environment; and,
- ► Management's views on all of the above.

By considering these inputs, our audit is focused on the areas that matter and our feedback is more likely to be relevant to the PCC and the CC.

We will provide an update to the Joint Audit Committee on the results of our work in these areas in our report to those charged with governance scheduled for delivery in September 2017.

2. Financial statement risks

We outline below our current assessment of the financial statement risks facing the Group, the PCC and the CC, identified through our knowledge of the Group's, the PCC's and the CC's operations and discussion with those charged with governance and officers.

At our meeting, we will seek to validate these with you.

Significant risks (including fraud risks)	Our audit approach
Risk of management override	
As identified in ISA (UK and Ireland) 240, management is in a unique position to perpetrate fraud because of its ability to manipulate accounting records directly or indirectly and prepare fraudulent financial statements by overriding controls that otherwise appear to be operating effectively. We identify and respond to this fraud risk on every audit engagement. For local authorities, the potential for the incorrect classification of revenue spend as capital is a particular area where there is a risk of management override.	Our approach will focus on: ► Testing the appropriateness of journal entries recorded in the general ledger and other adjustments made in the preparation of the financial statements ► Reviewing accounting estimates for evidence of management bias, and ► Evaluating the business rationale for significant unusual transactions ► Review capital expenditure on property, plant and equipment to ensure it meets the relevant accounting requirements to be capitalised.
Risk of Fraud in Revenue Recognition	
Under ISA240 there is a presumed risk that revenue may be misstated due to improper recognition of revenue. In the public sector, this requirement is modified by Practice Note 10, issued by the Financial Reporting Council, which states that auditors should also consider the risk that material misstatements may occur by the Manipulation of expenditure recognition. One area which may be particularly susceptible to manipulation is the capitalisation of revenue expenditure on Property, Plant and Equipment given the extent of the Capital programme.	We will ► Review and test revenue and expenditure recognition policies; ► Review and discuss with management any accounting estimates on revenue or expenditure recognition for evidence of bias; ► Develop a testing strategy to test material revenue and expenditure streams; ► Review and test revenue cut-off at the period end date; and Test the additions to the Property, Plant and Equipment balance to ensure that they are properly classified as capital expenditure.
Treatment of pension top-up grant from home office	
The PCC has shown the receipt of the top-up grant of £20.9m and the equal payment to the Police Pension Fund (PPF) as items that net off under Other Comprehensive Income & Expenditure. However, the PCC does not make payments direct to the PPF, but via the CC accounts. Therefore, adjustment to the accounts is required to amend this. There is no impact of these adjustments on the general fund balances. The revised treatment will require a prior year adjustment. .	We will ► Test the accounting transactions and journals to ensure the financial statements are materially accurate and compliant with the EY guidance and CIPFA Code of Practice.

Mid-year implementation of a new finance system

Cambridgeshire Constabulary implemented a new general ledger system, Advanced Financials v5.0 in January 2017. We consider the change of the main financial systems, mid-year, as a significant risk, as any errors in the transfer or input of data or in the calculations performed by the new system could result in a material misstatement in the financial statements.

We will

- Review work which has been carried out by Cambridgeshire Police to ensure that the data from the old system has been correctly migrated to the new system.
- Our combined risk assessment will increase as a result of the high risks to assertions (Completeness, valuation or measurement) and as such we will lower our testing thresholds for the accounts which are affected. This means that we will test more transactions than we have done previously to get the assurance that the data has been transferred correctly.
- Our IT team will check the system to ensure that there are good controls in place and the output from the system is correct so that we can rely on controls where appropriate.
- We will walk through the key controls in the new system for the significant classes of transaction which are affected.

Other financial statement risks

Financial statements presentation – Expenditure and funding analysis and Comprehensive income and expenditure statement

Amendments have been made to the *Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the United Kingdom 2016/17 (the* code) this year changing the way the financial statements are presented.

The new reporting requirements impact the Comprehensive Income and Expenditure Statement (CIES) and the Movement in Reserves Statement (MiRS), and include the introduction of the new 'Expenditure and Funding Analysis' note as a result of the '*Telling the Story'* review of the presentation of local authority financial statements.

The Code no longer requires statements or notes to be prepared in accordance with SeRCOP. Instead the Code requires that the service analysis is based on the organisational structure under which the authority operates. We expect this to show the Group's, the PCC's and the CC's segmental analysis.

This change in the code will require a new structure for the primary statements, new notes and a full retrospective restatement of impacted primary statements. The restatement of the 2015/16 comparatives will require audit review, which could potentially incur additional costs, depending on the complexity and manner in which the changes are made.

Our approach will focus on:

- Review of the expenditure and funding analysis, CIES and new notes to ensure disclosures are in line with the code
- Review of the analysis of how these figures are derived, how the ledger system has been re-mapped to reflect the Group's, the PCC's and the CC's organisational structure and how overheads are apportioned across the service areas reported.
- Agreement of restated comparative figures back to the Group's, the PCC's and the CC's segmental analysis and supporting working papers.

Property, plant and equipment valuations (Group, PCC)	
Property, Plant and Equipment (PPE) represents a material item on the Council's balance sheet. PPE is initially measured at cost and then revalued to fair value (determined by the amount that would be paid for the asset in its existing use) on a 5 year rolling basis. This is carried out by an expert valuer and is based on a number of complex assumptions. Annually assets are assessed to identify whether there is any indication of impairment. ISAs (UK and Ireland) 500 and 540 require us to undertake procedures on the use of experts and assumptions underlying fair value estimates.	Our approach will focus on: ► Reliance on management's valuation experts. This will include comparison to industry valuation trends and reliance on our own valuation experts where significant unexplained variations are identified; ► Testing the accounting treatment of valuations made in the year, including the assessment and treatment of impairments; and ► Reviewing and testing the Council's application of IFRS13 to ensure the fair value of relevant assets is based on economic best interest.

Pension valuations & disclosures (Group, PCC, CC)	
Cambridgeshire Constabulary is an admitted body to the Cambridgeshire County Council Pension Fund. Hymans Robertson are appointed as actuaries for this fund and provide Cambridgeshire Constabulary with the figures for the disclosures in the financial statements, based on payroll and pension data provided to them by Cambridgeshire Constabulary. The valuation of pension liabilities represents a significant balance in the financial statements and is an area which involves technical accounting transactions and estimates.	Our approach will focus on: ► Review the competence and capability of the actuary and assessing their work, including reviewing the assumptions used as the basis for producing the pensions figures; ► Agree the figures produced by the actuary in their actuarial valuation to the disclosures in the financial statements; and ► Test the accounting transactions and journals to ensure the financial statements are materially accurate and compliant with the CIPFA Code of Practice.

2.1 Responsibilities in respect of fraud and error

We would like to take this opportunity to remind you that management has the primary responsibility to prevent and detect fraud. It is important that management, with the oversight of those charged with governance, has a culture of ethical behaviour and a strong control environment that both deters and prevents fraud.

Our responsibility is to plan and perform audits to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole are free of material misstatements whether caused by error or fraud. As auditors, we approach each engagement with a questioning mind that accepts the possibility that a material misstatement due to fraud could occur, and design the appropriate procedures to consider such risk.

Based on the requirements of auditing standards our approach will focus on:

- Identifying fraud risks during the planning stages;
- Enquiry of management about risks of fraud and the controls to address those risks;
- Understanding the oversight given by those charged with governance of management's processes over fraud;
- Consideration of the effectiveness of management's controls designed to address the risk of fraud;
- Determining an appropriate strategy to address any identified risks of fraud, and,
- Performing mandatory procedures regardless of specifically identified risks.

3. Value for money risks

We are required to consider whether the PCC and the CC has put in place 'proper arrangements' to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness on its use of resources. For 2016/17 this is based on the overall evaluation criterion:

"In all significant respects, the audited body had proper arrangements to ensure it took properly informed decisions and deployed resources to achieve planned and sustainable outcomes for taxpayers and local people"

Proper arrangements are defined by statutory guidance issued by the National Audit Office. They comprise your arrangements to:

- Take informed decisions;
- Deploy resources in a sustainable manner; and
- Work with partners and other third parties.

In considering your proper arrangements, we will draw on the requirements of the CIPFA/SOLACE framework for local government to ensure that our assessment is made against a framework that you are already required to have in place and to report on through documents such as the annual governance statement for both the PCC and the CC.

We are only required to determine whether there are any risks that we consider significant, which the Code of Audit Practice which defines as:

"A matter is significant if, in the auditor's professional view, it is reasonable to conclude that the matter would be of interest to the audited body or the wider public"

Our risk assessment supports the planning of sufficient work to enable us to deliver a safe conclusion on arrangements to secure value for money and enables us to determine the nature and extent of further work that may be required. If we do not identify any significant risks there is no requirement to carry out further work.

Our risk assessment has therefore considered both the potential financial impact of the issues we have identified, and also the likelihood that the issue will be of interest to local taxpayers, the Government and other stakeholders. In 16/17 HMIC reviewed Cambridgeshire Constabulary's effectiveness, efficiency & legitimacy (PEEL assessments). We will consider the results of these reports for our audit work. Our work to date, which is currently in progress, has not resulted in the identification of significant risks which we view as relevant to our value for money conclusion. We continue to update our risk assessment throughout our audit, and will update you on any changes to that assessment and any additional local risk-based work we may need to undertake as a result.

4. Our audit process and strategy

4.1 Objective and scope of our audit

Under the Code of Audit Practice our principal objectives are to review and report on the Group's, the PCC's and the CC's:

- Financial statements
- Arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources to the extent required by the relevant legislation and the requirements of the Code.

We issue an audit report that covers:

1. **Financial statement audit**

Our objective is to form an opinion on the financial statements under International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland).

We report to you by exception in respect of the PCC's and the CC's governance statement and other accompanying material as required, in accordance with relevant guidance prepared by the NAO on behalf of the Comptroller and Auditor General.

Alongside our audit report, we also:

- Review and report to the NAO on the Whole of Government Accounts return to the extent and in the form they require; and
- Give a separate opinion on the part of the Council's financial statements that relates to the accounts of the pension fund.

2. **Arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness (value for money)**

We are required to consider whether the PCC and the CC have put in place 'proper arrangements' to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in their use of resources.

4.2 Audit process overview

The same audit team will be responsible for auditing the Group financial statements and the PCC and the CC components.

Our audit involves:

- Walking through the key internal controls in place and testing the operation of these controls;
- Reviewing internal audit plans and the results of work undertaken;
- Considering the work of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC); and
- Reliance on the work of experts in relation to areas such as pensions and valuations.

Processes

Our initial assessment of the key processes across the PCC and the CC has identified the following systems which we will document and walkthrough the key controls.

- Accounts Payable
- Accounts Receivable
- Payroll
- PPE
- Property Plant and Equipment
- General Ledger

New ERP Implementation

The Chief Constables of Cambridgeshire Constabulary, Hertfordshire Constabulary and Bedfordshire Police (BCH) are implementing the Advanced Financials V5.0 system to replace a number of different systems used within each county.

Advanced Financials V5.0 will support a number of key business processes which are considered significant for the financial statement audit of the group. In this regard, as your financial auditors we need to gain assurance that the implementation is adequately managed and incorporates key controls and considerations relating to the financial statements reporting process. We also plan to centrally test the IT general controls (ITGC) of Advanced Financials V5.0 with a view to rely on the system next year in order to support the audit of entities that will be using the system. We have agreed a scope of work with the CFOs of the PCCs and CCs and a copy of this scope can be made available to the Joint Audit Committees.

The system went live at Cambridgeshire Constabulary, mid-year, at the beginning of January 2017. The systems at Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire are due to go live at the beginning of FY2018. We are currently undertaking work at Cambridgeshire Constabulary to determine whether we can take a controls-reliant approach to the audit for 16/17 which could lead to a more efficient audit in this and future years. The work being undertaken by the EY PRM and ITRA teams at Cambridge Police will also allow us to highlight areas of improvement ahead of the Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire go-live dates.

The proposed fees which have been discussed and agreed with the CFOs (but to be agreed with PSAA) are as follows:

Approach	Force	Additional Indicative Fees
Controls approach	Cambridgeshire	£36k, 2016-2017
	Hertfordshire	£11k, 2017-2018
	Bedfordshire	£11k, 2017-2018

Analytics

We will use our computer-based analytics tools to enable us to capture whole populations of your financial data, in particular journal entries. These tools:

- Help identify specific exceptions and anomalies which can then be subject to more traditional substantive audit tests
- Give greater likelihood of identifying errors than random sampling techniques.

We will report the findings from our process and analytics work, including any significant weaknesses or inefficiencies identified and recommendations for improvement, to management and the Joint Audit Committee.

Internal audit

As in prior years, we will review internal audit plans and the results of their work. We will reflect the findings from these reports, together with reports from any other work completed in the year, in our detailed audit plan, where we raise issues that could have an impact on the year-end financial statements

Use of specialists

When auditing key judgements, we are often required to rely on the input and advice provided by specialists who have qualifications and expertise not possessed by the core audit team. The areas where either EY or third party specialists provide input for the current year audit are:

Area	Specialists
Pensions	EY pensions team and PwC CC actuary, Hymans Robertson LLP PCC actuary, Hymans Robertson LLP Government Actuaries Department (GAD)
Property, Plant & Equipment	EY valuations team and Gerald Eve PCC valuer, Estates and Facilities Department

In accordance with Auditing Standards, we will evaluate each specialist's professional competence and objectivity, considering their qualifications, experience and available resources, together with the independence of the individuals performing the work.

We also consider the work performed by the specialist in light of our knowledge of the PCC's and the CC's environment and processes and our assessment of audit risk in the particular area. For example, we would typically perform the following procedures:

- Analyse source data and make inquiries as to the procedures used by the expert to establish whether the source date is relevant and reliable;
- Assess the reasonableness of the assumptions and methods used;
- Consider the appropriateness of the timing of when the specialist carried out the work; and
- Assess whether the substance of the specialist's findings are properly reflected in the financial statements.

4.3 Mandatory audit procedures required by auditing standards and the Code

As well as the financial statement risks (section two) and value for money risks (section three), we must perform other procedures as required by auditing, ethical and independence standards, the Code and other regulations. We outline below the procedures we will undertake during the course of our audit.

Procedures required by standards

- Addressing the risk of fraud and error;

- Significant disclosures included in the financial statements;
- Entity-wide controls;
- Reading other information contained in the financial statements and reporting whether it is inconsistent with our understanding and the financial statements;
- Auditor independence.

Procedures required by the Code

- Reviewing, and reporting on as appropriate, other information published within both the Group's (including the PCC) and the CC's financial statements, including the Annual Governance Statement's for the PCC and the CC;
- Reviewing and reporting on the Group's Whole of Government Accounts return, in line with the instructions issued by the NAO

Finally, we are also required to discharge our statutory duties and responsibilities as established by the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 and Code of Audit Practice.

4.4 Materiality

For the purposes of determining whether the financial statements are free from material error, we define materiality as the magnitude of an omission or misstatement that, individually or in aggregate, could reasonably be expected to influence the users of the financial statements. Our evaluation requires professional judgement and so takes into account qualitative as well as quantitative considerations implied in the definition.

We have determined that overall materiality for the financial statements for the Group and the CC is £3.4 million and £3.3 million respectively based on 2% of 2015/16 gross revenue expenditure.

Overall materiality for the PCC is £1.6 million based on 2% of 2015/16 gross assets. Overall materiality for the Police Pension Fund is £0.8 million based on 2% of 2015/16 benefits payable.

We will communicate uncorrected audit misstatements to you greater than of £172,000 (for the PCC Group), £164,000 (for the CC single entity), £79,000 (for the PCC single entity) and £39,000 (for the Police Pension Fund).

The amount we consider material at the end of the audit may differ from our initial determination. At this stage, however, it is not feasible to anticipate all the circumstances that might ultimately influence our judgement. At the end of the audit we will form our final opinion by reference to all matters that could be significant to users of the financial statements, including the total effect of any audit misstatements, and our evaluation of materiality at that date.

4.5 Fees

The duty to prescribe fees is a statutory function delegated to Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA) by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. PSAA has published a scale fee for all relevant bodies. This is defined as the fee required by auditors to meet statutory responsibilities under the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 in accordance with the NAO Code. The indicative fee scale for the audit of PCC is £30,338 and for the audit of the CC is £15,000. Indicative fee agreed for the work to gain assurance over the new ERP system is £36,000 but this proposed variation is subject to approval by PSAA.

4.6 Your audit team

The engagement team is led by Neil Harris, Executive Director, who has significant experience in the police sector. Neil is supported by Nick Bernstein and Sheena Phillips who are responsible for the day-to-day direction of audit work and is the key points of contact for the PCC and the CC lead on the production of their accounts. There will be consistency of Executive Director, Manager and Senior across tri-force of Cambridgeshire, Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire.

4.7 Timetable of communication, deliverables and insights

We have set out below a timetable showing the key stages of the audit, including the value for money work and the Whole of Government Accounts. The timetable includes the deliverables we have agreed to provide to the PCC and the CC through the Joint Audit Committee's cycle in 2016/17. These dates are determined to ensure our alignment with PSAA's rolling calendar of deadlines.

From time to time matters may arise that require immediate communication with the Joint Audit Committee and we will discuss them with the Chair as appropriate.

Following the conclusion of our audit we will prepare Annual Audit Letter's to communicate the key issues arising from our work to the PCC and the CC and external stakeholders, including members of the public.

Audit phase	Timetable	Joint Audit Committee timetable	Deliverables
High level planning	April 2016	July 2016	Audit Fee Letter
Risk assessment and setting of scopes	December 2016	March 2017	Audit Plan
Testing routine processes and controls	January and March 2017	July 2017	Progress Report (Report by exception if significant matters arise from our interim audit work).
Year-end audit and completion of audit	July and August 2017	September 2017	Report to those charged with governance via the Audit Results Report Audit report (including our opinion on the financial statements; and, overall value for money conclusion). Audit completion certificate Reporting to the NAO on the Whole of Government Accounts return.
Conclusion of reporting	October 2017	December 2017	Annual Audit Letter

In addition to the above formal reporting and deliverables we will seek to provide practical business insights and updates on regulatory matters.

5. Independence

5.1 Introduction

The APB Ethical Standards and ISA (UK and Ireland) 260 'Communication of audit matters with those charged with governance', requires us to communicate with you on a timely basis on all significant facts and matters that bear on our independence and objectivity. The Ethical Standards, as revised in December 2010, require that we do this formally both at the planning stage and at the conclusion of the audit, as well as during the audit if appropriate. The aim of these communications is to ensure full and fair disclosure by us to those charged with your governance on matters in which you have an interest.

Required communications

Planning stage	Final stage
► The principal threats, if any, to objectivity and independence identified by EY including consideration of all relationships between you, your affiliates and directors and us; ► The safeguards adopted and the reasons why they are considered to be effective, including any Engagement Quality Review; ► The overall assessment of threats and safeguards; ► Information about the general policies and process within EY to maintain objectivity and independence.	► A written disclosure of relationships (including the provision of non-audit services) that bear on our objectivity and independence, the threats to our independence that these create, any safeguards that we have put in place and why they address such threats, together with any other information necessary to enable our objectivity and independence to be assessed; ► Details of non-audit services provided and the fees charged in relation thereto; ► Written confirmation that we are independent; ► Details of any inconsistencies between APB Ethical Standards, the PSAA Terms of Appointment and your policy for the supply of non-audit services by EY and any apparent breach of that policy; and ► An opportunity to discuss auditor independence issues.

During the course of the audit we must also communicate with you whenever any significant judgements are made about threats to objectivity and independence and the appropriateness of our safeguards, for example when accepting an engagement to provide non-audit services.

We also provide information on any contingent fee arrangements, the amounts of any future contracted services, and details of any written proposal to provide non-audit services;

We ensure that the total amount of fees that EY and our network firms have charged to you and your affiliates for the provision of services during the reporting period are disclosed, analysed in appropriate categories.

5.2 Relationships, services and related threats and safeguards

We highlight the following significant facts and matters that may be reasonably considered to bear upon our objectivity and independence, including any principal threats. However we have adopted the safeguards below to mitigate these threats along with the reasons why they are considered to be effective.

Self-interest threats

A self-interest threat arises when EY has financial or other interests in your entity. Examples include where we have an investment in your entity; where we receive significant fees in respect of non-audit services; where we need to recover long outstanding fees; or where we enter into a business relationship with the PCC and the CC.

At the time of writing, there are no long outstanding fees.

We believe that it is appropriate for us to undertake permissible non-audit services, and we will comply with the policies that the PCC and the CC have approved and that are in compliance with PSAA Terms of Appointment.

At the time of writing, the PCC and the CC have not commissioned any non-audit services from EY for 2016/17. No additional safeguards are required.

A self-interest threat may also arise if members of our audit engagement team have objectives or are rewarded in relation to sales of non-audit services to the PCC and the CC. We confirm that no member of our audit engagement team, including those from other service lines, is in this position, in compliance with Ethical Standard 4.

There are no other self-interest threats at the date of this report.

Self-review threats

Self-review threats arise when the results of a non-audit service performed by EY or others within the EY network are reflected in the amounts included or disclosed in the financial statements.

There are no other self-review threats at the date of this report.

Management threats

Partners and employees of EY are prohibited from taking decisions on behalf of management of your entity. Management threats may also arise during the provision of a non-audit service where management is required to make judgements or decisions based on that work.

There are no management threats at the date of this report.

Other threats

Other threats, such as advocacy, familiarity or intimidation, may arise.

There are no other threats at the date of this report.

Overall Assessment

Overall we consider that the adopted safeguards appropriately mitigate the principal threats identified, and we therefore confirm that EY is independent and the objectivity and independence of Neil Harris, the audit engagement Executive Director and the audit engagement team have not been compromised.

5.3 Other required communications

EY has policies and procedures that instil professional values as part of firm culture and ensure that the highest standards of objectivity, independence and integrity are maintained.

Details of the key policies and processes within EY for maintaining objectivity and independence can be found in our annual Transparency Report, which the firm is required to publish by law. The most recent version of this report is for the year ended June 2016 and can be found here:

http://www.ey.com/uk/en/about-us/ey-uk-transparency-report-2016

Appendix A Fees

A breakdown of our agreed fee is shown below.

	Planned Fee 2016/17 £	Scale fee 2016/17 £	Outturn fee 2015/16 £
The PCC for Cambridgeshire opinion Audit and VFM Conclusion	30,338	30,338	30,338
The CC of Cambridgeshire Constabulary opinion Audit and VFM Conclusion	15,000	15,000	15,000
ERP Implementation – indicative fee	36,000	TBA	0
Total Audit Fee – Code work	**81,338**	**45,338**	**45,338**
Non-audit work	0	0	0

All fees exclude VAT.

The agreed fee presented above is based on the following assumptions:

- ► Officers meeting the agreed timetable of deliverables;
- ► The operating effectiveness of the internal controls for the key processes outlined in section 4.2 above;
- ► We can rely on the work of internal audit as planned;
- ► Our accounts opinion and value for money conclusion being unqualified;
- ► Appropriate quality of documentation is provided by the PCC and the CC; and
- ► The PCC and the CC has an effective control environment.

If any of the above assumptions prove to be unfounded, we will seek a variation to the agreed fee. This will be discussed with the PCC and CC Chief Financial Officer in advance.

Fees for the auditor's consideration of correspondence from the public and formal objections will be charged in addition to the scale fee.

Appendix B UK required communications with those charged with governance

There are certain communications that we must provide to the Joint Audit Committee. These are detailed here:

Required communication	Reference
Planning and audit approach Communication of the planned scope and timing of the audit including any limitations.	► Audit Plan
Significant findings from the audit ► Our view about the significant qualitative aspects of accounting practices including accounting policies, accounting estimates and financial statement disclosures ► Significant difficulties, if any, encountered during the audit ► Significant matters, if any, arising from the audit that were discussed with management ► Written representations that we are seeking ► Expected modifications to the audit report ► Other matters if any, significant to the oversight of the financial reporting process ► Findings and issues regarding the opening balances on initial audits [delete if not an initial audit]	► Audit Results Report
Misstatements ► Uncorrected misstatements and their effect on our audit opinion ► The effect of uncorrected misstatements related to prior periods ► A request that any uncorrected misstatement be corrected ► In writing, corrected misstatements that are significant	► Audit Results Report
Fraud ► Enquiries of the Joint Audit Committee to determine whether they have knowledge of any actual, suspected or alleged fraud affecting the entity ► Any fraud that we have identified or information we have obtained that indicates that a fraud may exist ► A discussion of any other matters related to fraud	► Audit Results Report
Related parties Significant matters arising during the audit in connection with the entity's related parties including, when applicable: ► Non-disclosure by management ► Inappropriate authorisation and approval of transactions ► Disagreement over disclosures ► Non-compliance with laws and regulations ► Difficulty in identifying the party that ultimately controls the entity	► Audit Results Report
External confirmations ► Management's refusal for us to request confirmations ► Inability to obtain relevant and reliable audit evidence from other procedures	► Audit Results Report
Consideration of laws and regulations ► Audit findings regarding non-compliance where the non-compliance is material and believed to be intentional. This communication is subject to compliance with legislation on tipping off ► Enquiry of the Joint Audit Committee into possible instances of non-compliance with laws and regulations that may have a material effect on the financial statements and that the Joint Audit Committee may be aware of	► Audit Results Report

Required communication	Reference
Independence Communication of all significant facts and matters that bear on EY's objectivity and independence Communication of key elements of the audit engagement director's consideration of independence and objectivity such as: ► The principal threats ► Safeguards adopted and their effectiveness ► An overall assessment of threats and safeguards ► Information about the general policies and process within the firm to maintain objectivity and independence	► Audit Plan ► Audit Results Report
Going concern Events or conditions identified that may cast significant doubt on the entity's ability to continue as a going concern, including: ► Whether the events or conditions constitute a material uncertainty ► Whether the use of the going concern assumption is appropriate in the preparation and presentation of the financial statements ► The adequacy of related disclosures in the financial statements	► Audit Results Report
Significant deficiencies in internal controls identified during the audit	► Audit Results Report
Fee Information ► Breakdown of fee information at the agreement of the initial audit plan ► Breakdown of fee information at the completion of the audit	► Audit Plan ► Audit Results Report Annual Audit Letter if considered necessary
Group audits ► An overview of the type of work to be performed on the financial information of the components ► An overview of the nature of the group audit team's planned involvement in the work to be performed by the component auditors on the financial information of significant components ► Instances where the group audit team's evaluation of the work of a component auditor gave rise to a concern about the quality of that auditor's work ► Any limitations on the group audit, for example, where the group engagement team's access to information may have been restricted ► Fraud or suspected fraud involving group management, component management, employees who have significant roles in group-wide controls or others where the fraud resulted in a material misstatement of the group financial statements	► Audit Plan ► Audit Results Report

EY | Assurance | Tax | Transactions | Advisory

Ernst & Young LLP

Ernst & Young LLP, 1 More London Place, London, SE1 2AF.

ey.com