The Police and Crime Commissioner for Suffolk and the Chief Constable for Suffolk Constabulary

Year ending 31 March 2015

Audit Plan

Presented to 27 March 2015 Audit Committee

Building a better working world

DELIBERATELY LEFT BLANK FOR PRINTING PURPOSE

Building a better working world

Ernst & Young LLP
400 Capability Green
Luton
Bedfordshire
LU1 3LU

Tel: 01582 643000
Fax: 01582 643001
ey.com

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Tim Passmore
The Police and Crime Commissioner for Suffolk
Office of the Suffolk Police and Crime Commissioner
Martlesham Heath
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP5 3QS

11 March 2015

Ref: NH/SPCC/2014-15/
Audit Plan
Direct line: 01582 643000
Email: nharris2@uk.ey.com

Gareth Wilson
The Temporary Chief Constable for Suffolk Constabulary
Police Headquarters
Martlesham Heath
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP5 3QS

Dear Tim and Gareth

2014/15 Audit Plan

We are pleased to attach our Audit Plan for the Police and Crime Commissioner for Suffolk (the PCC) and the Chief Constable for Suffolk Constabulary (the CC).

The Plan sets out how we intend to carry out our responsibilities as auditor. The purpose of this report is to provide the Audit Committee with a basis to review our proposed audit approach and scope for the 2014/15 audit, in accordance with the requirements of the Audit Commission Act 1998, the Code of Audit Practice, Standing Guidance, auditing standards and other professional requirements. The purpose is also to ensure that our audit is aligned with the Audit 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 report with you at 27 March 2015 Audit Committee and to understand whether there are other matters which you consider may influence our audit.

Yours sincerely

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

DELIBERATELY LEFT BLANK FOR PRINTING PURPOSES

Contents

In March 2010 the Audit Commission issued a revised version of the 'Statement of responsibilities of auditors and audited bodies' (Statement of responsibilities). It is available from the Chief Executive of each audited body and via the Audit Commission's website.

The Statement of responsibilities serves as the formal terms of engagement between the Audit Commission's 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 Standing Guidance serves as our terms of appointment as auditors appointed by the Audit Commission. The Standing Guidance sets out additional requirements that auditors must comply with, over and above those set out in the Code of Audit Practice 2010 (the Code) and statute, and covers matters of practice and procedure which are of a recurring nature.

This Audit Results Report is prepared in the context of the Statement of responsibilities. It is addressed to the Members of the audited body, and is prepared for their sole use. 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 Suffolk (the PCC); and
- The Chief Constable for Suffolk Constabulary (the CC).

We recognise the manner in which these two bodies are inter-linked and operate based on the governance documents and scheme 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 will set out separately, any risks which are solely pertinent to one of the bodies.

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

Context for the audit

This audit plan covers the work that we plan to perform in order to provide you with:

- Our audit opinion on whether the financial statements of the Group, PCC and CC give a true and fair view of the financial position as at 31 March 2015 and of the income and expenditure for the year then ended; and
- A statutory conclusion on the Group's, PCC's and 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 your PCC's Group Whole of Government Accounts return.

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 CC.

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

In part 2 and 3 of this report we provide more detail on the areas which we believe present significant risk to the financial statements audit, and outline our plans to address these risks.

As with all audited bodies, we include a significant risk of management override of controls in the Audit Plan. We have assessed the implementation of the new Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system as an other risk. The risks are in respect of the impact on capacity for the compilation of the financial statements and the security of data upon the transfer to the new systems.

For 2014/15, we have again assessed financial resilience as a significant risk to the PCC's and CC's arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

As with other police bodies, we have classed PCC commissioning role as an other risk within the Office of the PCC given the level of sums at a budgeted £1.6 million now administered by the PCC's Office.

Based on our work in 2013/14 the following area no longer features as a significant risk in our audit plan:

- The presentation of the Group, PCC and CC accounts.

In parts three and four of this plan we provide more detail on the above areas and we outline our plans to address them. Our proposed audit process and strategy are summarised below and set out in more detail in section five.

We will provide an update to the Audit Committee on the results of our work in these areas in our report to those charged with governance scheduled for delivery in September 2015.

Our process and strategy

Financial statement audit

We consider materiality in terms of the possible impact of an error or omission on the financial statements and set an overall planning materiality level. We then set a tolerable error to reduce the probability that the aggregate of uncorrected and undetected misstatements exceeds planning materiality to an appropriately low level. We also assess each disclosure and consider qualitative issues affecting materiality as well as quantitative issues.

We will undertake walk through tests of the key controls and undertake substantive tests of transactions and amounts. To the fullest extent permissible by auditing standards, we will seek to rely on the work of internal audit wherever possible. As in prior years, we will review internal audit plans and the results of work undertaken.

There are no changes of personnel within our management team and the team will be responsible for auditing the Group financial statements and the PCC and CC components.

At present there are no new significant risks included within the 2014/15 Audit Plan. However, extra audit fees may arise through our work on:

- Reviewing savings plans to assess the robustness of the PCC's and CC's financial resilience; and

- Reviewing the assumptions within the PCC's Private Finance Initiative for the Police Investigation Centres. It is now three years since the previous auditors undertook this work and we will be seeking assistance from EY's technical experts.

Arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness

Our approach to the value for money (VFM) conclusion for Group, PCC and CC for 2014/15 is based on criteria specified by the Audit Commission relating to whether there are proper arrangements in place within the Group, PCC and CC for:

- Securing financial resilience.
- Challenging how the Group, PCC and CC secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

We adopt an integrated audit approach, so our work on the financial statement audit feeds into our consideration of the arrangements in place for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

Further detail is included in section 4 of this Audit Plan.

2. The Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014

The Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 (the 2014 Act) closes the Audit Commission and repeals the Audit Commission Act 1998.

The 2014 Act requires the Comptroller and Auditor General to prepare a Code of Audit Practice. This must be laid before Parliament and approved before 1 April 2015.

Although this new Code will apply from 1 April 2015, transitional provisions within the 2014 Act provide for the Audit Commission’s 2010 Code to continue to apply to audit work in respect of the 2014/15 financial year. This plan is therefore prepared on the basis of the continued application of the 2010 Code of Audit Practice throughout the 2014/15 audit.

3. Financial Statement risks

We outline below our assessment of the financial statement risks facing the Group, PCC and CC, identified through our knowledge of the Group's, PCC's and 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.	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.

Other financial statement risks	
Risk from Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) implementation	
Suffolk and Norfolk Constabularies are implementing the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system to support Human Resources, Duties, Finance, Procurement and Payroll. The ERP will assist joint working and improve the efficiency of support departments to enable savings to be realised. The system is due to start in April 2015. There are risks to capacity of the finance team for the production of the financial statement and for the transfer of legacy data.	Our approach will focus on: ► Reviewing Internal Audit's work on ERP and assessing the PCC's and CC's response; ► Monitoring the impact on the project for the compilation of the financial statements; and ► Reviewing the PCC's and CC's plans for securing the safe transfer of legacy data.

Respective responsibilities in relation to 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 fraud risks.

We will consider the results of the National Fraud Initiative and may refer to it in our reporting to you.

4. Economy, efficiency and effectiveness

Our approach to the value for money (VFM) conclusion for Group's, PCC's and CC's for 2014/15 is based on criteria specified by the Audit Commission relating to whether there are proper arrangements in place at the PCC and CC for securing:

1. Financial resilience, and

2. Economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources.

The Audit Commission VFM guidance for 2014/15 requires that auditors consider and assess the significant risks of giving a wrong conclusion and carry out as much work as is appropriate to enable them to give a safe conclusion on arrangements to secure VFM.

Our assessment of what is a significant risk is a matter of professional judgement, and is based on consideration of both quantitative and qualitative aspects of the subject matter in question.

For those significant risks identified by our risk assessment that are relevant to our VFM conclusion, where these risks will not be addressed by our financial statements audit work or work undertaken by the PCC and CC, Audit Commission or other review agency, we consider the need to undertake local VFM work.

The table below provides a high-level summary of our risk assessment and our proposed response to those risks.

Significant risks	Impacts arrangements for securing:	Our audit approach
Financial resilience		
The PCC and CC updated the Medium Term Financial Plan in January 2015 as part of the precept setting process for 2015/16. Dependent on whether a 2% Council Tax precept is levied or the Council Tax Freeze Grant is taken each year, a deficit before unidentified savings of between £7.4 million and £10.5 million is forecast by 31 March 2020. The deficit position itself is dependent upon the achievement of savings plans of £10.1 million during this period. If robust savings plans are not developed early in the process, there are increased and significant risks to the financial position and achievement of service delivery.	Economy, efficiency and effectiveness Financial resilience	Our approach will focus on: ► Considering the impact of any further amendments to the Medium Term Financial Plan during 2015; ► Considering any relevant work and findings from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary; ► Reviewing the robustness of savings planned arising from the Suffolk Policing Model; and ► Reviewing the robustness of savings plans arising from collaboration with Norfolk Constabulary and the other plans as detailed within the Medium Term Financial Plan.

We have also identified the following areas that we will focus on as part of our assessment.

PCC Commissioning		
In line with Section 143 (1) – (3) of the Anti - Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, a local policing body may provide for the provision of services that: • Will contribute to securing crime and disorder reduction in the body's area; • Are intended to help victims or witnesses of offences or ant-social behaviour; and • Are specified in an order made by the Secretary of State. The local policing body may make grants in connection with the arrangements which may be subject to any conditions that the body thinks appropriate. The MTFP records a PCC commissioning budget of £1.6 million for 2014/15 covering crime and disorder reduction grants, the Safer Suffolk Fund and the Ministry of Justice Competed Fund. The PCC for Suffolk has set out conditions for the awards of grants to organisations. The provision of funding and its governance represent new areas of work for the Office of the PCC. The PCC needs to ensure that arrangements are in place to provide the appropriate scrutiny of funds dispensed to ensure expenditure achieves intended outcomes.	Economy, efficiency and effectiveness	Our approach will focus on: ► Reviewing Internal Audit's work on Crime and Disorder Reduction Grants and assessing the PCC's and CC's response. ► Understanding and reviewing the arrangements the PCC's office are putting in place to provide appropriate scrutiny of funds and how these align with the PCC's business plan and strategic objectives.

We will keep our risk assessment under review throughout our audit and communicate to the Audit Committee any revisions to the specific risks identified here and any additional local risk-based work we may need to undertake as a result.

5. Our audit process and strategy

5.1 Objective and scope of our audit

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

- Financial statements; and
- Arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in their use of resources.

to the extent required by the relevant legislation and the requirements of the Code.

We issue a two-part audit report covering both of these objectives.

i) Financial statement audit

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

We will also review and report to the NAO on the Whole of Government Accounts return to the extent and in the form they require.

ii) Arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness

The Code sets out our responsibility to satisfy ourselves that the Group, PCC and CC have proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in their use of resources. In arriving at our conclusion, we will rely as far as possible on the reported results of the work of other statutory inspectorates on corporate or service performance.

In examining the PCC's and CC's corporate performance management and financial management arrangements, we consider the following criteria and areas of focus specified by the Audit Commission:

- Arrangements for securing financial resilience – whether the PCC and CC have robust systems and processes to manage financial risks and opportunities effectively, and to secure a stable financial position that enables them to continue to operate for the foreseeable future.
- Arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness - whether the PCC and CC are prioritising their resources within tighter budgets, for example by achieving cost reductions and by improving efficiency and productivity.

5.2 Audit process overview

The same audit team will be responsible for auditing the Group financial statements and the PCC and 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 other regulators (for example Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary) where appropriate; and

- Reliance on the work of experts in relation to areas such as pensions and valuations; and

Processes

We are not planning to rely on testing of key controls and will take a fully substantive approach to the audit as we believe this is the most efficient approach.

Analytics

We will use our computer-based analytics tools covering the General Ledger and Payroll 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; and

- 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 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 experts

We will use specialist EY resource as necessary to help us to form a view on judgments made in the financial statements. Our plan currently includes involving specialists in pensions, valuations and financial reporting in respect of the PCC's Private Finance Initiative.

In producing the financial statements, management will place reliance on the work undertaken by a small number of experts, including a professional valuer in relation to the valuation of property plant and equipment and an actuary in relation to the liability to the local government pension scheme administered by Suffolk County Council and the police pension fund. We anticipate being able to undertake sufficient procedures such that we will be able to place reliance on the work undertaken by management's experts.

We also anticipate relying on the work of the experts commissioned by the Audit Commission in respect of land and property values and the work undertaken by the pension scheme actuary appointed by Suffolk County Council.

We will utilise specialist Ernst & Young resource, as necessary, to help us to form a view on judgments made in the financial statements. Our plan currently includes the involvement of specialists in pensions, valuations and on the assumptions within the PCC's Private Finance Initiative covering the Police Investigation Centres.

Mandatory procedures required by auditing standards

As well as the financial statement risks outlined in 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; and
- ► Auditor independence.

Procedures required by the Code

- ► Reviewing, and reporting on as appropriate, other information published with the financial statements, including the Annual Governance Statement and the Remuneration Report
- ► Reviewing and reporting on the Whole of Government Accounts return, in line with the instructions issued by the NAO; and
- ► Reviewing and examining, where appropriate, evidence relevant to the PCC's and CC's corporate performance management and financial management arrangements, and their reporting on these arrangements.

5.3 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 CC is £3.7 million and £3.5 million respectively based on 2% of Gross Revenue Expenditure.

Overall materiality for the PCC is £1.9 million based on 2% of Gross Assets. Overall materiality for the Police Pension Fund is £0.6 million based on 2% of Benefits Payable.

We will communicate uncorrected audit misstatements to you greater than of £187,000 (PCC Group), £175,000 (CC single entity), £97,000 (PCC single entity) and £29,000 (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.

5.4 Fees

The Audit Commission has published a scale fee for all authorities. This is defined as the fee required by auditors to meet statutory responsibilities under the Audit Commission Act in accordance with the Code of Audit Practice 2010. The indicative fee scale for the audit of the PCC is £42,310 and for the audit of the CC is £20,000.

However, extra audit fees may arise through our work on:

- Any risk based reviews of savings plans to assess the robustness of the PCC's and CC's financial resilience; and
- Reviewing the assumptions within the PCC's Private Finance Initiative for the Police Investigation Centres. It is now three years since the previous auditors undertook this work and we will be seeking assistance from EY's technical experts.

5.5 Your audit team

The engagement team is led by Neil Harris, who has significant experience on the audit of Suffolk PCC, Suffolk CC and former the Suffolk Police Authority. Neil Harris is supported by Chris Hewitt who is responsible for the day-to-day direction of audit work, and who is the key point of contact for the Chief Finance Officer. Jo Heal will supervise the on-site audit team, is the key point of contact for the finance team and is responsible for raising and discussing emerging issues with officers.

5.6 Timetable of communication, deliverables and insights

We have set out below a timetable showing the key stages of the audit, including the VFM work and the Whole of Government Accounts. The timetable includes the deliverables we have agreed to provide to the PCC and CC through the Audit Committee's cycle in 2014/15. These dates are determined to ensure our alignment with the Audit Commission's rolling calendar of deadlines.

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

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

Audit phase	Timetable	Committee timetable	Deliverables
High level planning:	April 2014	June 2014	Audit Fee Letter
Risk assessment and setting of scopes	January – March 2015	March 2015	Audit Plan
Testing of routine processes and controls	January - March 2015	June 2015	Interim results report (if appropriate)
Completion of audit	July – September 2015	September 2015	Report to those charged with governance via the Audit Results Report Audit report (including our opinion on the financial statements and a conclusion as to whether the Group, PCC and CC have put in place proper arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in their use of resources). Audit completion certificate Reporting to the NAO on the Whole of Government Accounts return
Conclusion of reporting	October 2015	November 2015	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.

6. Independence

6.1 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 Audit Commission’s Standing Guidance 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.

6.2 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 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 CC have approved and that are in compliance with the Audit Commission's Standing Guidance.

At the time of writing, we are not planning to undertake and non-audit services work.

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 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 Director and the audit engagement team have not been compromised.

6.3 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 27 June 2014 and can be found here:

http://www.ey.com/UK/en/About-us/EY-UK-Transparency-Report-2014

Appendix A Fees

A breakdown of our agreed fee is shown below.

	Planned Fee 2014/15 £	Out-turn 2013/14 £	Published fee 2013/14 £	Explanation
The Office of Police and Crime Commissioner for Suffolk	42,310	43,822	42,310	Management and the Audit Commission agreed a scale fee variation increase of £1,512 in 2013/14 as regards work on financial resilience.
The Chief Constable for Suffolk Constabulary	20,000	23,780	20,000	Management and the Audit Commission agreed a scale fee variation increase of £3,780 in 2013/14 as regards work on financial resilience.
Total Audit Fee – Code work Opinion Audit and VFM Conclusion	**62,310**	**67,602**	**62,310**	

All fees exclude VAT.

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

- Officers meeting the agreed timetable of deliverables;
- We can rely on the work of internal audit as planned;
- The Audit Commission making no significant changes to the use of resources criteria on which our conclusion will be based;
- Our accounts opinion and use of resources conclusion being unqualified;
- Appropriate quality of documentation is provided by the PCC and CC. and
- The PCC and CC have 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's and CC's Chief Finance 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.

However, extra audit fees may arise through our work on:

- Any risk based reviews of savings plans to assess the robustness of the PCC's and CC's financial resilience; and
- Reviewing the assumptions within the PCC's Private Finance Initiative for the Police Investigation Centres. It is now three years since the previous auditors undertook this work and we may seek assistance from EY's technical experts.

Appendix B UK required communications with those charged with governance

There are certain communications that we must provide to the 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	► Report to those charged with governance
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	► Report to those charged with governance
Fraud ► Enquiries of the 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	► Report to those charged with governance
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	► Report to those charged with governance
External confirmations ► Management's refusal for us to request confirmations ► Inability to obtain relevant and reliable audit evidence from other procedures	► Report to those charged with governance

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 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 Audit Committee may be aware of	► Report to those charged with governance
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 ► Report to those charged with governance
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	► Report to those charged with governance
Significant deficiencies in internal controls identified during the audit	► Report to those charged with governance
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 ► Report to those charged with governance ► Annual Audit Letter
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 ► 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 ► Report to those charged with governance ► Annual Audit Letter if considered necessary

Appendix C Detailed Scopes

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

We set audit scopes for each reporting unit which together enable us to form an opinion on the group accounts. We take into account the size, risk profile, changes in the business environment and other factors when assessing the level of work to be performed at each reporting unit.

- Full scope: locations deemed significant based on size and those with significant risk factors are subject to a full scope audit, covering all significant accounts and processes using materiality levels assigned by the EY Cambridge audit team for the purposes of the consolidated audit. Procedures are full-scope in nature, but may not be sufficient to issue a stand-alone audit opinion on the local statutory financial statements (as materiality thresholds support to the consolidated audit).

- Specific scope: locations where only specific procedures are performed by the local audit team, based upon procedures, accounts or assertions identified by the EY Cambridge audit team.

- Limited Scope: limited scope procedures primarily consist of enquiries of management and analytical review. On-site or desk top reviews may be performed, according to our assessment of risk.

ISA 600 (UK and Ireland) requires that we provide you with an overview of the nature of our planned involvement in the work to be performed by the component auditors of significant locations/reporting units. Our involvement can be summarised as follows:

We will undertake a full scope audit on the PCC and CC accounts. The same audit team will be responsible for auditing the Group financial statements and the PCC and CC components.