Bolsover District Council

January 2017

Contents

The contacts at KPMG in connection with this report are:

Tony Crawley Director

KPMG LLP (UK)

Tel: 0116 256 6067 tony.crawley@kpmg.co.uk

Kay Meats Manager

KPMG LLP (UK)

Tel: 0782 482 1375 kay.meats@kpmg.co.uk

	•
Headlines	3
Fees	4
Recommendations	5
Prior year recommendations	7

This report is addressed to the Authority and has been prepared for the sole use of the Authority. We take no responsibility to any member of staff acting in their individual capacities, or to third parties. Public Sector Audit Appointments issued a document entitled Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and Audited Bodies summarising where the responsibilities of auditors begin and end and what is expected from audited bodies. We draw your attention to this document which is available on Public Sector Audit Appointment's website (www.psaa.co.uk).

Page

External auditors do not act as a substitute for the audited body's own responsibility for putting in place proper arrangements to ensure that public business is conducted in accordance with the law and proper standards, and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for, and used economically, efficiently and effectively.

We are committed to providing you with a high quality service. If you have any concerns or are dissatisfied with any part of KPMG's work, in the first instance you should contact Tony Crawley, the engagement lead to the Authority, who will try to resolve your complaint. If you are dissatisfied with your response please contact the national lead partner for all of KPMG's work under our contract with Public Sector Audit Appointments Limited, Andrew Sayers (andrew.sayers@kpmg.co.uk). After this, in relation to the certification of the Housing Benefit Subsidy grant claim, if you are still dissatisfied with how your complaint has been handled you can access PSAA's complaints procedure by emailing generalenquiries@psaa.co.uk, by telephoning 020 7072 7445 or by writing to Public Sector Audit Appointments Limited, 3rd Floor, Local Government House, Smith Square, London, SW1P 3HZ.



© 2016 KPMG LLP, a UK limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.

Headlines

Introduction and background

This report summarises the results of work we have carried out on the Council's 2015/16 grant claims and returns.

This includes the work we have completed under the Public Sector Audit Appointment certification arrangements, as well as the work we have completed on other grants/returns under separate engagement terms. The work completed in 2015/16 is:

- Under the Public Sector Audit Appointments arrangements we certified one claim
 - the Council's 2015/16 Housing Benefit Subsidy claim. This had a value of £22,206,058.
- Under separate assurance engagements we certified one claim as listed below.
 - Pooling of Housing Capital Receipts. This had a value of £1,348,165.

Certification and assurance results (Page 3)

Our certification work on Housing Subsidy Benefit claim included:

- agreeing standard rates, such as for allowances and benefit incomes, to the DWP Circular communicating the value of each rate for the year;
- sample testing of benefit claims to confirm that the entitlement had been correctly calculated and was supported by appropriate evidence;
- undertaking an analytical review of the claim form considering year-on-year variances and key ratios;
- confirming that the subsidy claim had been prepared using the correct benefits system version; and
- completing testing in relation to modified schemes payments, uncashed cheques and verifying the accurate completion of the claim form.

Following the completion of our work, the claim was subject to a qualification letter.

The reasons for the qualification were as follows:

- Incorrect State Retirement Pension (SRP) income figures used in the calculation of benefit;
- Incorrect earned income figures used in the calculation of benefit; and
- Incorrect classification of overpayments as claimant error instead of LA error.

These results were a slight deterioration on than last year given the additional work required to be undertaken in respect of the misclassification of overpayments.

Our work on the other grant assurance engagements did not result in a qualification or amendment of the return.

One adjustment was necessary to the Housing Subsidy Benefit claim as a result of our certification work this year.

 An amendment was made to modified schemes as a result of a misclassification of expenditure. The value of the amendment was £843.

No such issues were identified in the previous year.

Recommendations (Pages 5 – 7)

We have made 3 recommendations to the Council from our work this year and agreed an action plan with officers.

In addition there were two recommendations outstanding from our previous year's work on grants and returns. These issues have remained in 2015/16.

Fees (Page 4)

Our indicative fee for certifying the Council's 2015/16 Housing Benefit Subsidy grant was £7,670. The actual proposed fee for this work is £8,430 which is subject to determination by the PSAA.

Our fees for the other 'assurance' engagements were subject to agreement directly with the Council and was £3,000 in respect of Pooling of Housing Capital Receipts.



© 2016 KPMG LLP, a UK limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International") a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.

Fees

Our fees for the Housing Benefit Subsidy claim are set by Public Sector Audit Appointments.

Our fees for other assurance engagements on grants/returns are agreed directly with the Council.

The overall fees we charged for carrying out all our work on grants/returns in 2015/16 was £11,430.

Public Sector Audit Appointments certification arrangements

Public Sector Audit Appointments set an indicative fee for our work on the Council's Housing Benefit Subsidy claim in 2015/16 of £7,670. Our proposed fee is higher at £8,430, and this compares to the 2014/15 fee for this claim of £8,980.

The main reasons for the fee exceeding the original estimate were:

- Additional sample testing required in respect of the misclassifications of overpayments;
- Additional work required to confirm the cell amendments relating to the misclassification of expenditure on modified schemes; and
- Assistance provided in the accurate completion of the workbooks and generation of summaries required for submission to the PSAA.

Grants subject to other assurance engagements

The fees for our assurance work on other grants/returns are agreed directly with the Council. Our final fees for 2015/16 were £3,000, in line with those in 2014/15.

Breakdown of fees for grants and returns work

Breakdown of fee by grant/return								
	2015/16 (£)	2014/15 (£)						
Housing Benefit Subsidy claim	8,430	8,980						
Pooling of Housing Capital Receipts	3,000	3,000						
Total fee	11,430	11,980						



Recommendations

We have given each recommendation a risk rating and agreed what action management will need to take.

2

Priority rating for recommendations

Issues that are fundamental and material to your overall arrangements for managing grants and returns or compliance with scheme requirements. We believe that these issues might mean that you do not meet a grant scheme requirement or reduce (mitigate) a risk.

Issues that have an important effect on your arrangements for managing grants and returns or complying with scheme requirements, but do not need immediate action. You may still meet scheme requirements in full or in part or reduce (mitigate) a risk adequately but the weakness remains in the system. Issues that would, if corrected, improve your arrangements for managing grants and returns or compliance with scheme requirements in general, but are not vital to the overall system. These are generally issues of best practice that we feel would benefit you if you introduced them.

Issue	Implication	Rec	ommendation	Priority	Comment	Responsible officer and target date		
Housing Benefit Subsidy Claim								
SRP Income Our sample testing identified that the Council has used incorrect SRP income figures in the calculation of benefits. This issue was also identified in the previous year – refer to page 7.	The use of incorrect SRP income figures resulted in the wrong amount of benefits being paid to claimants. If benefit is overpaid, this results in a necessity for the claimant to repay overpaid benefit back to the Council. It also reduces the amount of subsidy which the Council receives. If benefit is underpaid then the claimant is not receiving the full amount of benefit to which they are entitled. The Council can not claim subsidy on benefit which has not been paid.	1	Training should be provided to all benefit assessors to ensure that the correct figures are being identified for SRP.	2				



© 2016 KPMG LLP, a UK limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.

Recommendations (cont.)

Issue	Implication	Rec	ommendation	Priority	Comment	Responsible officer and target date	
Housing Benefit Subsidy Claim							
Earned Income Our sample testing identified that the Council has used incorrect earned income figures in the calculation of benefits. This issue was also identified in the previous year – refer to page 7.	The use of incorrect earned income figures resulted in the wrong amount of benefits being paid to claimants. If benefit is overpaid, this results in a necessity for the claimant to repay overpaid benefit back to the Council. It also reduces the amount of subsidy which the Council receives. If benefit is underpaid then the claimant is not receiving the full amount of benefit to which they are entitled. The Council can not claim subsidy on benefit which has not been paid.	2	Training should be provided to all benefit assessors to ensure that they know how to calculate earned income correctly.	2			
Overpayment Misclassification Our sample testing identified that the Council had misclassified LA errors as claimant errors on the subsidy claim form.	The Council is not entitled to receive subsidy on LA error overpayments but does receive subsidy at 40% on claimant errors which are classed as eligible overpayments. This misclassification of the overpayments has meant that the Council has received more subsidy than it was entitled to.	3	Training should be provided to all benefit assessors to ensure they know when an overpayment should be classified as claimant error and when it should be classified as LA error.	2			



Annual report on grants and returns 2015/16 Prior year recommendations

We made two recommendations in our 2014/15 Certification of Grants and Returns Annual Report. Where recommendations have not yet been implemented fully we have detailed their current status below.

Pri	or year recommendation	Priority	Status as at November 2016	Management comments
Но	using Benefit Subsidy Claim			
1	SRP Income		Further work was undertaken in 2015/16 to test the accuracy of SRP income figures used	
	Our sample testing identified that the Council has used incorrect figures in the calculation of benefits.	2	in benefit calculations. Similar issues were identified which were reported in the gualification letter.	
	Training should be provided to all benefit assessors to ensure that the correct figures are being identified for SRP.			
2	Earned Income		Further work was undertaken in 2015/16 to	
	Our sample testing identified that the Council has used incorrect earned income figures in the calculation of benefits.	2	test the accuracy of earned income figures used in benefit calculations. Similar issues were identified which were reported in the qualification letter.	
	Training should be provided to all benefit assessors to ensure that they know how to calculate earned income correctly.			





kpmg.com/uk



© 2016 KPMG LLP, a UK limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.

The KPMG name and logo are registered trademarks or trademarks of KPMG International. | CREATE: CRT070784A

Document Classification: KPMG Confidential