**Appendix 2**

**PROCUREMENT OF EXTERNAL AUDIT from financial year 2023/24**

**FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS provided by the LGA**

“Were prices set too low in the current contract?”

It is clear that firms did submit bids that reflected what seemed at the time to be very stable market conditions. Unfortunately, a series of financial collapses in the private sector have since created a very different climate and resulted in a whole series of new regulatory pressures.  It is very likely that firms thought they could make savings as a result of the new timetable, essentially finishing the accounts audits by the end of July each year. Of course, that is not what has happened.

The Government opened up the market principally on the argument that costs would reduce, and views were mixed in the sector when the first contract was being let. Some councils wanted more savings and some were worried about reduced standards.

“Has the current contract helped cause these issues?”

Since the current contract is based around the Code of Audit Practice and the local government accounting code, this is unlikely.  The first year of the new contract coincided with the introduction of new standards and with the emergence of some difficult audit issues such as the McCloud judgement (a legal case which affected the valuation of pension liabilities). The second year was affected by COVID-19.  This laid bare the lack of capacity in the supplier side of the market and led to considerable delays.  It is hard to see how the contract could have pre-empted this, but now we are clearer about the level of uncertainty in the system, the next contract can adjust for it.

“If we let our own contract, could we have more influence over auditors?”

No. The auditors are required to be independent and are bound by the Codes and need to deliver to them in line with the regulator’s expectations or face action under the regulatory framework.

As far as delays in audits is concerned, auditors are required to allocate resources according to risk and councils that procure for themselves will find themselves in the same queue as those within the national arrangement.

“If we let our own contract, can we get the auditors to prioritise our audit over others?”

Very unlikely. Auditors are running at full capacity and have to deploy resources according to their assessment of audit risks in accordance with professional standards.  It is very unlikely that auditors could give preference to some clients rather than others even if they wanted to.

“Didn’t we used to get more from our auditors?”

Yes we did.  For example, auditors were often prepared to provide training to audit committees on a pro-bono basis.  The fact that they used to be with us for most of the year meant officers could develop professional working relationships with auditors and they understood us better, within the boundaries required of their independent status.   Auditors no longer have the capacity to do extra work and the light shone on audit independence in other sectors of the economy has reinforced the rules on the way auditors and councils work together.

“Under the national framework we have had to negotiate our own fee variations. Will that continue to be the case?”

Unfortunately, virtually all councils have had to engage in discussions with auditors about fee variations linked to new regulatory requirements and, of course, the challenges of COVID-19. PSAA has worked hard with MHCLG to enable the recent consultation on changes to the fee setting regime, and the resulting regulatory change will bring scope for more issues to be settled at a national level in future.

“Can we band together in joint procurements to get most of the benefits of not going it alone?”

We understand that this is lawful.  However, joint procurement partners would not be part of PSAA’s efforts on behalf of the sector to increase the number of firms competing in the market, which will therefore be less likely to succeed.

At best, joint procurement spreads the pain of procuring over a larger number of councils and at worst it introduces a new layer of bureaucracy, because someone is going to have to take the lead and bring all the members of the consortium along.   It’s not altogether clear to us why a joint procurement would be better than the national contract, especially as the consortium would then have to manage the contract throughout its life (for example, the implications of changes of audit scope).