




# Telford and Wrekin Council

**Draft** Report to the Audit Committee

External Audit plan and strategy for the year ending 31  
March 2026

—

April 2026



# Introduction

## To the Audit Committee of Telford and Wrekin Council

We are pleased to have the opportunity to meet with you on 27 May 2026 to discuss our audit of the consolidated financial statements of Telford and Wrekin Council, as at and for the year ending 31 March 2026.

This report provides the Audit Committee with an opportunity to review our planned audit approach and scope for the 2025/26 audit. The audit is governed by the provisions of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 and is carried out in compliance with the NAO's 2024 Code of Audit Practice, auditing standards and other professional requirements.

This report outlines our initial risk assessment and planned audit approach. Our planning activities are still ongoing, and we will communicate any significant changes to the planned audit approach subsequently.

We provide this report to you in advance of the meeting to allow you sufficient time to consider the key matters and formulate your questions.

Contents	Page
Overview of planned scope including materiality	3
Significant risks and Other audit risks	5
Audit Risks and our audit approach including Going concern	6
Mandatory communications	13
Appendix	18

## The engagement team

Richard Walton is the engagement director on the audit. He has 22 years of experience Local audit experience. He shall lead the engagement and is responsible for the audit opinion.

Other key members of the engagement team include Liz Gardiner (Lead Manager) Arpit Sarraf (Manager) and Avika Dhingra (In charge) with 10 years ,13 years and 6 years of experience respectively.

Yours sincerely,



Richard Walton

30 April 2026

### Restrictions on distribution

This report is intended solely for the information of those charged with governance of the Telford and Wrekin Council and the report is provided on the basis that it should not be distributed to other parties; that it will not be quoted or referred to, in whole or in part, without our prior written consent; and that we accept no responsibility to any third party in relation to it.

## How we deliver audit quality

Audit quality is at the core of everything we do at KPMG and we believe that it is not just about reaching the right opinion, but how we reach that opinion. We consider risks to the quality of our audit in our engagement risk assessment and planning discussions.

We define 'audit quality' as being the outcome when :

- An audit is executed consistently, in line with the requirements and intent of applicable professional standards within a strong system of quality controls; and
- All of our related activities are undertaken in an environment of the utmost level of objectivity, independence, ethics and integrity.

We depend on well-planned timing of our audit work to avoid compromising the quality of the audit. This is also heavily dependent on receiving information from management and those charged with governance in a timely manner.

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 Richard Walton (Richard.Walton@KPMG.co.uk) the engagement lead to the Authority, who will try to resolve your complaint. If you are dissatisfied with the response, please contact the national lead partner for all of KPMG's work under our contract with Public Sector Audit Appointments Limited, Tim Cutler ([tim.culter@kpmg.co.uk](mailto:tim.culter@kpmg.co.uk)). After this, if you are still dissatisfied with how your complaint has been handled you can raise your complaint as per the following process [Complaints](#).

# Overview of planned scope including materiality

## Our materiality levels

We determined materiality for the consolidated financial statements at a level which could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements. We used a benchmark of expenditure which we consider to be appropriate given the sector in which the entity operates, its ownership and financing structure, and the focus of users.

We considered qualitative factors such as stability of legislation, lack of shareholders when determining materiality for the financial statements as a whole.

To respond to aggregation risk from individually immaterial misstatements, we design our procedures to detect misstatements at a lower level of materiality £9.1m / 65% of materiality driven by our expectations of increased level of undetected or uncorrected misstatements in the period. We also adjust this level further downwards for items that may be of specific interest to users for qualitative reasons

We will report misstatements to the audit committee including:

- Corrected and uncorrected audit misstatements above £700k
- Errors and omissions in disclosure (Corrected and uncorrected) and the effect that they, individually and in aggregate, may have on our opinion.
- Other misstatements we include due to the nature of the item.

## Control environment

The impact of the group control environment on our audit is reflected in our planned audit procedures. Our planned audit procedures reflect findings raised in the previous year and management's response to those findings.

## Group Materiality

	Group
Materiality for the consolidated financial statements as a whole	<b>£14.0m</b> (2024-25: £13.3m 2.18% of Expenditure)
Performance materiality	<b>£9.1m</b> (2024-25: £8.7m), 65% of Materiality
Misstatements reported to the audit committee	<b>£700k</b> (2024/25: £665k)

## Council's Materiality

**£11m**  
2.21% of Telford and Wrekin Council Expenditure  
(2024-25: £10.2m)



# Overview of planned scope including materiality (cont.)

## Timing of our audit and communications

We will maintain communication led by the engagement director and senior manager throughout the audit. We set out below the form, timing and general content of our planned communications:

- Kick-off meeting with management in May 2026 where we present our draft audit plan outlining our audit approach and discuss management's progress in key areas.
- Audit committee meeting in July 2026 where we present our final audit plan.
- Status meetings with management between April and October where we communicate progress on the audit plan, any misstatements, control deficiencies and significant issues.
- Closing meeting with management in October 2026 where we discuss the auditor's report and any outstanding deliverables.
- Audit committee meeting in November 2026 where we communicate audit misstatements and significant control deficiencies.
- Biannual private meetings can also be arranged with the Committee chair if there is interest.

## Using the work of others and areas requiring specialised skill

We outline below where, in our planned audit response to audit risks, we expect to use the work of others such as Internal Audit or require specialised skill/knowledge to perform planned audit procedures and evaluate results.

Others	Extent of planned involvement or use of work
<b>Internal Audit</b>	We will review the work of Internal Audit as part of our risk assessment procedures but will not place direct reliance on their work.
<b>KPMG IT Audit</b>	We will use our IT Audit team to understand how the Council uses IT in financial reporting, and the key processes and governance in place over those IT systems.
<b>KPMG Pensions Centre of Excellence</b>	The pensions audit team will perform all planning, risk assessment, and substantive procedures over the LGPS account balances. KPMG actuary will review and assess the underlying assumptions within the entity's year-end actuarial report.
<b>KPMG Clara Analytics</b>	We will utilise the KPMG Data Analytics team to aid in creating a journal entry dashboard that provides insights over manual and automated journals, helps in pattern identification and stratification of the population thus helping the audit team in identifying high risk criteria to mitigate the risk of management override.

# Significant risks and Other audit risks

Our risk assessment draws upon our understanding of the applicable financial reporting framework, knowledge of the business, the industry and the wider economic environment in which Telford and Wrekin Council operates.

We also use our regular meetings with senior management to update our understanding and take input from sector and internal audit reports.

Due to the current levels of uncertainty, there is an increased likelihood of significant risks emerging throughout the audit cycle that are not identified (or in existence) at the time we planned our audit. Where such items are identified we will amend our audit approach accordingly and communicate this to the Audit Committee.

## Value for money

We are required to provide commentary on the arrangements in place for ensuring Value for Money is achieved at the Council and report on this via our Auditor's Annual Report. This will be published on the Council's website and will include a commentary on our view of the appropriateness of the Council's arrangements against each of the three specified domains of Value for Money: financial sustainability; governance; and improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

We have outlined the methodology for the VFM risk assessment and will provide our detailed risk assessment on VFM separately.


### Significant risks

1. Valuation of Investment property
2. Management override of Controls
3. Valuation of post retirement benefit obligation

### Other audit risk

4. Valuation of land and buildings

Key: # Significant financial statement audit risks  
# Other audit risk



# Audit risks and our audit approach

## 1 Valuation of Investment property

The carrying amount of revalued Investment properties differs materially from the fair value

Change vs prior year



### Significant audit risk

The Code defines an investment property as one that is used solely to earn rentals or for capital appreciation or both. Property that is used to facilitate the delivery of services or production of goods as well as to earn rentals or for capital appreciation does not meet the definition of an investment property.

During 2024/25, the authority has completed a review of the property assets it holds and has determined that a number of individual sites meet CIPFA's definition of Investment Property. The fair value of investment properties recorded in the signed 24/25 financial statements was £48.763m (£46.575m FY23/24).

There is a risk that investment properties are not being held at fair value, as is required by the Code. At each reporting period, the valuation of the investment property must reflect market conditions. Significant judgement is required to assess fair value and management experts are often engaged to undertake the valuations.



### Planned response

We will perform the following procedures designed to specifically address the significant risk associated with the valuation:

- We will critically assess the independence, objectivity and expertise of Estate and Investment council's internal valuers used in developing the valuation of the Council's investment property at 31 March 2026;
- We will inspect the instructions issued to the valuers to verify they are appropriate to produce a valuation consistent with the requirements of the CIPFA Code.
- We will compare the accuracy of the data provided to the valuers for the development of the valuation to underlying information;
- We will evaluate the design and implementation of controls in place for management to review the valuation and the appropriateness of assumptions used;
- We will challenge the appropriateness of the valuation; including any material movements from the previous revaluations. We will challenge key assumptions within the valuation as part of our judgement;
- We will agree the calculations performed of the movements and verify that these have been accurately accounted for in line with the requirements of the CIPFA Code;
- Disclosures: We will consider the adequacy of the disclosures concerning the key judgements and degree of estimation involved in arriving at the valuation.

# Audit risks and our audit approach (cont.)

## 2 Management override of controls

Fraud risk related to unpredictable way management override of controls may occur

Change vs prior year



### Significant audit risk

Professional standards require us to communicate the fraud risk from management override of controls as significant.

Management is in a unique position to perpetrate fraud because of their ability to manipulate accounting records and prepare fraudulent financial statements by overriding controls that otherwise appear to be operating effectively.

We have not identified any specific additional risks of management override relating to this audit.



### Planned response

Our audit methodology incorporates the risk of management override as a default significant risk.

- Assess accounting estimates for biases by evaluating whether judgements and decisions in making accounting estimates, even if individually reasonable, indicate a possible bias.
- Evaluate the selection and application of accounting policies.
- In line with our methodology, evaluate the design and implementation of controls over journal entries and post closing adjustments.
- Assess the appropriateness of changes compared to the prior year to the methods and underlying assumptions used to prepare accounting estimates.
- Assess the business rationale and the appropriateness of the accounting for significant transactions that are outside the component's normal course of business or are otherwise unusual.
- In line with our audit plan, test post closing adjustments.
- Make inquiries of individuals involved in the financial reporting process about inappropriate or unusual activity relating to the processing of journal entries and other adjustments.
- Identify journal entries and other adjustments with characteristics that indicate that they may be inappropriate or unauthorised and therefore may have been used to manipulate the financial statements (which we refer to as 'high-risk journals and other adjustments'), using KPMG Clara Journal Entry Analysis and perform procedures to test the appropriateness of these entries and adjustments.

Note: (a) Significant risk that professional standards require us to assess in all cases.

# Audit risks and our audit approach (cont.)

## 3 Valuation of post retirement benefit obligations

An inappropriate amount is estimated and recorded for the defined benefit obligation

Change vs prior year



### Significant audit risk

The valuation of the post retirement benefit obligations involves the selection of appropriate actuarial assumptions, most notably the discount rate applied to the scheme liabilities, inflation rates and mortality rates. The selection of these assumptions is inherently subjective and small changes in the assumptions and estimates used to value the Council's pension liability could have a significant effect on the financial position of the Council.

The actuary will take account of the results of the new Triennial Valuation as at 31 March 2025 for accounting at 31 March 2026. This means re-basing their estimate models to allow for actual experience since March 2022, which could result in corrections to the defined benefit obligation and asset valuations this year. It also updates the contributions payable, which could have an impact on the assessment of the asset ceiling applying to the Council.

The effect of these matters is that, as part of our risk assessment, we determined that post retirement benefits obligation has a high degree of estimation uncertainty. The financial statements disclose the assumptions used by the Council in completing the year end valuation of the pension deficit and the year-on-year movements.



### Planned response


We will perform the following procedures:

- Understand the processes the Councils has in place to set the assumptions used in the valuation;
- Evaluate the competency, objectivity of the actuaries to confirm their qualifications and the basis for their calculations;
- Perform inquiries of the accounting actuaries to assess the methodology and key assumptions made, including actual figures where estimates have been used by the actuaries, such as the rate of return on pension fund assets;
- Agree the data provided by the audited entity to the Scheme Administrator for use within the calculation of the scheme valuation;
- Evaluate the design and implementation of controls in place for the Council to determine the appropriateness of the assumptions used by the actuaries in valuing the liability.
- Challenge, with the support of our own actuarial specialists, the key assumptions applied, being the discount rate, inflation rate and mortality/life expectancy against externally derived data;
- Confirm that the accounting treatment and entries applied by the Council are in line with IFRS and the CIPFA Code of Practice;
- Consider the adequacy of the Council's disclosures in respect of the sensitivity of the deficit to these assumptions;

# Audit risks and our audit approach (cont.)

## 3 Valuation of post retirement benefit obligations- continued

An inappropriate amount is estimated and recorded for the defined benefit obligation

Change vs prior year 



### Significant audit risk

We have identified this in relation to the following pension scheme memberships: Local Government Pension Scheme

Also, recent changes to market conditions have meant that more councils are finding themselves moving into surplus in their Local Government Pension Scheme (or surpluses have grown and have become material). The requirements of the accounting standards on recognition of these surplus are complicated and requires actuarial involvement.



### Planned response

We will perform the following procedures:

- Consider the adequacy of the Council's disclosures in light of the updated information and change of contributions following the completion of the funding valuation and assess the sensitivity of the deficit or surplus to the assumptions made.
- Assess the level of surplus that should be recognised by the entity; and
- Assess the impact of special events, if any.

# Audit risks and our audit approach

## Expenditure – rebuttal of Significant Risk

Practice Note 10 states that the risk of material misstatement due to fraudulent financial reporting from the manipulation of expenditure recognition is required to be considered. Having considered the risk factors relevant to the Council and the nature of expenditure within the Council, we have determined that a significant risk relating to expenditure recognition is not required.

Specifically, the financial position of the Council (whilst under pressure) is not indicative of a position that would provide an incentive to manipulate expenditure recognition, and the nature of expenditure has not identified any specific risk factors.

Due to the pressures on the financial position across the sector and our ongoing risk assessment, we may revisit our conclusion on this in the future. If there are any changes to our assessment, we will update the Audit Committee with a revised audit plan.

# Audit risks and our audit approach

## 4 Valuation of land and buildings– rolling programme

The carrying amount of revalued Land & Buildings differs materially from the fair value

Change vs prior year ▼



### Other audit risk

The Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the UK 2025/26 ('the Code') has introduced changes to asset revaluation. The Code requires revaluations for each class of PPE are undertaken using one of the following:

- A quinquennial revaluation, supplemented by annual indexation in intervening years.
- A rolling programme of revaluations over a five-year cycle, with annual indexation applied to assets during the intervening four years.

The Authority has adopted a rolling revaluation model which sees all land and buildings revalued over a five-year cycle and indexation in the intervening years.

This creates an elevated risk that the carrying value of assets not revalued in year differs materially from the year end current value as the indexation applied is not appropriate.

A further risk is presented for those assets that are revalued in year as valuations are inherently judgmental and there is a risk of error that the assumptions are not appropriate or correctly applied.

We will review this business process at the end of the year to ensure the risk is still suitable based on year-end figures.



### Planned response

We will perform the following procedures designed to specifically address the elevated risk associated with the assets revalued in year:

- We will critically assess the independence, objectivity and expertise of the council's internal valuers used in developing the valuation of the Council's properties at 31 March 2026;
- We will inspect the instructions issued to the valuers for the valuation of land and buildings to verify they are appropriate to produce a valuation consistent with the requirements of the CIPFA Code.
- We will compare the accuracy of the data provided to the valuers for the development of the valuation to underlying information;
- We will evaluate the design and implementation of controls in place for management to review the valuation and the appropriateness of assumptions used;
- We will challenge the appropriateness of the valuation of land and buildings; including any material movements from the previous revaluations. We will challenge key assumptions within the valuation as part of our judgement;
- We will agree the calculations performed of the movements in value of land and buildings and verify that these have been accurately accounted for in line with the requirements of the CIPFA Code;
- Disclosures: We will consider the adequacy of the disclosures concerning the key judgements and degree of estimation involved in arriving at the valuation.

We will also perform audit procedures in response to the risk of material error arising from the application of indexation, however we consider the risk of error to be lower than the risk for buildings being subject to valuation.

# Audit risks and our audit approach

## Revenue – Rebuttal of Significant Risk

Professional standards require us to presume, unless rebutted, that the fraud risk from revenue recognition is a significant risk. Due to the nature of the revenue within the sector we have rebutted this significant risk. We have set out the rationale for the rebuttal of key types of income in the table below.

Description of Income	Nature of Income	Rationale for Rebuttal
<b>Council tax</b>	This is the income received from local residents paid in accordance with an annual bill based on the banding of the property concerned.	The income is highly predictable and is broadly known at the beginning of the year, due to the number of properties in the area and the fixed price that is approved annually based on a band D property: it is highly unlikely for this balance to be subject to fraudulent financial manipulation.
<b>Business rates</b>	Revenue received from local businesses paid in accordance with an annual demand based on the rateable value of the business concerned.	The income is highly predictable and is broadly known at the beginning of the year, due to the number of businesses in the area and the fixed amount that is approved annually: it is highly unlikely for this balance to be subject to fraudulent financial manipulation.
<b>Fees and charges</b>	Revenue recognised from receipt of fixed fee services, in line with the fees and charges schedules agreed and approved annually.	The income stream represents high volume, low value sales, with simple recognition. Fees and charges values are agreed annually. We do not deem there to be any incentive or opportunity to manipulate the income.
<b>Grant income</b>	Predictable income receipted primarily from central government, including for housing benefits.	Grant income at a local authority typically involves a small number of high value items and an immaterial residual population. These high value items frequently have simple recognition criteria and can be traced easily to third party documentation, most often from central government source data. There is limited incentive or opportunity to manipulate these figures.



# Mandatory communications - additional reporting

## Going concern






We will assess the risk relating to management’s judgement on the use (or otherwise) of the going concern basis and the adequacy of related disclosures, including any possible material uncertainty. Under NAO guidance, including Practice Note 10 - A local authority’s financial statements shall be prepared on a going concern basis; this is, the accounts should be prepared on the assumption that the functions of the authority will continue in operational existence for the foreseeable future. Transfers of services under combinations of public sector bodies (such as local government reorganization) do not negate the presumption of going concern. However, financial sustainability is a core area of focus for our Value for Money responsibilities.

## Additional reporting

Your audit is undertaken to comply with the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 which gives the NAO the responsibility to prepare an Audit Code (the Code), which places responsibilities in addition to those derived from audit standards on us. We also have responsibilities which come specifically from acting as a component auditor to the NAO. In considering these matters at the planning stage we indicate whether:

Work is completed throughout our audit and we can confirm the matters are progressing satisfactorily 	We have identified issues that we may need to report 	Work is completed at a later stage of our audit so we have nothing to report 
---	---	---

We have summarised the status of all these various requirements at the time of planning our audit below and will update you as our work progresses:

Type	Status	Response
Our declaration of independence		No matters to report. The engagement team and others in the firm, as appropriate, have complied with relevant ethical requirements regarding independence.
Issue a report in the public interest		We are required to consider if we should issue a public interest report on any matters which come to our attention during the audit. We have not identified any such matters to date.
Provide a statement to the NAO on your consolidation schedule		This “Whole of Government Accounts” requirement is fulfilled when we complete any work required of us by the NAO.
Provide a summary of risks of significant weakness in arrangements to provide value for money		We are required to report significant weaknesses in arrangements. Work to be completed at a later stage.
Certify the audit as complete		We are required to certify the audit as complete when we have fulfilled all of our responsibilities relating to the accounts and use of resources as well as those other matters highlighted above.

# Mandatory communications

Type	Statements
<b>Management’s responsibilities (and, where appropriate, those charged with governance)</b>	<p>Prepare financial statements in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.</p> <p>Provide the auditor with access to all information relevant to the preparation of the financial statements, additional information requested and unrestricted access to persons within the entity.</p>
<b>Auditor’s responsibilities</b>	<p>Our responsibilities set out through the NAO Code (communicated to you by the PSAA) and can be also found on their website, which include our responsibilities to form and express an opinion on the financial statements that have been prepared by management with the oversight of those charged with governance. The audit of the financial statements does not relieve management or those charged with governance of their responsibilities.</p>
<b>Auditor’s responsibilities – Fraud</b>	<p>This report communicates how we plan to identify, assess and obtain sufficient appropriate evidence regarding the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements due to fraud and to implement appropriate responses to fraud or suspected fraud identified during the audit.</p>
<b>Auditor’s responsibilities – Other information</b>	<p>Our responsibilities are communicated to you by the PSAA and can be also found on their website, which communicates our responsibilities with respect to other information in documents containing audited financial statements. We will report to you on material inconsistencies and misstatements in other information.</p>
<b>Independence</b>	<p>Our independence confirmation at page 22 discloses matters relating to our independence and objectivity including any relationships that may bear on the firm’s independence and the integrity and objectivity of the audit engagement partner and audit staff.</p>



# Telford and Wrekin Council

## Value for money risk assessment

### Our approach

Year ended 31 March 2026

April 2026

# Value for money

**Our value for money reporting requirements have been designed to follow the guidance in the Audit Code of Practice.**

Our responsibility is to conclude on significant weaknesses in value for money arrangements.

The main output is a narrative on each of the three domains, summarising the work performed, any significant weaknesses and any recommendations for improvement.

We have set out the key methodology and reporting requirements on this slide and provided an overview of the process and reporting on the following page.

## Risk assessment processes

Our responsibility is to assess whether there are any significant weaknesses in the Council's arrangements to secure value for money. Our risk assessment will consider whether there are any significant risks that the Council does not have appropriate arrangements in place.

In undertaking our risk assessment, we will be required to obtain an understanding of the key processes the Council/Entity has in place to ensure this, including financial management, risk management and partnership working arrangements. We will complete this through review of the Council's/Entity's documentation in these areas and performing inquiries of management as well as reviewing reports, such as internal audit assessments.

## Reporting

Our approach to value for money reporting aligns to the NAO guidance and includes:

- A summary of our commentary on the arrangements in place against each of the three value for money criteria, setting out our view of the arrangements in place compared to industry standards;
- A summary of any further work undertaken against identified significant risks and the findings from this work; and
- Recommendations raised as a result of any significant weaknesses identified and follow up of previous recommendations.

The Council will be required to publish the commentary on its website at the same time as publishing its annual report online.

### Financial sustainability

*How the body manages its resources to ensure it can continue to deliver its services.*


### Governance

*How the body ensures that it makes informed decisions and properly manages its risks.*

### Improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness

*How the body uses information about its costs and performance to improve the way it manages and delivers its services.*

# Value for money



# Appendix

<b>A</b>	Audit team and rotation	19
<b>B</b>	Audit timeline	20
<b>C</b>	Fees	21
<b>D</b>	Confirmation of Independence	22
<b>E</b>	KPMG's Audit Quality Framework	24

# Audit team and rotation

Your audit team has been drawn from our specialist local government audit department and is led by key members of staff who will be supported by auditors and specialists as necessary to complete our work. We also ensure that we consider rotation of your audit director and firm.



Richard Walton is the director responsible for our audit. They will lead our audit work, attend the Audit Committee and be responsible for the opinions that we issue.



Liz Gardiner is the lead senior manager responsible for our audit. They will co-ordinate our audit work, attend the Audit Committee and ensure we are co-ordinated across our accounts and VFM work.



Arpit Sarraf is the other senior manager responsible for our audit. They will co-ordinate our audit work and ensure we are co-ordinated across our accounts and VFM work.



Avika Dhingra is the in-charge responsible for our audit. They will be responsible for our on-site fieldwork. He will complete work on more complex section of the audit.

To comply with professional standard we need to ensure that you appropriately rotate your external audit partner. There are no other members of your team which we will need to consider this requirement for:



This will be director's second year as your engagement lead. They are required to rotate every five years, extendable to seven with PSAA approval.

# Audit timeline

We have developed our audit timeline based on management’s financial reporting timetable. If we need to make significant changes to the audit timeline below, then we will communicate the reasons to you on a timely basis.

	2025		2026										
Activity	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov
Risk assessment and planning	Inquiries of those charged with governance from April 2026												
Evaluate and test controls													
Audit complex accounting estimates													
Year-end audit fieldwork													
Procedures on financial statements/annual report													

\* Dates for issuing deliverables are preliminary and based on information available at planning. They are therefore subject to change.

# Fees

## Audit fee

The audit fees for the year ended 31 March 2026 are set out below.

Entity	2025/26 (£)	2024/25 (£)
Scale fees as set by PSAA	343,328	337,869
FV ISA600r*	-	4,012
FV IFRS16*	-	2,430
FV Prior Period Adjustment*	-	5,104
FV overruns*	-	1,872
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>343,328</b>	<b>351,287</b>

We note we are expecting fee variations for the following areas in 2025/26 and will advise of the level as work progresses:

- LGPS Triennial valuation (we will be in a position to provide an estimate once this has been considered further.

- The fees also assume no significant risks are identified as part of the Value for Money risk assessment. Additional fees in relation to these areas will be subject to the fee variation process as outlined by the PSAA.

\*Submitted for PSAA approvals.

## Billing arrangements

Fees will be billed in accordance with the milestone completion phasing that has been communicated by the PSAA.

## Basis of fee information

Our fees are subject to the following assumptions:

- The entity's audit evidence files are completed to an appropriate standard (we will liaise with you separately on this);
- Draft statutory accounts are presented to us for audit subject to audit and tax adjustments;
- Supporting schedules to figures in the accounts are supplied;
- The entity's audit evidence files are completed to an appropriate standard (we will liaise with management separately on this);
- A trial balance together with reconciled control accounts are presented to us;
- All deadlines agreed with us are met;
- We find no weaknesses in controls that cause us to significantly extend procedures beyond those planned;
- Management will be available to us as necessary throughout the audit process;
- There will be no changes in deadlines or reporting requirements; and
- There are no VFM significant risks.

We will provide a list of schedules to be prepared by management stating the due dates together with pro-formas as necessary.

Our ability to deliver the services outlined to the agreed timetable and fee will depend on these schedules being available on the due dates in the agreed form and content.

Any variations to the above plan will be subject to the PSAA fee variation process.

# Confirmation of Independence

We confirm that, in our professional judgement, KPMG LLP is independent within the meaning of regulatory and professional requirements and that the objectivity of the Partner and audit staff is not impaired.

## To the Audit and Risk Committee members

### Assessment of our objectivity and independence as auditor of Telford and Wrekin Council

Professional ethical standards require us to provide to you at the planning stage of the audit a written disclosure of relationships (including the provision of non-audit services) that bear on KPMG LLP's objectivity and independence, the threats to KPMG LLP's independence that these create, any safeguards that have been put in place and why they address such threats, together with any other information necessary to enable KPMG LLP's objectivity and independence to be assessed.

This letter is intended to comply with this requirement and facilitate a subsequent discussion with you on audit independence and addresses:

- General procedures to safeguard independence and objectivity;
- Independence and objectivity considerations relating to the provision of non-audit services; and
- Independence and objectivity considerations relating to other matters.

### General procedures to safeguard independence and objectivity

KPMG LLP is committed to being and being seen to be independent. As part of our ethics and independence policies, all KPMG LLP partners/directors and staff annually confirm their compliance with our ethics and independence policies and procedures including in particular that they have no prohibited shareholdings. Our ethics and independence policies and procedures are fully consistent with the requirements of the FRC Ethical Standard. As a result we have underlying safeguards in place to maintain independence through:

- Instilling professional values.
- Communications.
- Internal accountability.
- Risk management.
- Independent reviews.

The conclusion of the audit engagement partner as to our compliance with the FRC Ethical Standard in relation to this audit engagement and that the safeguards we have applied are appropriate and adequate is subject to review by an engagement quality control reviewer, who is a director not otherwise involved in your affairs.

We are satisfied that our general procedures support our independence and objectivity.

### Independence and objectivity considerations relating to the provision of non-audit services

#### Summary of non-audit services

Facts and matters related to the provision of non-audit services and the safeguards put in place that bear upon our independence and objectivity, are set out on the table below:

Description of scope of services	Principal threats to Independence	Safeguards Applied	Basis of fee
Certification of the Teachers Pension return for 25/26	Self review	Work completed by a separate team.	Fixed

# Confirmation of Independence (cont.)

## Summary of fees

We have considered the fees charged by us to the Group and its affiliates for professional services provided by us during the reporting period.

### Fee ratio

The ratio of non-audit fees to audit fees for the year is anticipated to be 0:1. We do not consider that the total non-audit fees create a self-interest threat since the absolute level of fees is not significant to our firm as a whole.

	2025/26
	£'000
Scale fees	343
Other Assurance Services	-
Non – audit services	7
<b>Total Fees</b>	<b>350</b>

## Independence and objectivity considerations relating to other matters

There are no other matters that, in our professional judgment, bear on our independence which need to be disclosed to the Audit and Risk Committee.


## Confirmation of audit independence

We confirm that as of the date of this letter, in our professional judgment, KPMG LLP is independent within the meaning of regulatory and professional requirements, and the objectivity of the partner and audit staff is not impaired.

This report is intended solely for the information of the Audit and Risk Committee of the Group and should not be used for any other purposes.

We would be very happy to discuss the matters identified above (or any other matters relating to our objectivity and independence) should you wish to do so.

Yours faithfully



**KPMG LLP**

# KPMG's Audit quality framework

**Audit quality is at the core of everything we do at KPMG and we believe that it is not just about reaching the right opinion, but how we reach that opinion.**

To ensure that every partner and employee concentrates on the fundamental skills and behaviours required to deliver an appropriate and independent opinion, we have developed our global Audit Quality Framework.

Responsibility for quality starts at the top through our governance structures as the UK Board is supported by the Audit Oversight Committee, and accountability is reinforced through the complete chain of command in all our teams.

## ■ Commitment to continuous improvement


- Comprehensive effective monitoring processes
- Significant investment in technology to achieve consistency and enhance audits
- Obtain feedback from key stakeholders
- Evaluate and appropriately respond to feedback and findings

## ■ Performance of effective & efficient audits

- Professional judgement and scepticism
- Direction, supervision and review
- Ongoing mentoring and on the job coaching, including the second line of defence model
- Critical assessment of audit evidence
- Appropriately supported and documented conclusions
- Insightful, open and honest two way communications

## ■ Commitment to technical excellence & quality service delivery

- Technical training and support
- Accreditation and licensing
- Access to specialist networks
- Consultation processes
- Business understanding and industry knowledge
- Capacity to deliver valued insights



## ■ Association with the right entities

- Select entities within risk tolerance
- Manage audit responses to risk
- Robust client and engagement acceptance and continuance processes
- Client portfolio management

## ■ Clear standards & robust audit tools

- KPMG Audit and Risk Management Manuals
- Audit technology tools, templates and guidance
- KPMG Clara incorporating monitoring capabilities at engagement level
- Independence policies

## ■ Recruitment, development & assignment of appropriately qualified personnel

- Recruitment, promotion, retention
- Development of core competencies, skills and personal qualities
- Recognition and reward for quality work
- Capacity and resource management
- Assignment of team members and specialists



[kpmg.com/uk](https://kpmg.com/uk)

© 2026 KPMG LLP, a UK limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved.

**Document Classification: KPMG Confidential**