

Audit and Assurance Committee



Date: 14 June 2016

Item: EY Letter on Independence and Objectivity

This paper will be considered in public

1 Summary

- 1.1 To report to the Audit and Assurance Committee on the independence and objectivity of Ernst and Young (EY).

2 Recommendation

- 2.1 **The Committee is asked to note the report.**

3 Background

- 3.1 EY is required to report annually to the Audit and Assurance Committee on their independence and objectivity, taking into account guidance including the National Audit Office's Code of Audit Practice.
- 3.2 EY have reviewed their procedures and their letter is attached for the Committee's review.

List of appendices to this report:

Appendix 1: Letter from EY dated 7 June 2016

List of Background Papers:

None

Contact Officer: Ian Nunn, Chief Finance Officer
Number: 020 3054 8941
Email: lanNunn@tfl.gov.uk

Appendix 1

Audit and Assurance Committee
Company Secretariat
Transport for London
Windsor House
42-50 Victoria Street
London
SW1H 0TL

7 June 2016

Ref: KH/GB/TfL/1516Ind
Direct line: 01189 281502
Email: KHavers@uk.ey.com

Dear Sirs

Independence and objectivity – Transport for London 2015/16

In order to carry out our duties and responsibilities as auditor, we are required to consider our independence and objectivity within the context of the regulatory and professional framework in which we operate. We are also mindful of all stakeholders, including the Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA) and the National Audit Office (NAO). For further details of specific independence requirements for PSAA appointments, refer to the PSAA Terms of Appointment at <http://www.psaa.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2006/08/Terms-of-Appointment-from-1-April-2015.pdf>

Appendix 1 to this letter highlights the significant facts and matters that may be reasonably considered to bear upon our objectivity and independence, including any principal threats. It also contains reference to the key policies and processes in place within EY for maintaining objectivity and independence. We consider these throughout our audit and are required to communicate with you whenever any significant judgements are made about threats to objectivity and independence and the appropriateness of safeguards put in place, for example, when accepting an engagement to provide non-audit services.

For 2015/16, we have undertaken a small piece of non-audit work in relation to the review of the current and proposed final draft of the TfL Business Expenses policy. This work was performed by a different service line within EY separate to the engagement team, and management remain responsible for the exercise of all key decisions. The proposed fee for this work is £4,000 as summarised in a separate letter. In compliance with Ethical Standard 4, we confirm that no members of our audit engagement team, including those from other service lines, have objectives or are rewarded in relation to sales of non-audit services to you. We therefore confirm that there are no self-interest or self-review threats associated with this non-audit work.

We are also concluding a separate review of the work performed by Internal Audit on the Garden Bridge procurement. This is considered to be additional audit work under the NAO Code of Audit Practice (<https://www.nao.org.uk/code-audit-practice/>) rather than non-audit work. We brought in appropriate specialists with internal audit and procurement knowledge to supplement the audit team.

Overall we confirm that as of 7 June 2016, in our professional judgment, EY is independent within the meaning of regulatory and professional requirements and the objectivity of the partner and audit engagement team have not been compromised.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'K. Havers', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right. The signature is written over a light gray rectangular background.

Karl Havers
Partner
For and on behalf of Ernst & Young LLP

Appendix 1

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 you.

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 you.

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.

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.

Other threats

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

We believe that it is appropriate for us to undertake permissible non-audit services and we will comply with the policies that you have approved. In addition, when the ratio of non-audit fees to audit fees exceeds 1:1, we are required to discuss this with our Ethics Partner, as set out by the APB Ethical Standards, and if necessary agree additional safeguards or not accept the non-audit engagement. We will also discuss this with you.

Policies and procedures in place

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 in place within EY for maintaining objectivity and independence can be found in our annual Transparency Report which the firm is required to publish by law. The most recent version of this Report is for the year ended June 2015 and can be found at:

<http://www.ey.com/UK/en/About-us/EY-UK-Transparency-Report-2015>