

DEFINITIONS OF AUDIT OPINIONS (For 2015/16 Audits)

Opinion	Framework	Effectiveness(Implementation)
Excellent	... innovative frameworks are in place, which demonstrate efficiencies and excellent value for money, whilst ensuring the achievement of service objectives, good corporate governance and high level of protection for the council against foreseeable risks.	... there is full compliance with the framework of controls and the risk management process is considered to be fully effective. There is evidence of notable practice and no areas of concern were identified.
Minimum requirement	All controls are in place	All controls are fully implemented
Good	... a high level of control framework is in place to ensure the achievement of service objectives, good corporate governance and to protect the Council against foreseeable risks.	... the framework of controls is substantially being complied with and risk management process is considered to be good. Only minor errors or omissions identified
Minimum requirement	All controls are in place	51% or above of risks examined are low and the remainder are medium. Limited room for further development
Satisfactory	... controls exist to enable the achievement of service objectives, obtain good corporate governance and mitigate against significant foreseeable risks.	... occasional instances of failure to comply with the control process were identified and opportunities still exist to mitigate further against potential risks.
Minimum requirement	Control requirements are substantially met	Up to 50% of risks examined are medium or low. Opportunities for further developments exists requiring constructive proposals for management consideration
Un-satisfactory	... limited controls are in place but there are gaps in the process, which leave the service exposed to foreseeable risks. Hence further	... there is an urgent need to introduce additional controls and improve compliance with existing controls, to reduce the risk exposure to the Council.

	development in framework is needed to make the system effective.	
Minimum requirement	Control requirements are patchy and unreliable	Testing results identified one or more high risk
Un-acceptable	... controls are considered to be inadequate or non-existent with the absence of at least one critical control mechanism. An urgent need exists to introduce appropriate level of controls without delay.	... failure to urgently improve controls leaves the Council exposed to significant risk, which could lead to major financial loss, embarrassment, or failure to achieve key service objectives. Note: compliance testing in this circumstance may not add value. However, there would be some value in conducting weakness testing in some circumstances to determine the level of “threat” or “loss” to the Council. Hence an opinion for compliance may not be given where the framework is “unacceptable”
Minimum requirement	No evidence of controls exit	Testing results identified one or more very high risk

DEFINITIONS OF AUDIT OPINIONS (For 2016/17 Audits Going Forward)

OPINION	DEFINITIONS
Full Assurance (no High or Medium Risk Recommendations)	<p>A sound framework of control is in place that meets the Council's or service objectives. All expected controls tested are in place and are operating effectively.</p> <p>No specific follow-up review will be undertaken; follow-up will be undertaken as part of the next planned review of the system.</p>
Substantial Assurance (no High Risk Recommendations)	<p>There is generally a sound framework of control in place designed to meet the Council's or service objectives. However, there are isolated weaknesses in design of controls, or inconsistent application of controls, which puts the achievement of a limited number of objectives at risk.</p> <p>Follow up of medium priority recommendations only will be undertaken within 3 to 6 months; follow up of low priority recommendation will be undertaken as part of the next planned review of the system.</p>
Limited Assurance	<p>Weaknesses identified within the framework and there exist evidence of non-compliance with Council procedures or good practice, which puts the achievement of the Council's or service objectives in many of the areas reviewed at risk.</p> <p>Follow-up of high and medium priority recommendations only will take place within 3 to 6 months; follow-up of low priority recommendations will be undertaken as part of the next planned review of the system.</p>
No Assurance	<p>Absent or non-existent evidence of framework; fundamental weaknesses identified within design; operation of key controls has resulted in failure, or could result in failure to achieve the Council's or service objectives in the areas reviewed.</p> <p>Follow-up of high and medium priority recommendations only will take place within 3 to 6 months; follow-up of low priority recommendations will be undertaken as part of the next planned review of the system.</p>