**Introduction**

This issue of the Newsletter deals with some of the current projects organised by Sigma and carries feature articles on *Achieving High Quality in the Work of SAIs* (page 2); on *Basic Understanding of Internal Control Concepts and Categories* (page 5); and on matters of interest for SAIs concerning *The Roadmap to an Integrated Internal Control Framework, and SAI Cooperation* (page 11).

It covers the multi-country *EU Agricultural Funds Audit Activity* project (page 4), which was launched in 2005 and has been a great success. Originally the SAIs of Hungary and Slovakia started the cooperation activity with Sigma, but the Lithuanian National Audit Office decided that the activity would be beneficial for their institution and so they also joined the activity in March 2006.

Other features (page 10), cover information on the network of the Candidate and Close to Candidate SAIs *Parallel Audit of EU Investment Projects*; and their Twinning Expert Group’s work on a *Good Practice Guide for SAI Twinning*.

All the best from Sigma
ACHIEVING HIGH QUALITY IN THE WORK OF SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTIONS:
SIGMA PAPER: No. 34^1

This SIGMA paper focuses primarily on the issue of how to achieve high quality in the audit process of an SAI (Supreme Audit Institution). In addition to describing the types of procedures needed to achieve audit quality in an SAI, it also discusses basic principles and those matters of institutional management that create an environment that encourages high quality in an SAI’s work. It is particularly focused on developing and transitional SAIs. Audit quality is obtained by a process of identifying and administering the activities needed to achieve the quality objectives of an SAI. All types of SAIs need to understand the benefits that can be realised once audit quality is made a top priority. Improving audit quality requires a systematic SAI-wide approach. Piecemeal efforts by individuals and individual audit teams are not enough and will not work. There are no quick fixes to be obtained where audit quality is concerned. SAIs need to proceed methodically in an organised way to fix each quality issue and problem in turn. As new problems will always emerge, this should be a continuous process for the SAI. It is also evident that many audit quality related problems are mainly the result of poor management of the audit process or of the SAI itself.

Ensuring high levels of quality in an audit organisation involves a succession of detailed steps that must be taken over a period of time. In fact, it is a never-ending process of continual improvement. The first requirement is to define the standards of quality and then to put quality control procedures in place that will ensure that these standards are met. These procedures need not – and should not – suppress the initiative and good judgement of the auditor in adapting to particular circumstances. However, if the auditor judges that it is necessary to depart from the usual audit techniques, it is incumbent upon the auditor to demonstrate the necessity of doing so, and to show that the approach he or she has chosen is capable of satisfying the audit objectives. The next stage in the evolution of an SAI’s quality management involves the assurance that quality control procedures are working effectively together with the identification of ways of improving the effectiveness and/or efficiency of these procedures. The best technique for accomplishing this is the use of various types of post-audit quality reviews and the use of peer review concepts for institutional issues. Achieving true excellence requires going even further. It requires building an institutional culture in which high quality is a fundamental value that is reflected in the leadership management competencies of the SAI and in its relations with other institutions.

Chapter 1 sets out the basic concepts, principles and requisites that must underlie an effective approach to ensuring the high quality of an SAI’s audit work and reports. This includes such matters as:

- Code of Professional Ethics
- Adoption and adherence to International Auditing Standards
- Appropriate resources and organisational structure
- Manuals and guidance
- Capable staff
- Quality management policies and guidance
- Continuous learning and improvement

Chapter 2 draws on international experience to set out a number of “good practices” involved in the audit process. To build high quality into the audit process, an SAI should:

- Ensure effective direction, supervision and review during all phases of the audit process.
- Clearly specify the roles and responsibilities of each of the participants in each phase.
- Identify and document the quality control criteria applicable to each phase and the sources from which those criteria were drawn.
- Clearly establish the quality control procedures to be followed during each phase and document both the implementation of those procedures and the results.

^1http://www.oecd.org/document/19/0,2340,en_33638100_34612958_2074195_1_1_1_1,00.html
Chapter 3 discusses ways of ensuring that the quality control processes that an SAI has put in place are operating effectively. Experience has demonstrated that the most effective means of accomplishing this is the post-audit quality review. The purpose of such reviews is not to criticise the particular audit being examined, but rather to ascertain whether or not the quality control procedures established by an SAI are consistently and properly used and are effective, and to identify ways in which the controls can be improved. One form of such a review is carried out internally, by experienced auditors within the SAI who are independent of the audit under review. These reviews should be performed on a selected sample of audits annually. The second form is an external review, performed by experts (peers) from relevant professional organisations or from SAIs in other countries. External reviews should be performed at intervals of several years.

Chapter 4 describes ways in which the overall management of an SAI can contribute to the quality and effectiveness of its work. Quality control and quality assurance systems and procedures are essential for ensuring that an SAI’s audit reports and other products meet a minimum standard of quality. In fact, however, an SAI should seek to go beyond such minimums. This requires that the management of the SAI be skilled, not only in the techniques of auditing, but also in the techniques of management. These are skills that some managers acquire through experience, but they also can be – and often are – learned and enhanced through effective training. They range from the ability to lead and inspire the professional and support staff on a day-to-day basis to the more wide-ranging skills of budgeting and strategic planning. The most successful SAIs invest considerable time and resources in ensuring that managers at all levels of the organisation continuously enhance these skills.

The several Annexes to the paper give further practical advice or information including on quality assurance practices in selected audit courts. While all SAIs do seek conscientiously to ensure high quality in their audit work, considerably more attention still needs to be given to this issue on the part of many SAIs. This paper suggests some good, helpful and practical ways of going about that task.

~

ECA 2006 REPORTS – AN UPDATE

The ECA Annual Report concerning the financial year 2005 will be transmitted to the European Institutions by 31 October 2006. This is slightly earlier than the previous publication date of mid-November. The date has been brought forward in order to be of more use in the preparation of the budget of the following year, i.e. 2008. Since the last edition of the Audit Newsletter, a further four Special Reports and one Opinion were published by the ECA in June and July. These were:

- Special Report No 3 concerning the European Commission Humanitarian Aid Response to the Tsunami
- Special Report No 4 concerning Phare Investment Projects in Bulgaria and Romania
- Special Report No 5 concerning The MEDA programme
- Special Report No 6 on the environmental aspects of the Commission's development cooperation
- Opinion No 2/2006 on a proposal for a Council Decision on the system of the European Communities' own resources

The Reports in full, as well as the Opinions, can be found on the ECA Web site, in all EU languages: see www.eca.europa.eu
SLOVAKIAN-HUNGARIAN-LITHUANIAN AUDIT ACTIVITY

Following contact and discussions held during the Audit of EU Agriculture Funds Workshop held in Romania from 8-10 June 2005 (see the September 2005 issue of the Audit Newsletter), the SAIs of Slovakia and Hungary have been cooperating with Sigma on an audit activity concerning pre and post accession EU agricultural funds audit.

Both SAIs are Certifying Bodies for (European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund) EAGGF/Sapard. They have been meeting regularly to discuss and share experiences on their audit work on agricultural funds and as Certifying Bodies with Sigma experts. In March 2006, the SAI of Lithuania joined the audit activity and they will host the fifth audit activity meeting, in Vilnius, in September 2006.

Topics covered by the audit activity have included:

- Audit Sampling and error evaluation (with practical examples)
- Reporting structures and contents
- Classification of irregularities
- Audit of delegated bodies
- Use of WinIDEA
- The audit approach for debtors
- EU audit requirements and methods

For colleagues who wish to know more about the audit please contact: Maria Kysucka (Slovakia) Zsusza Szarka (Hungary) Tomas Mackevicius (Lithuania) or Nick Treen (Sigma)
BASIC UNDERSTANDING OF INTERNAL CONTROL CONCEPTS AND CATEGORIES

In European public financial management circles, great attention is currently being given to the concept and the activity of “control”. The “Road Map to an Integrated Internal Control Framework” is a top priority for the European Commission and Member States (see page 11). This article tries to develop a broader understanding of what this thing called control is, and proposes some elements of good practice for control.

Traditionally, control in the EU is normally conceptualised or placed into categories such as ex ante, ex post, ongoing. To many, this categorising can seem confusing and also tends to focus too much on controls of transactions or the timing of detailed control activities. In the modern risk-based world, both in the public and private sectors, internal control is now seen as a total concept with a common language developed throughout the world. Control is not limited to certain phases of activity but is present throughout the operation and functioning of an organisation. Every operation and function is subject to internal control and can no longer be seen in isolation from other parts of the organisation. Concentrating solely on certain phases or timings of work, e.g. ex ante, and using these rather old fashioned terms, is not necessarily the most effective or transparent of ways of understanding what control actually is.

Internal control can also mean different things to different persons. This may cause confusion or misunderstanding among key interested parties. Problems are compounded when the term, if not clearly defined, is written into law, regulations or rules. To help in the understanding of control and controls, they may be usefully and interestingly divided into different types, levels and concepts. Below is an attempt to provide explanations and information about control and controls which will hopefully aid understanding.

Types of Control

Types of controls can be categorized as follows:

**Preventive** – designed to prevent the occurrence of inefficiencies, errors or irregularities. These cannot guarantee that the controlled factor will not occur, but they do reduce the chance of it occurring. Examples include division of duties and authorisation controls.

**Detective** – designed to detect and correct errors, inefficiencies or irregularities. They may not give absolute assurance since they operate after an event has occurred or an output has been produced but they should reduce the risk of undesirable consequences as they enable remedial action to be taken. Detective controls are most effective when they form part of a feedback loop in which their results are monitored and used to improve procedures or preventive controls. Examples include post payment confirmation, stock verification and bank reconciliations.

**Directive** – designed to cause or encourage actions and events necessary to the achievement of objectives. Examples include clear definition of policies, the setting of targets, and adequate training and staffing.

In practice, the above categories may not be clearly distinguished and a single control may operate to cover two or more functions. Supervision, for example, covers all three types. Well organised and managed corrective actions and processes are, obviously and logically, also necessary when control weaknesses and failures occur.

Levels of Control

External auditors often use a control framework comprising of a managerial hierarchy to identify levels of controls within an organization, and this is helpful for them in determining their audit approach. They like to concentrate on senior management controls as they often include processes and systems to ensure that lower levels of controls are working satisfactorily. This control framework consists of:

- At the top, senior management will use strategic information in order to make decisions affecting the
business as a whole and the component activities within the business. Controls are likely to involve a high level of aggregation and a low level of detail.

- Beneath this level, middle management controls will be focused on distinct sets of data at a much greater level of detail. Controls at this level will include budgetary monitoring and variance analysis, exception reporting and monitoring of progress. Controls can also take the form of periodic reviews, including those by Internal Audit.

- The supervisory and clerical level is the lowest control level. At this level, control is based on detailed control procedures relating to small groups of transactions or individual transactions. These include controls over information and information processing.

Entity - Level Controls

Controls are everywhere and permeate an entity. They have a significant impact on how it achieves its financial reporting and other objectives. Public institutions and organisations should design and ensure the operating effectiveness of entity level controls in addition to detailed control activities at the process or transaction levels. These controls are exemplified by the control environment itself, which includes the tone at the top, the corporate code of conduct, policies and procedures, the assignment of authority and responsibility, management’s risk assessment processes, fraud-prevention efforts and other entity-wide programs that apply to all locations and business units. Entity-level controls also monitor the results of operations and the functionality of other controls, including self-assessment programmes and internal audit reviews. Oversight activities by senior management, the audit committee and the board also demonstrate these controls.

Corporate and Organisational Control Concepts

So far we have looked at control and controls primarily in terms of timing, types, levels, or individual or groups of controls to cover certain conditions. Corporate governance, and its requirements that good internal control process should exist in an organisation, have led to organisations taking a wider view of the whole control framework for which they are responsible. This has resulted in a move to provide an overall assessment of an organisation’s control activities with the aim of giving an assurance as to the effectiveness of its internal control systems. A number of frameworks have been established and adapted according to the individual characteristics of an organisation. Perhaps the one which has attracted the greatest following and has demonstrated its effectiveness well is the COSO framework.

COSO definition of Internal Control

For the COSO framework model internal control is a process effected by an entity’s board of directors, management and other personnel, designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the achievement of objectives in the following categories: effectiveness and efficiency of operations; reliability of financial reporting; and compliance with applicable laws and regulations. Key COSO concepts are that:

- Internal control is a process. It is a means to an end and not an end in itself.
- Internal control is carried out by people. It is not merely policy manuals and forms, but people at every level of an organisation.
- Internal control can be expected to provide only reasonable assurance, not absolute assurance, to an entity’s management and board.
- Internal control is geared to the achievement of objectives in one or more separate but overlapping categories.

---


3 The Committee of Sponsoring Organisations of the Treadway Commission www.coso.org COSO is a voluntary body dedicated to improving the quality of financial reporting through ethics, effective internal controls and corporate governance.
The COSO framework is built around five main control areas: control environment; risk assessment and management; control activities; monitoring and corrective action; and information and communication. In these control areas we have combinations of “soft” and “hard” controls such as establishing an environment in which controls can survive and flourish (these are the “soft” controls) alongside more traditional types of “hard” controls over accounting and financial transactions.

COSO’s Principals of Internal Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Integrity and Ethical Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Importance of Board of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management’s Philosophy and Operating Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organisational Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Commitment to Financial Reporting Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Authority and Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Importance of Financial Reporting Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Identification and Analysis of Financial Reporting Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Assessment of Fraud Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Elements of a Control Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Control Activities Linked to Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Selection and Development of Control Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Information Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Information Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Management Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Upstream Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Board Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Communication with Outside Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ongoing Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Separate Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Reporting Deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Management Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Board and Audit Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Other Personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTOSAI Control Concepts and Definition

According to INTOSAI, internal control in public sector organisations should be understood within the context of the specific characteristics of these organisations, i.e. their focus on meeting social or political objectives; their use of public funds; the importance of the budgetary cycle; the complexity of their performance (that calls for a balance between traditional values like legality, integrity and transparency and modern managerial values like efficiency and effectiveness); and the correspondingly broad scope of their public accountability and needs for transparency.

The INTOSAI Guidance Definition

**Internal control** is an integral process that is effected by an entity’s management and personnel and is designed to address risks and to provide reasonable assurance that in pursuit of the entity’s mission, the following general objectives are being achieved:

- Executing orderly, ethical, economical, efficient and effective operations;
- Fulfilling accountability obligations;
- Complying with applicable laws and regulations; and
- Safeguarding resources against loss, misuse and damage.

Internal control is a dynamic integral process that is continuously adapting to the changes an organisation is facing. Management and personnel at all levels have to be involved in this process to address risks and to provide reasonable assurance of the achievement of the entity’s mission and general objectives. Internal control is not one event or circumstance, but a series of actions that permeate an entity’s activities. These actions occur throughout an entity’s operations on an ongoing basis. They are pervasive and inherent in the way management runs the organisation. Internal control is therefore different from the perspective of some observers who view it as

---

4 The International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI) has prepared “Guidelines for Internal Control Standards for the Public Sector”, 2004. [http://www.intosai.org/Level3/Guidelines/3_InternalContrStand/3_GuICS_PubSec_e.pdf](http://www.intosai.org/Level3/Guidelines/3_InternalContrStand/3_GuICS_PubSec_e.pdf)
something added on to an entity’s activities, or as a necessary burden. INTOSAI recognises the usefulness of COSO, having an effective internal audit and using risk management techniques as essential for good control.

The Chain-based Control Concept

This control model implies the development of a chain of control procedures with each level or area of the control system having specified and defined objectives which take into account and do not excessively or wastefully duplicate the work of other controls. The overall cost of controls should be in proportion to the overall benefits they bring in both monetary and political terms. In 2004, the European Court of Auditors published Opinion No 2/2004, supporting the use of such a method in the development of an integrated internal control framework, based on common principles and standards, as a means for improving the financial management of EU funds.

PIFC

Public Internal Financial Control (PIFC) is a term and concept developed by the European Commission to assist the understanding and implementation of well developed and effective control systems during the EU Accession process. Its aim is to ensure that public funds (both national and EU) are well managed and cost effectively controlled. It should give value for money to the taxpayer.

PIFC comprises all measures to control and manage overall government income, expenditure, assets and liabilities. It covers all internal control systems and procedures in public institutions and helps provide assurance that public funds are spent properly and achieve value for money. A functionally independent and decentralised internal audit is also part of the PIFC system, as is the so-called Central Harmonisation Unit (CHU) based in the Ministry of Finance and which responsible, amongst other things, for setting standards for internal control and internal audit and helping to ensure that those standards are delivered to a suitably high quality. However, the ultimate responsibility for making the PIFC system operational lies with the specifically accountable Ministers, Heads of Government institutions and other senior managers. They will be formally and strictly held responsible for setting up and guaranteeing the proper and effective functioning of PIFC within their own organisations.

Inter-relationships of Controls

Controls should not be viewed singly because they inter-relate, either in a hierarchy or in the consecutive flow of operations. A hierarchy may be represented by controls at the various levels within a process or system, or be imposed by a higher level system (e.g. budgetary control). In the consecutive flow of operations, controls at one stage of processing may act to achieve similar objectives to others at different stages. Weaknesses in one control may therefore be compensated for by other controls. Appraisal of the adequacy of internal controls should therefore be made in relation to the objectives of control in the system as a whole.

Benefits of Control

Controls need not be exclusively restrictive. Modern management philosophy regards control as an aid rather than a constriction. It is a means of helping people and their organisation to meet their goals. Controls become the means of auto-control and not only protect the organisation but also the employee. Further, by establishing an appropriate system of control, managers can provide assurances to their stakeholders as to the acceptable conduct of their business. Control is especially important in large organisations where managers are unable to personally oversee everything for which they will be held accountable.

Risk Management

In recent years, many public sector organisations have focused on management of risk as the key to controlling and making organisations successful in delivering their objectives whilst improving control and protecting the

---

5 For internationally accepted internal audit standards and guidance see www.theiia.org
6 http://www.eca.europa.eu./audit_reports/opinions/opinions_budgetary_management_en.htm
7 Conceptualised and then mainly developed by Robert de Koning, the PIFC Accession Negotiations Team Leader at DG Budget.
interests of their stakeholders. Risk is uncertainty of outcome, and good risk management allows an organisation to:

- Have increased confidence in achieving its desired outcomes
- Effectively control threats to acceptable levels
- Take informed decisions about exploiting opportunities

Risk management also allows stakeholders to have increased confidence in the organisation’s corporate governance and ability to deliver. Risk is defined as an uncertainty of outcome, whether positive opportunity or negative threat, of actions and events. The risk has to be assessed in respect of the combination of the likelihood of something happening, and the impact which arises if it does actually happen. Risk management includes identifying and assessing risks and then responding to them. The response, which is initiated within the organisation, to risk is part of “internal control” and may involve one or more of the following:

- Tolerating the risk
- Controlling the risk in an appropriate way and reducing risk to a tolerable level
- Transferring the risk
- Terminating the activity giving rise to the risk

A strong system of internal control supports the achievement of the organization’s business objectives and therefore good internal control is a way of managing risk.

**Some Good Practice for Controls**

- Achieving good and cost effective control is not easy. Providing good, cost effective control is a main responsibility of senior managers. Without good control of operations and activities, organisations cannot perform well or achieve the desired results.

- Control is not a person or an organisation. Control is a sophisticated process or system on many levels, activities and elements. Focusing only on control of transactions does not provide good control.

- Control is expensive and redundant controls can inhibit the successful delivery of services and policies. Too many and too complicated controls result in a loss of control. The repetition of an action can be a good control; but duplication of controls is a waste.

- Control systems should be designed to ensure an appropriate balance between the costs of controls and the benefits they bring in terms of managing the risk of control failure and irregularity. Control is not an end in itself.

- An effective internal audit is an essential support to good control. Risk management is an essential element in a good and modern process and system of control.

- The control environment is very important and this includes the tone at the top; the corporate code of ethics and conduct, policies and procedures; the assignment of authority, responsibility and accountability; risk assessment and management processes; and fraud-prevention strategy and efforts. Monitoring and evaluating the results of operations and the functionality of controls, including self-assessment programs and internal and external audit, is essential.

- Oversight activities by senior management, the audit committee and the management board etc are very necessary to ensure and demonstrate that control is working properly.

---

8 Two good basic references for those who wish to know more about risk management are the:

1) COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework, 2004 [www.coso.org/Publications/ERM/COSO_ERM_ExecutiveSummary.pdf](http://www.coso.org/Publications/ERM/COSO_ERM_ExecutiveSummary.pdf); and

PARALLEL AUDIT WORKING GROUP MEETING, BUCHAREST, 4-5 MAY 2006

The network of SAIs of the Candidate and Close to Candidate countries and the ECA have joined together with Sigma in a project to carry out audits of national EU infrastructure projects in parallel with each other. This will allow the SAIs to learn new and different auditing techniques from each other during this practical audit collaboration. The parallel audit is also supported by the European Court of Auditors and the EU SAI Joint Working Group on Audit Activities. The parallel audit started in earnest at a planning meeting hosted by the Romanian SAI from 4-5 May 2006 in Bucharest. Formats and guidelines for planning were agreed and a timetable for the audits was set out. Sigma circulated a good practice guide for “Audit Reporting”.

Following the planning meeting, a review meeting was held at the European Court of Auditors in June 2006, at which the individual national planning summaries were reviewed and agreed; and audit work has now started.

It is hoped to have audit work completed and national draft audit reports completed by December 2006.

MAKING SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTION TWINNING SUCCESSFUL
A GOOD PRACTICE GUIDE

The Network of the SAIs of the Candidate and Close to Candidate counties, the ECA and Sigma have set up an expert group to prepare a Good Practice Guide to help encourage more SAI Twinnings and make them even more successful.

The expert group comprises: Galia Ivanova and Snezhina Dimitrova (Bulgaria), Lidija Pernar (Croatia), Dragos Budulac (Romania), George Paterson (ECA), and Nick Treen (SIGMA). Excellent support was also provided by Martin Winter (Germany) and Iain Johnston (UK). The Group would also like to thank Bill Burnett (currently UK NAO Resident Twinning Advisor in Croatia) and members of Audit Group III at the ECA for their advice and support

The expert group plans to finish the Good Practice Guide in September 2006. Contact Nick Treen, or others in the expert group, if you would like further information.
THE ROADMAP TO AN INTEGRATED INTERNAL CONTROL FRAMEWORK, AND COOPERATION AMONG THE SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTIONS

The European Commission under the Presidency of José Barroso has made it a strategic decision to strive for a positive statement of assurance (or DAS) from the European Court of Auditors (ECA). 2004 marked the eleventh successive year that the ECA had presented a DAS which was once more largely positive as regards the reliability of the accounts, commitments and own resources, but indicated that it had no reasonable assurance for payments under all parts of the general budget of the European Union apart from administrative expenditure.

To this end, and also in response to the ECA Opinion 2/2004 on an effective and efficient control framework, in June 2005 the Commission published a roadmap to an integrated internal control framework. This intended to initiate the process whereby a common understanding could be reached between the Commission, the European Parliament and the Council on how the control framework can be improved so that a positive statement of assurance could be given. The Commission also published a working paper identifying the results of a gap assessment which compared the control framework in place for the main types of budgetary expenditure and the general principals defined by the ECA in its Opinion 2/2004.

Throughout the remaining months of 2005, there followed a series of discussions at the highest EU political levels, for example, within the European Parliament (the Budgetary Control Committee) and in the Council of Ministers (ECOFIN), as well as an expert group meeting organised under the umbrella of the Commission and the UK Presidency. These discussions culminated in an Action Plan published by the Commission in January 2006, outlining the steps to be taken by the Commission itself and the Member States. Broadly speaking, four main thematic areas were addressed, and within each, a number of action points were outlined:

- Simplification and common control principles
- Management declarations and audit assurance
- Single audit approach: sharing results and prioritising cost-benefit
- Sector-specific gaps

The Supreme Audit Institutions of the European Union have naturally closely followed these developments in order to provide expert advice if needed and to monitor issues that could directly affect them. By definition, national SAIs cannot be presumed to be part of the EU or Member State government control framework, nor could they be seen to integrate into an EU external audit framework in a subordinate role in relation to the European Court of Auditors.

At their annual meeting of the Contact Committee of the Heads of SAIs of the EU in Stockholm in December in 2005, the role of external audit within the framework for accountability for Community funds topic was firmly on the agenda. A resolution was adopted, confirming that this clear distinction between internal control and internal audit, and external audit must be emphasized, and that the responsibility for the design and administration of the internal control framework lies with management, i.e. the European Commission and the governments of the Member States.

However, SAIs could yet play an important role in strengthening the internal controls of EU funds in the Member States. Indeed, the aforementioned Action Plan suggested a role for SAIs, namely to “exercise oversight over the national control frameworks for EC funds”, as well as providing an independent opinion on potential management declarations. Some SAIs have indeed expressed a willingness to discuss further how they might strengthen their contribution to an integrated control framework governing EU funds without jeopardising their independence, and in accordance with Article 248(3) of the EC Treaty. The Contact Committee will therefore continue to examine how its members can collectively and individually contribute towards improving the framework of the audit of Community finances.  

George Paterson, ECA

---

9 Further information:
- ECA Opinion No 2/2004 on the 'single audit' model (and a proposal for a Community internal control framework) - OJ C 107, 30/04/2004
NEW MEMBERS AT THE ECA

Earlier this year, five new Members of the European Court of Auditors were appointed for a term of six years, starting from 1 March 2006.

The Members of the Court are independent in their functions, representing solely the interests of the European Community. The five new Members were formally sworn in at the Court of Justice of the European Communities on 17 March 2006.

2006/2007 AGENDA OF EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31st Meeting of EUROSAI Governing Board</td>
<td>Reykjavik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>NMS and CC SAIs Working Group on audit methods and manuals – SIGMA/ECA 13th Workshop on “Experiences learnt during the accession in developing audit methods and manuals”. Hosted by the Riigikontroll Laulasmaa (Estonia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>EUROSAI Conference on role of SAIs in the fight against fraud and corruption</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>Meetings of the Liaison Officers of the SAIs of the EU; and the Candidate Countries and Close to Candidate Countries, ECA and SIGMA</td>
<td>ECA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>SAI, Parliamentary Audit Committee and Ministry of Finance Seminar hosted by the Lithuanian NAO</td>
<td>Vilnius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>55th Meeting of the INTOSAI Governing Board</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>EUROSAI Seminar on the Audit of Public Aids and Subsidies</td>
<td>Prague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22-29</td>
<td>5th Seminar of the EUROSAI Working Group on Environmental Auditing</td>
<td>ECA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>Meeting of the Contact Committee of the Heads of the SAIs of the European Union</td>
<td>Warsaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>International Conference of the IIA</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contributions for the next issue of the newsletter are most welcome and should be sent to: Nick Treen or Esther Bright www.oecd.org/gov/sigma