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Introduction

Welcome to risk based internal auditing (RBIA). I've been in and around internal audit for 30 years and the aim of this introduction and the associated audit manuals is to pass on some of my ideas and experience.

I won't claim that my ideas are shockingly original; indeed most are built on accepted thinking and practices. Thanks are due to my colleagues in the Boots Group and contacts gained from the IIA-UK and Ireland for their help and advice – but the views expressed are my own. My aim in this book is to present some of the principles of internal auditing in a simplified way and make them consistent, based on risk. The reader can then move onto more complex concepts, such as those published by COSO (see the Links section of www.internalaudit.biz).

This book builds on these principles to consider why internal auditing can be of benefit to an organisation and then details how, using risk-based methods, it can deliver this benefit.

This introduction is aimed at anyone interested in internal auditing, from Audit Committee members to students. It is split into chapters. The first deals with the principles of internal auditing and should be of interest to all readers. The remaining chapters show how to introduce risk based internal auditing into an organisation and are more suited to readers who have some experience of internal auditing.

Internal auditing is related to both corporate governance and risk management. Corporate governance includes internal auditing and I have not covered other aspects of it in this book. I have covered risk management, but only as it affects internal auditing.

I should mention that this book discusses the objectives of internal auditing as a ‘process’ within an organisation, and not the objectives of an internal audit activity (internal audit department). Hopefully, the primary objective of an internal audit activity will be to achieve the objectives of internal auditing, but other aims may also involve documenting controls, stock counting, providing staff on secondment, routine branch audits and efficiency audits.

This book, with its related web site and audit manuals are my view of risk based internal auditing. They are not meant to represent ‘best practice’ but to be thought provoking. This book is not intended to be a lengthy, well-researched academic treatise, but a simple introduction. I’ve therefore used an informal, as opposed to an academic, style. I'll leave you to judge whether this works. I have written another book (available on www.internalaudit.biz) on the implementation of RBIA that is more formal and expresses more of a mainstream view, but not completely. I would advise you to look for further information from the links on the website.

Finally, Risk based internal auditing by David Griffiths is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported License. I don’t mind you using parts of it, provided you quote this source. It should not be used to promote any product or service, without my permission. I do mind you making money out of it, unless I get some!

Many thanks and happy reading…

David M Griffiths Ph.D. F.C.A.
1 The basics

1.1 What is a risk?

Why are we bothered about risks? Because they threaten our objectives. They may threaten our personal objectives - the risk of a delayed train threatens our the visit to our family; or our organisation’s objectives - the risk of a competitor’s new product threatens our profits.

So what is a risk? My definition:

A risk is a set of circumstances that hinder the achievement of objectives.

This definition requires the existence of objectives. If we don’t have any objectives – we don’t have any risks. It also results in an interesting observation: that the same set of circumstances can be an opportunity, or a risk, depending on our objectives.

For example: take a farmer with land near the River Nile and a Curator managing a nearby museum. One objective of the farmer is to work fertile land, helped by the annual flood, which deposits river silt. One objective of the Curator is to keep the exhibits in his museum safe. The flooding of the Nile is therefore a risk to the curator, but an opportunity for the farmer. So if you don’t know your objectives, you aren’t going to get far in managing your risks.

It’s often said that risks are not always unwanted. For example, launching a new product is considered as a risk, although not an unwanted one. I don’t agree, launching a new product is a process with risks threatening its success. That doesn’t mean we don’t launch the product; it does mean we aim to reduce the risks to levels we can accept, which would at least be to a level where we can reasonably expect the product to make a profit! So we should aim at managing all risks. Ideally, we should try and quantify risks threatening projects, for example by using financial risk modelling. In this way the risks can be compared with the potential benefits.

Risks are also a fact of life. Some managers would like to remove them completely, but this is impossible without closing down the entire organisation (which also presents risks). So they need to be mitigated (managed).

1.2 How do we manage risks?

So what can we do about risks? Well there are processes we can use to manage them.

- **Avoid the risks**, for example not starting up a business selling innovative products or closing a factory making dangerous chemicals. This may mean giving up significant opportunities. This process is known as ‘termination’.

- **Transfer** them, the best example being insurance.

- **Tolerate them**, without planning any contingencies. These are the ‘asteroid hits earth’ type of risk. This does not mean that no-one will address this risk – governments may decide to try and deflect asteroids using nuclear missiles.

- **Tolerate them**, and plan contingencies. These are the ‘hurricane destroys factory’ type of risk.

- **Introduce some processes to reduce the consequence or likelihood** of a risk. These processes are usually referred to as ‘controls’ and include everything from having a clear strategy to installing a fire alarm. This method of management is known as ‘treatment’.
However, I define any process which manages risk in one of the above ways as an ‘internal control’. Thus:

**An internal control is a process which manages a risk.**

There’s an important point about controls: controls are a response to risk. If there is no risk, then you don’t need a control. In other words, controls are a product of an organisation’s risk management processes.

### 1.3 How do we assess internal controls?

So, our objectives are threatened by risks, which require internal controls to manage them. How do we know if the internal control is effective? What do we mean by effective?

An effective internal control is one which manages the risk down to a level which our controlling board of management (Board of Directors, Trustees, Governors) considers acceptable. Thus we need:

- A means of measuring the significance of a risk.
- A statement from the controlling board as to which risks they consider significant and which must therefore be managed, using the measuring system we have implemented - known as their risk appetite.

We’ll consider the detail of measuring risks and setting a risk appetite when we look at implementing risk management. We’ll assume for now that we have measured our risks before applying an internal control (the inherent or gross risk score) and after an internal control (residual or net risk score). We would expect our internal control to reduce the inherent risk score to a residual risk score which is less than the score our board has set as their risk appetite (target score).

### 1.4 Who is responsible for implementing internal controls?

The management of an organisation are responsible for:

- Identifying what risks exist.
- Scoring these risks (inherent risk score).
- Implementing internal controls to manage risks, and scoring the controlled risk (residual risk score).
- Receiving from the controlling board their risk appetite, in terms of the scoring used.
- Informing the board about those risks which are still above the risk appetite (usually those which are to be tolerated).
- Implementing internal controls to bring the remaining risks below the risk appetite
- Assuring the organisation’s board that it is monitoring the internal controls which bring the remaining risks to below their risk appetite.

Management have these responsibilities because they are in the best position to know the risks threatening their objectives, take action to implement the appropriate internal controls and monitor their continued operation.
1.5 What is the role of internal audit?

Well, the main aim of any activity in an organisation should be to achieve the objectives of the organisation itself. Thus:

**The main aim of internal auditing is to assist the organisation to achieve its objectives.**

So if the organisation’s objective is to ‘add shareholder value’ then that is the aim of internal auditing. If it is to ‘Relieve famine in central Africa’, then that is what internal auditors should be doing. Seems obvious, but it’s worth making the point that internal auditing is not special. It should be able to justify its existence just like any other process in the organisation.

There is an assumption, hopefully justified, that the objectives of any organisation would include the requirement to obey applicable laws and regulations.

So how do internal auditors justify their salary? Let’s go back to the objectives of the organisation. The achievement of these objectives is hindered by risks which should be managed below the risk appetite by internal controls. But are they? It’s the role of internal audit to provide an opinion. Hence my definition:

**Internal auditing provides an independent and objective opinion to an organisation’s management as to whether its risks are being managed to acceptable levels.**

Let’s look at this definition in detail:

**Independent:** the function carrying out the internal auditing activity should be outside the normal management hierarchy, ideally responsible to a board executive, or similar, with a strong reporting line to the chairman of the audit committee.

**Objective:** objectivity is a state of mind; it doesn’t depend on your boss. Opinions should be based on verifiable facts, viewed without bias.

**Opinion:** This is the keyword in the definition. The objective of the internal auditing is all about telling management and through them the stakeholders, whether risks are being managed. The word ‘assurance’ is often used but it doesn’t allow for the circumstances where assurance can’t be given. An opinion can be good or bad.

**Organisation:** A group of people, with supporting assets, that is accountable to stakeholders. For example, external parties, such as shareholders, governments and trustees; or owners, such as partners and shareholders in a ‘private’ company. Such an organisation will normally have to prepare financial, and other, statements for these ‘stakeholders’.

**Management:** The group of people accountable for these statements and for the proper operation of the organisation. In public companies, ‘management’ is now being specified as the audit committee.

**Managed:** Risks are managed by using the internal controls we have considered: terminate, transfer, tolerate or treat.
Acceptable: This means that the internal controls are managing risks to a level that management consider reasonable, that is below the ‘risk appetite’ of the organisation. Thus internal auditors have to understand this risk appetite, against which the significance of risks can then be measured. It also implies that, when management is assuring the board that it is controlling risks, the risk appetite must be understood by all. It is the board which defines the risk appetite, and which the internal audit activity must accept, even if it considers it is set too high or low. However, the board has a responsibility to its stakeholders and probably has to comply with legislation that requires it to maintain a proper system of internal control.

1.6 Where does ‘risk management’ fit in?
What is risk management and what responsibility does the internal audit activity have? Let’s start with some certainties:

- Managers own risks and it is their responsibility to control them.
- Internal auditing provides an opinion, to management, as to whether risks are properly controlled.

‘Risk management’ is a term widely used, and ‘Risk Manager’ jobs exist in organisations. Theoretically, since managers own risks, they must ‘manage’ them. That accountability cannot be passed to a third party. In practice, risk managers tend to have responsibilities between managers and the internal audit activity, assisting the organisation to identify its risks, running risk workshops, coaching staff in risk management and setting ‘best practice standards’.

The Internal Audit department may be asked to provide advice, and more, on risk management.

Based on this, my advice to internal auditors would be to give as much assistance as you like provided:

- It doesn’t compromise your independence and objectivity.
- The resources required don’t hinder you from achieving your main objective of meeting your audit committee’s targets.
- Managers don’t come to regard you as the risk owner. You’re providing an opinion to them, not the other way round.

My own experience has shown that, if risk managers exist, the responsibilities of internal audit and risk management must be clearly defined and communicated within the organisation. Ideally both functions should report to different senior managers or directors to reinforce the distinction.

1.7 Summary
So my current definitions may be summarised:

- **Risks** threaten objectives.
- **Internal controls** manage risks.
- **Internal auditing** provides opinions about whether **internal controls** are managing risks to acceptable levels.

Although my definitions are not the same as those from official bodies, I prefer them because:

- They are simple
They provide a clear trail from an organisation’s objectives to all the internal controls it requires, and to the purpose of internal auditing.

This diagram summarises the elements of internal auditing.

---

**Fig. 1 The elements of internal auditing**
# The risks

## 2.1 What internal audit needs

If internal audit are to provide an opinion on whether risks are being managed to acceptable levels, this requires that:

- A system for measuring risks is established.
- The board define a risk appetite in terms of this measuring system.
- Management determine all risks and score them.
- Risks are formally recorded in a *Risk Register* with their scores.

Ideally:

- Management have introduced internal controls to manage the risks.
- Management have the residual risks to ensure they are below the risk appetite.
- A framework is established in order to categorise risks.

Since there may be over 200 risks in a small organisation, and many thousands in a large one, risks need to be categorised in a framework in order to record and score them.

## 2.2 Who's responsible for finding risks?

### 2.2.1 The role of management

We have seen that the role of management includes:

- Identifying what risks exist.
- Scoring these risks (inherent risk score).

In some organisations management will set up a framework to identify and score risks, possibly appointing 'risk managers' to help. In other organisations, the internal audit activity will be asked to help, and in the remainder not much will happen at all.

*The complete identification of risks, by management, is the most important part of risk-based internal auditing, as well as being vital to the proper operation of any organisation.*

### 2.2.2 The role of internal audit

We've learnt that:

*Internal auditing provides an independent and objective opinion to an organisation's management as to whether its risks are being managed to acceptable levels.*

Which can also serve as the definition of risk based internal auditing!

It is management's responsibility to identify, score and manage risks, so where does the internal audit activity fit in? It doesn't, since it is management's responsibility to pass over a list of risks to internal audit, on which they can then base a plan of work (an audit plan) to deliver the internal auditing objective above.

However, internal audit may assist in the identification of risks, provided it does not affect their objectivity and they take no role in managing the risks.
2.3 Grouping risks

We need to find some way of grouping risks into categories, in order to ensure the risk register is not a large number of unrelated risks which cannot easily be used as the basis of an audit programme.

There are various options to categorise risks:

1. By the job title of the person responsible for the risk. These however change over time and make the register difficult to keep up-to-date.
2. By the department or system which the risk is threatening. This is a possible method but makes the assumption that the systems do not have stages missing, or that the systems do have too many stages (are inefficient).
3. Since risks threaten our objectives, we can break down the objectives into a hierarchy until we come to a level where there are only a few risks threatening each objective.

How can we use option 3 in practice?

2.4 Breaking down objectives

2.4.1 Level 1

Let’s take an example – a charity with the top level (level 1) objective: ‘Relieve famine in central Africa’. (I’ve chosen a charity as an example, in order to illustrate that we can use the risk based audit approach for any organisation. I should state that I have no experience of this type of charity!).

The significant ‘top level’ (level 1) risks might be

1. No clear strategy as to how to achieve our objective.
2. Unable to predict where and when famines will occur.
3. Unable to obtain food.
4. Unable to deliver the food to the starving.
5. Do not have the staff and systems to support the operation.

These risks can be arranged in a hierarchy (appendix B).

Nothing difficult so far – but we can’t really drive manageable audits out of these risks. For example, an audit of the supply chain might involve everything from paying for shipping grain, through making sure we had spare parts for our lorries, to checking that bridges along the route would take the weight of these lorries.

2.4.2 Level 2 objectives

So we need to break down the objectives further until we get to a level where we can identify risks and controls which can be audited. How? We’ve seen that risks hinder objectives, so the next level of objectives is to overcome the risks identified.

Taking our example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks to level 1 objective</th>
<th>Related objectives (level 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No clear strategy as to how to achieve our objective.</td>
<td>Devise a strategy for the next five years to deliver our objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unable to predict where and when famines will occur.</td>
<td>Set up a system which enables us to predict famine areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unable to obtain food.</td>
<td>Set up agreements with donors to obtain food</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Unable to deliver the food to the starving. | Establish delivery systems to deliver food when and where it is required
5. Do not have the staff and systems to support the operation. | Establish functions to support the field operations

Let’s carry on to the next hierarchy for risk 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks to level 2 objective</th>
<th>Related objectives (level 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unable to obtain space on ships</td>
<td>Establish contacts with shipping companies to anticipate problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Insufficient lorries to transport grain</td>
<td>Decide how future needs are to be met, by local carrier or own lorries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lorries break down</td>
<td>Lorries to be properly maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Insufficient drivers</td>
<td>Identify how to recruit at short notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Roads are impassable</td>
<td>Set up possible alternative routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do not know where food is required most urgently</td>
<td>Set up strategy for prioritizing camps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We could carry on, as these objectives are hindered by risks and could be further subdivided. However, we have now reached a level where there are only a few risks threatening each objective and the internal control required is nearly identical to the objective. So, we can carry any more subdivision as part of an audit.

2.4.3 A hierarchy of objectives

We can now build the hierarchy (appendix B) into an Objectives Map – see appendix C. (It is useful to number each objective as shown). The objectives map takes the organisation’s primary objective and identifies the objectives necessary to deliver it, in ever increasing detail down to a level at which we wish to plan individual audits.

The advantages of an objectives map are:

- It will incorporate all the organisation’s objectives, after it has been agreed by management.
- It is independent of the departments and people in the organisation, and so, when they change, we don’t have to change the map, only the owners of the objectives.
- By linking risks to these objectives we can be reasonably sure that we have identified nearly all the significant risks.
- We can compare our objectives to the processes actually in use to deliver them and see if any are missing, or are not required.
- By scoring (see later) the risks relating to each objective, we can identify the objectives hindered by the most significant risks and audit these first.
- We can define audits in terms of the objectives included in that audit. Thus enabling us to easily identify our audit coverage.

So we have now got a logical structure for our organisation, which will be used to help management identify all significant risks. We now need a means of deciding the significance of each risk, so:
2.4.4 An alternative method

When I was a trustee for a small charity providing 60 houses for the elderly, I had to compile a risk register. The charity is an almshouse charity, with standards available from the Almshouse Association. I used these standards to create a three level hierarchy of processes and generated risks from the standards. These were then combined with risks compiled by the Board of Trustees. Details are available on www.internalaudit.biz site.

Standards may be applicable to parts of an organisation, such as IT, where the Control Objectives for Information and related Technology (COBIT®) standards can be applied.

2.5 Measuring risks

2.5.1 Scoring

One common method of scoring risks, which is simple and effective, is to consider two characteristics:

- The Consequence (also called impact) when a risk occurs.
- The Likelihood (also called probability) of the risk occurring.

There are five levels applied to each characteristic, defined as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If the consequence when the risk occurs is:</th>
<th>The likelihood of the risk occurring is:</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To close down the organisation, or a significant part, for a very long period</td>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>Very high (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To prevent the organisation achieving a major part of its objectives for a long time</td>
<td>Probable</td>
<td>High (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To stop the organisation achieving its some of its objectives for a limited period</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Medium (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To cause inconvenience but not affecting the achievement of significant objectives</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Low (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To cause very minor inconvenience, not affecting the achievement of objectives</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Very Low (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If possible, it is useful to put values to the consequence score, for example, a cash loss over £1m might be considered very high if it threatened the existence of the organisation. However, don’t get carried away with a need for accuracy, remember we only need an approximate value to determine where we audit.

Since we need to sort risks, it helps to attach numbers to the risk measure (for example 4 for ‘High’). Consequence and likelihood can be multiplied together to give a single measure of the significance of a risk, or a different combination can be used. For example, take the risk that a lorry may break down. Assuming we have only three, old lorries, the consequence could be medium (scores 3) but the likelihood could be high (scores 4), giving a significance of 12.

2.5.2 Measuring the effect of controls

Risks are scored before and after taking account of the internal control which manages the risk.

- **Inherent** (or gross or absolute) risk scores are measured by assessing the consequence and likelihood of a risk occurring before any internal controls are taken into account.

- **Residual** (or net or controlled) risk scores are measured by assessing the consequence and likelihood of a risk occurring after any internal controls are taken into account.

In practice, it is relatively easy to measure inherent risks for new projects, since there are no controls yet in place. However, for ongoing operations it is much more difficult. Measuring the consequences is not too difficult, since most controls don’t reduce these, but only the likelihood. But what’s the likelihood of a risk occurring if we have no controls – almost certain every time! It’s for this reason that, when carrying out interviews, or a risk workshop, the best risks to measure are residual risk, since people naturally assume controls to be in place.

The main danger, of course, is that there is an assumption that controls are present and operating. Since it is the purpose of internal auditing to provide an opinion to management as to whether these controls properly manage risks, the internal audit plan should be chosen on the basis of inherent risk, not residual risk. So, there is no real reason to determine the mitigating controls, and score the residual risk, since this will be done as part of the audit. In practice it is better to do this because:

- The residual risk is the only measure we may have from risk workshops.
- It checks our scoring of the inherent risks. For example, a residual risk with a consequence of high (4) cannot have an inherent score with a consequence of medium (3) unless the internal control had actually increased the risk!
- The audits which may need high priority are those with a high residual risk – since we know we have got problems in these processes.

2.6 What risks are the board prepared to accept?

We have talked about managing all risks to acceptable levels, sometimes called the 'target' level. Now we have scored risks before and after internal controls we can begin to define the organisation’s ‘risk appetite’.

One method of deciding which risks to accept is to place them on a grid of likelihood and consequence (see Fig. 2 below). This enables the board to define the action it requires management to take for each likelihood/consequence combination. The boundary between the acceptable risks and those which require managing is known as the ‘risk appetite’. If inherent risks cannot be managed below this line by ‘treatment’ then they will have to be terminated, transferred or tolerated.
Note that the board have determined that a risk with catastrophic consequences and rare likelihood requires action to manage it, even if it only has a score of five. Of course that action may be to ‘tolerate’ the risk if it cannot be cost-effectively reduced.

The risk appetite could be set higher for different parts of the organisation, or for development projects aimed at increasing the value of the organisation.

The diagram also shows the potential impact of internal controls in reducing an unacceptable risk to an acceptable risk. Risk-based internal auditing is all about providing an opinion as to whether these controls are managing risks to an acceptable level.
So now we can assign risks to a structure, measure them and assess their significance. Let’s get out and find out what people think are the real, significant risks.

### 2.7 Finding the significant risks

#### 2.7.1 Start at the top

Who knows the significant risks? The most significant people. That is, the board of a company, the partners, the trustees of a charity or the Vice-chancellor and senate of a university.

There are three basic methods of determining risks:

- Interviewing
- Risk workshops
- The accounts

If your organisation has a ‘Risk Management’ function, it is they who will probably be involved in using these techniques.

#### 2.7.2 Interviewing

The output from an interview is an individual’s view of the risks hindering their objectives within the organisation. The advantages of an interview are:

- It’s easier to arrange than trying to get a group of people together.
- People may be prepared to express their concerns, which they may not wish to do in a meeting. This should give rise to a wider range of risks than from a meeting.

The disadvantages are:

- The wide range of risks will be more difficult to categorise.
- You will still have to run a risk workshop to get consensus on the consequence and likelihood of risks.

Some practical tips for interviews are given in appendix D.

#### 2.7.3 Risk workshops

The output from a risk workshop is a list of risks, which could threaten the objectives being considered, with a measure of their consequence and likelihood.

Risk workshops can be used:

- With the most senior people in an organisation, to get the significant risks.
- With members of a project team, to highlight the risks facing the project.
- With people involved in an audit, to highlight any issues already known.

The advantage of a risk workshop, over interviews of individuals, is that people interact with each other to produce new ideas. Risks workshops are useful at the start of audits because they help get ‘buy-in’ from the departments involved.

Details of how a risk workshop can be run are included in appendix E.

#### 2.7.4 The accounts

We should examine the accounts of the organisation, both the figures and the surrounding processes with the management concerned.
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For each of the headings in the accounts, what represents the significant risks? For example, in banks these might include the ‘bad debts provision’, but for retailers these might include the ‘obsolete stock provision’. Don’t only look at figures that might be unusually high, but those which are unusually low. We might expect these figures to be checked by the external auditors but past failures show this trust might be misplaced.

2.8 Recording the risks

2.8.1 What we’ve got so far

- A list of risks which are considered significant by the people that own them - management. Some may have been prioritised in risk workshops.

- An objectives map, updated from interviews and risk workshops. For example process 5.1 (Raise money) on our original objectives map (appendix C) has been raised to 5 (Acquire funding) to indicate its importance. (I’ve not included an updated appendix C but the risk register, discussed later, shows the amended structure). It is probably still incomplete.

It will have taken some time, and considerable effort to reach this stage. We still have some problems:

- While some people will understand the purpose of identifying risk, others will consider it a waste of time. Getting management to support and contribute to the identification of risks is one of the most difficult parts of risk-based internal auditing.

- We don’t know if the organisation has captured all its risks, and we have a record of them.

- Our list of risks will be broad and some may look as if they will never match up to our objectives map.

- Many risks will focus on new projects which may not have clear objectives.. These effectively link up to process 1.3 (Delivery of strategy) but when it comes to audit planning each project will have to be evaluated to determine its objectives and assess its risks.

- Some risks will be very broad covering most, if not all the organisation. Such risks include:
  - The inability to recruit good staff.
  - The lack of contingency plans.
  - Fraud.

In practice these are included as additional processes under ‘Support’ (5 in appendix C) but considered for inclusion in all audits. Appendix L gives some ideas.

- One risk that will be highlighted is ‘the loss of the organisation’s reputation’. However, an organisation doesn’t lose its reputation for no reason but from other risks, such as poor quality products, bad advice, and expensive products. So when this is mentioned as a risk, determine the underlying risks.

- Although our risks should be linked to our objectives map, this does not necessarily match with the systems actually being used, for example purchasing.

- The lack of structure in a list of risks will make it difficult to talk about the audit plan, and its achievements, to the Audit Committee and other interested people.
So, we need to allocate the risks which have been identified, to those objectives threatened by them, in a structured way. We can then determine the most significant risks, and build the audit plan to check if these are adequately managed by internal controls. The audit will enable us to match objectives with the systems in use.

### 2.8.2 The risk register

Since risks will have to be scored and sorted, they are best input into a ‘database’. This can be held in a spreadsheet (for example ‘Excel’), or database program (for example ‘Access’). We start by putting the objectives map into the database, adding risks and scoring them. Appendix F shows part of this database, held on a spreadsheet, which is known as the **risk register**. (Those appendices which show the risk register can only show part, with some columns and rows omitted. To view the whole database, download the spreadsheet from [www.internalaudit.biz](http://www.internalaudit.biz) and examine G - RAU planning).

Since each risk is to be scored and sorted, the objectives to which it is attached are repeated in the appropriate columns. If an objective is threatened by several risks it is repeated. If a risk affects more than one objective, it is repeated.

As we saw when drawing up the objectives map, since the aim of the register is to set up an audit plan, we only have to break down the objectives to a level low enough to identify audits. Hence many objectives are only broken down to level 2. A column 'Objective description' is included to provide more details on the lowest level.

It is useful to record the consequence when a risk occurs to assist in setting a consequence score.

Recording the source of the risk is important to demonstrate its authority.

The risk is given scores for consequence (Cons) and likelihood (Like), assuming no internal controls are present to mitigate it. These two scores are multiplied together to give the significance score (Sig).

It would be possible to add another column for 'System' to link the objective/risk with the actual systems in use, such as sales cycle, purchases cycle and payroll. This would be useful where there was a good systems map, possibly used for systems based auditing, since it could highlight missing objectives and risks.

We could now add those controls we have been told are present and score the residual risks. (I haven’t done this for all risks). It isn’t essential, as we will have to verify the proper operation of the controls as part of our audit work. Where the residual risks are scored:

- It enables us to concentrate on those areas with residual risks over the risk appetite, since these represent a control weakness.
- We can calculate the **control score** as the inherent risk score minus the residual risk score. This gives a measure of the importance of the control, and therefore the priority we should give it when decided when to audit it.

There is a column **Audit action** where we can indicate whether the risks and associated control requires auditing.

### 2.8.3 Updating the register

Since management is accountable for the control of risks, the register is effectively owned by the managers. They should agree to its content and scoring. They should be involved in regularly updating it with new risks, removing those that no longer exist and re-scoring risks, where necessary.

The risk register needs to be held independently, to ensure changes are correct. This might be risk management in a large organisation, or could be internal audit.
I should also add that the register would be built up over many months and be much more comprehensive than Appendix F. Take it as an illustration, not ‘best practice’!

2.9 Life in the real world

2.9.1 Levels of risk maturity

In the real world we may not get the opportunity to influence the compilation of the risk register. If we are lucky, it may be collection of risks put together by managers who have been properly trained. If we are unlucky we may get a collection of risks thrown together by untrained managers who want to get on with their ‘real’ jobs. The degree to which the organisation understands risks and has implemented risk management is known as its risk maturity.

The IIA – UK and Ireland publication on ‘Risk Based Internal Auditing’ defined five levels of risk maturity: risk enabled, risk managed, risk defined, risk aware and risk naïve. Since the effectiveness of RBIA revolves around a reliable risk register, we need to understand the characteristics of each type, and then decide where our organisation fits!

**Risk enabled:** (Risk management and internal control fully embedded into the operations).

An understanding of the management of risk and the monitoring of controls will be very sophisticated in this organisation. A complete risk register will be available for audit planning. Confidence in the risk management process should enable a range of auditing techniques to be used, from checking the management of individual risks, to those affecting a complete subsidiary. The emphasis of the audit work will be that the risk management processes are working properly, in particular, that key risks are reported to the board and that monitoring of controls by managers is operating. If weaknesses are found, it is unlikely that a recommendation from the internal activity will be necessary, since management will know the action to be taken.

**Risk managed:** (Enterprise-wide approach to risk management developed and communicated).

Similar to the risk enabled approach. It may be necessary to facilitate management’s proposed action where weaknesses are found.

**Risk defined:** (Strategies and policies in place and communicated. Risk appetite defined).

While most managers may have compiled lists of risks, it is possible that these will not be assembled into a complete risk register. The internal audit activity will act as a consultant to facilitate the compilation of a complete risk register from lists risks already compiled by managers.

The quality of risk management may vary across this type of organisation. Any individual audit therefore will have to place emphasis on understanding the level of risk maturity in the areas being audited. Where risk management is poor, we will have to facilitate the identification of risks, using workshops and interviews. It is probable that some consultation work will be necessary to advise managers what action to take where weaknesses are found.

**Risk aware:** (Scattered silo approach to risk management)
No risk register will be available, only a few managers will have determined their risks. We will act as a consultant to undertake a risk assessment (in conjunction with management) to determine the work required to implement a risk framework that fulfils the requirements of the board. Using the key risks agreed with management, an audit/consultancy plan will be generated which aims to provide assurance that risks are being managed, or advice as to how to respond to them.

**Risk naïve: (No formal approach developed for risk management).**

As with the risk aware organisation, it will be necessary to promote, or provide consultation on, the establishment of a risk management framework.

2.9.2 **The impact of risk maturity**

If our organisation is only risk aware or risk naïve, there are some unpleasant consequences:

- For organisations that are subject to regulations concerning the adequacy of risk management, the level of risk maturity in risk aware and risk naïve organisations is not acceptable, and we should report this to the audit committee.

- If our organisation has this level of risk maturity, we don’t have a reliable risk register and, I would argue, we cannot therefore implement RBIA. Some would disagree, believing it is possible to use RBIA, based on the internal audit activity’s own analysis of risks. This is a very dangerous approach, not only are internal auditors unlikely to be able to produce the comprehensive risk register necessary but it only encourages management to continue believing that internal auditors own the risks!

- Risk driven individual audits are possible, without reference to a risk register. These rely on risks being determined as part of the audit work and require management training and risk workshops to determine risks in the areas being audited. The internal audit activity should not determine risks without management involvement, nor maintain their own list of risks. This will only reinforce management’s belief that internal audit are responsible for risk management.
3 The risk register

3.1 What is risk based internal auditing?
I don’t think risk based internal auditing is different from internal auditing. Or, in other words, internal auditing is the same as risk based internal auditing and should use the RBIA methodology.

This is a very controversial statement, as it implies that all the other methodologies used by internal audit activities should be replaced - and that includes all those standard audit programmes. There is more on this argument in the section on the impact of RBIA.

Let’s return to the definition of internal auditing:

Internal auditing provides an independent and objective opinion to an organisation’s management as to whether its risks are being managed to acceptable levels.

This means that the organisation's risks determine where and when internal audits take place. There is no separate list of internal audit's risks, no separate schedule of internal audits to be carried out on a cyclical basis and no list of systems to be audited. We are dependent on management's list of risks and so we'd better make sure it's accurate and complete!

3.2 The organisation’s requirements
So RBIA requires that the organisation:

- Knows all its significant inherent risks, that is, all those above its risk appetite.
- Has evaluated these risks so that they can be prioritised in order of the threat they represent.
- Has defined its risk appetite such that inherent and residual risks can be evaluated to determine whether they are above or below it.

These requirements imply:

- That the board has set appropriate policies on internal control.
- That the board has approved the risk appetite.
- That the management has been properly trained to identify and evaluate risks, and to design, operate and monitor the system of internal control which implements the policies adopted by the board.

If we haven’t been involved in the process of compiling the risk register, one of our first jobs is to audit it for completeness and accuracy.

3.3 The RBIA stages
RBIA is all about providing an opinion on whether risks are being properly managed. So the work we have to do is:

1. Confirm the organisation’s risk register is suitable for us to use as a basis for planning.
2. Decide those risks on whose management we are to provide an opinion and when. Group these risks into audits, that is compile the risk and audit universe. Compile an audit plan, probably annual, for approval by the audit committee.
3. Carry out the individual audits that will provide the opinions. Deliver a periodic (at least annual) report to the audit committee, and update the risk and audit universe as necessary.

In practice, stage 1 will need to be done only once, or until we are confident in the risk register! The universe will need to be regularly updated as risks change and audits are completed. Stage 2 will be done annually, although the plan will probably change throughout the year.

We will consider stage 1 in this chapter, 2 in chapter 5, and 3 in chapter 6.
3.4 The RBIA Documentation

We’ll deal with the detail later on, but it’s useful to consider the overall methodology at this point. There are two documents which drive the methodology detailed in this book:

3.4.1 The risk and audit universe (RAU)

This is an extension of management’s risk register and is best kept as a database, either on a spreadsheet (for example Excel), a database (for example Access) or a database especially for the purpose. The RAU contains:

- The risks that management has identified and their score.
- The objective that the risks threaten and possibly the related system.
- The owner of the risk.
- Details of controls managing the risk.
- The audit that provides an opinion on the management of each risk.
- Details of the last and next audits.
- Other attributes of the risks and controls, such as the COSO framework categories. (See the Links section of www.internalaudit.biz for more information)

Since a database can be sorted, it is possible the produce reports showing:

- Audits in the current audit plan
- Risks, in order of the objectives they threaten. This assumes objectives are uniquely numbered as has been done in the examples in this book
- Risks, in order of their significance, using the inherent risk score.
- Many other reports, including those showing resources, depending on the data held.

For an example, see appendix H in the spreadsheet downloadable from www.internalaudit.biz.

3.4.2 The audit database

It would be theoretically possible to include all the organisation’s risks in the RAU but this would usually result in a huge database that is difficult to manage. One of the advantages of using special software is that it is capable of recording all the risks. The solution to this problem is to set up a separate database for each audit. This is similar in layout to the RAU but shows more detailed processes and audit tests and results. It links in with the RAU by incorporating the high level processes and risks that are relevant to the audit. There is therefore an ‘audit trail’ from the audit to the RAU. For an example, see appendix K in the spreadsheet downloadable from www.internalaudit.biz.

Since this database holds most of the information relevant to an audit, it replaces much of the documentation necessary and links in with the audit report.
3.4.3 Other important documentation

The Report to the audit committee summarises the results from the individual audits and is derived from the RAU.

The Audit Report presents the results of an individual audit and is derived from the audit database. An example is given in the Audit Manual on www.internalaudit.biz.

3.4.4 Summary

The diagram below summarises the important documentation and shows the ‘audit trail’ that RBIA provides. It makes it possible to see how any individual test relates to the overall opinion provided to the audit committee and allows this opinion to be easily justified, right down to individual tests.
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3.5 Stage 1 - Reliability of the risk register

3.5.1 Objective of the stage
We now need to demonstrate that risks above the risk appetite have been identified and correctly evaluated by management in order to assess whether the risk register can be used as the basis for the RAU and audit planning.

3.5.2 Internal audit work
- Discuss the understanding of risk with the board and senior managers.
  Determine what has already been done to improve the risk maturity of the organisation such as training, risk workshops, questionnaires about risks and interviews with risk managers.
- Ask for documents which detail:
  - The objectives of the organisation.
  - The methods to be used by managers to determine the significant risks that threaten the processes for which they are responsible.
  - The scoring system to be used for assessing the significance of risks. Ideally this will include values for a ‘consequence’ scale.
  - The board’s statement of risk appetite.
  - How a consideration of risk is to be embedded into management’s decision processes, particularly project management.
  - Our organisation’s risks, preferably structured in some way which enables an opinion to be made as to the completeness of the risk register.
- Examine the documents, check that procedures are adequate and have been followed, throughout the organisation.

3.5.3 Opinion
Reach a conclusion as to the suitability of the risk register as a basis for audit plans.
- If it can be used, with minor improvements if required, ask management to make these.
- If it cannot be used for all, or parts of, the organisation, we decide on whether we are willing to facilitate improvements. We report to the audit committee that there is no complete list of evaluated risks and discuss other strategies for selecting areas to audit.

3.6 Stage 2 - Compiling the risk and audit universe and audit plan

3.6.1 Objective of the stage
- To decide which risks should be included in the audit plan
- To allocate risks to the audits that will provide an opinion on their management.
3.6.2 Which risks?

Where risks are to be terminated, transferred or tolerated, a conventional audit will not necessarily be appropriate. Our next stage is therefore to filter the risks as follows:
• The risk is within the risk appetite of the organisation and requires no further work.

• Management consider the risk cannot be bought within the risk appetite, and it will be tolerated. If contingency plans are required, we do not filter out the risk, in order to ensure the plans are audited.

• Management have transferred the risk, for example by insurance. An audit may still be necessary to ensure all the risk has been transferred. For example that insurance covers all the risks management believes it covers.

• Management will terminate the risk. There may be a need to keep this risk within the audit plan, to ensure that any risks arising from the termination are being managed.

• The risk is being examined by a third party (external auditors, quality control, health and safety), who may provide assurance directly to the audit committee, or through internal audit, or through another function (director of governance, for example). The organisation’s overall strategy on assurance should provide guidance.

• The risk was being managed within the risk appetite, as evidenced by previous audit work. Taking into account the risk evaluation, audit results, management monitoring of controls, changes in the area concerned, and the time since the last audit, internal audit can provide assurance that risks will remain within the risk appetite, without doing any audit work. A date outside the plan may be recommended for the next audit.

The remaining risks are those on whose management an opinion is required and these will form the basis of the audit plan (stage 3). These risks, and those filtered out, will be included in the report to the audit committee so they are aware of how all the risks are being managed.

### 3.6.3 Grouping risks into audits

We now have a risk register from management (Appendix F) that we can use for the basis of our audit plan. It shows objectives, with the risks that threaten them and a score attached to the risk, indicating its significance.

At this stage we could sort the database by risk score to find the most significant risks. However, this will split up the objectives so it is useful to group those risks and related processes that will be included in the same audit (I’ve just used letters – you can be more sophisticated).

The grouping of risks into one audit will depend on:

• The length of time, and resources we want to devote to any single audit (the more objectives, the longer it will take).

• The people we wish to interview as part of the audit. (If we are to arrange meetings with many people, we might as well include as many relevant objectives as possible).

• The location of the audit. If we are going to Africa, we want to include all the relevant objectives and risks.

An alternative method favoured by some organisations is to list out all the possible audits (the Audit Universe) first and then link objectives and risks to them. This is particularly useful if the organisation has many off-site operations and wishes to audit each one as a unit. If this methodology is used, it’s important to check that all risks are being covered by at least one audit.
Now consider the list of audits identified. Are there any missing that the internal auditor would consider essential to check the management of significant risks? Their absence may indicate that we have missed some risks from the register.

Whichever method we use, the risk register will now show the audits that will check their management (appendix G). The advantage of recording the risk and audit universe by having one line for each risk is that we can sort it by objective (sort by columns L2 then L3 then L4) or by adjusted inherent risk score (column S) or in other ways, as we require. (If you need more information then look at the ‘Managing lists’ chapter in the Excel help menu.

So we now have a list of risks and the audits (denoted by a letter) that will check the management of those risks (appendix G). This is the start of the risk and audit universe that we use as the basis for all our audit work, including the annual plan, which is stage 3.
4 The annual audit plan

4.1 Objective of stage 3
To produce a plan showing:

- Those audits required.
- When they might be carried out.
- How long they are expected to take (days).
- The risks and related processes to be included in each audit.
- The staff assigned to the audits.

The plan will become ‘less definite’ depending on the length of time to the audit.

4.2 Why an annual plan?
I’ve heard the proposal that there is no need for an annual plan – since in practice, we can’t plan in detail that far ahead. Thus we could work down the risks in the risk and audit universe and build these into a detailed quarterly audit plan. There are however reasons for an annual plan:

- Our organisation’s senior management (board, trustees) may require a plan to use as a target for the internal audit activity.
- Some regulations require an annual assessment to ensure that the board has considered all significant aspects of internal control for the year under review. This implies that the annual plan should contain audits which enable the board to make its public statement.

4.3 When to audit?
Is the management of every inherent risk above the risk appetite to be checked every year? Do we have to cover every risk in the first year of setting up RBIA? For most organisations this would require a large number of auditors, so a compromise has to be found.

One possibility is to use our matrix (below). At the start of RBIA we would aim to audit the management of ‘red’ risks is the first year, ‘yellow’ risks within two years, ‘light green’ within three years and ‘green’ risks never. We can only use this methodology if we are confident in the scoring of the risks.
It’s not ideal. Although it’s simple, it reminds me of ‘cyclical’ auditing, which RBIA is trying to move away from.

### 4.4 Which audits?

If we don’t use the cyclical method above, do we work down to the bottom of the risk and audit universe, before going back to the top, or do we re-audit the controls over ‘high’ risks before auditing some of the ‘low’ risks? Our decision depends on:

- The inherent risk score (significance).
- When the audit was last completed.
- The results of the audit.
- The risk level above which the audit committee want our opinion.

We can apply a factor to the risk score, based on the time since the last audit, and the opinion. For example:

*Fig. 6 Grid for the frequency of audits*
(Audit result opinion: green = risk is controlled, amber = risk is partially controlled, red = risk is not controlled)

So, if the risk has a score of 12, was audited one year ago and found not to be controlled (red), it would be scored with a significance of 12*0.75 = 8 when drawing up the audit plan.

So, we take the risk and audit universe (RAU) (appendix G) we have so far, add details of previous audits to it, and apply the factor to give us the adjusted score for the year, 2006 (appendix H). I've not updated the date in this version, as I would be do it every year!). This is a more sophisticated system than the cyclical method and does have the important advantage of taking into account the results of the last audit. At this point we now have a means of sorting the RAU by the adjusted inherent risk score to give us risks in order of priority for an opinion on the effectiveness of their management.

We just need to know the value of the adjusted inherent risk score above which the audit committee require an opinion as to the risk’s management. This might be the risk appetite score (which we have taken as 4 or below for ‘acceptable’, that is no audit required). If we ‘draw’ a line above the scores of 4 and below, any audit above this line should be included in the annual plan. Some audits may involve risks above and below the line and we can decide whether to include these, or not.

In order to uniquely identify a specific audit, an audit number is added from the top (starting from last year’s last number) and put against each risk in that audit letter. An alternative numbering method would be to use the audit letter and year of audit as the identifier (For example, D2014). It is at this point that we might wish to omit the lower scored risks from audits. If we were using a proper database (as opposed to a spreadsheet) we could link details of the audits carried out to the processes, using the unique audit number.
RBIA - Compiling the audit plan

There are alternatives to the approach used above. For example, if the number of risks is large, it is probably better to group them into audits and then score each audit, based on the risks included. Each audit could be scored on the total risk score it included, or the average. Make your choice!

We do need to add the objective owners, since it is they who are accountable for delivering the objective, and who therefore own the risks. They are our main points of contact.

The residual risk score is not used as a basis for the audit plan, as it is determined using the assumption that the internal control is operating, and it is this that we wish to audit.

4.5 Resources

We can decide on the staff resources required to deliver the audit plan by deciding on the number of days each level of auditor is required for each audit, adding these up, and comparing them with the total days available. This calculation is done at the bottom of appendix H of the Excel spreadsheet. (We could of course work out the resources available first and see what audits we can carry out but this is not recommended as a basis for providing an opinion on the control over the organisation’s risks).

Note that audits will vary in length; even those which are high risk could be done very quickly. It may only take logging into our organisation’s intranet to confirm that it has a strategy, and this is being communicated.

The resource requirements should be regularly updated to ensure the plan can be completed, especially if audits are added and staff leave the department.

4.6 The ongoing risk and audit universe

We now have the definitive risk and audit universe of objectives, risks and audits for 2006 (appendix H). This database is used to:

- Record the objectives and their related risks. It is updated at least quarterly by those managers who own the objectives.
- Show the ‘owner’ of the risks, that is, the person directly responsible for ensuring the risk is being properly managed. It is likely to be this person who carries out the monitoring controls.
- Decide on those risks, with management, where it requires audits to give an opinion whether the risks are being managed to acceptable levels. This includes the addition and removal of audits resulting from the periodic updates of risks and their scores.
- Show the risks whose management will be checked by each audit.
- Indicate the agreed timing (month or quarter) of planned audits.
- Show the status of the audits for the current year (unplanned, planned, fieldwork, reporting, complete).
- Indicate the achievement of milestones (agreement of the work required, report).
- Show the results of previous audits.
- Form the basis of next year’s plan, after updating with the results of audits from this year.
If required, show the controls and monitoring controls which manage the significant risks in the RAU. These will otherwise be shown in the individual audit databases.

4.7 Publishing the annual plan

We’ve now got an annual plan within the RAU (appendix H), which can be sorted or filtered to provide a variety of reports. This spreadsheet is so wide, only part is included in appendix H. I would advise you to download it from www.internalaudit.biz.

We will provide the audit committee with a summary which will show:

- Details of those risks where an opinion will be provided about the risk management processes by carrying out the audits in the plan.
- Details of those risks where an opinion will be provided but based on audit work from previous years, plus limited follow-up work where desirable.
- Details of those risks where consultancy work will be carried out to assist management in reducing the residual risks to below the risk appetite.
- Any risks not covered, due to policy or resource constraints.
- Confirmation that the plan is in accordance with the internal audit department’s terms of reference.

4.8 Quarterly plan

In the good old days when we had work plans which defined clearly what tests should be done, and management were involved only in the close down meeting, we knew exactly how long an audit would take and people could work full time on that audit.

Risk-based audits are not so simple:

- We may never have audited these processes before and can’t easily estimate the time required.
- We are auditing strategic processes, which involve strategic people, who aren’t always available. Even meetings that are arranged well in advance may be cancelled at short notice, leaving the auditor short of work. (OK, I know internal audit should be so important that directors won’t cancel meetings, even when the CEO calls them).
- Risk workshops and close down meetings will have to be arranged well in advance, and even then we may lose one or two important persons, so delaying the audit.

My experience of managing risk-based audits is that, in order to ensure auditors are kept busy, they need at least three audits – one being set up, one where fieldwork is being done and one where the report is being written and agreed. You can also throw in a systems development audit. This requires the recruiting of self-motivated auditors who can prioritise their time – but that’s another story.

An example of the quarterly plan is in appendix I.
5 The audit

5.1 Objective of the audit

To provide an opinion as to whether the risks covered by the audit are being managed to within the risk appetite. The processes involved are shown below.

![Diagram of the audit process](Diagram.png)
This figure is also provided on a PowerPoint slide in the file to be used with this book.

### 5.2 What is an audit?

So, we know what audits we’re doing, when we’re doing them and who’s doing them, even if we don’t know precisely how long they will take. We also know, at a high level from the plan, the risks on whose management we will provide an opinion and the high level business objectives which these risks are threatening.

So how do we do the audits? Back to first principles: internal auditing provides an opinion to management whether risks, which threaten the achievement of objectives, are being managed by internal controls. So the basic structure of an audit is:

1. Determine, in greater detail than is probably in the plan, the detailed objectives which deliver the high level objectives.
   
   2. Check the risk management framework in the areas concerned, using the methodology in stage 1. Where the organisation has not determined its detailed risks, you have choices:
      - Stop the audit work and report to senior management that it cannot continue because management have not identified risks.
      - Work with the management to identify and evaluate the detailed risks affecting their processes.

   Document all objectives and associated risks in an audit database (appendix K). The definitive list of risks is noted in the column ‘risks for this audit’. The more risk mature the organisation is, the more information will be available on risks and their associated controls.

3. Ascertain, and test the existence of, the internal controls. The greater the risk maturity, the greater the emphasis will be on checking the monitoring controls carried out by management. Check the residual risk scores evaluated by management, on the basis of the test results. If they have not been scored, agree a score with management.

4. Decide where risks are not being sufficiently managed by controls, according to the organisation’s risk appetite.

5. Provide an opinion to management whether individual risks are being managed to an acceptable level. Agree the action to be taken, and timing, with management.

The diagram in appendix J shows 5 stages involved in an individual audit in relation to the overall purpose of internal auditing.

In practice audit stages 1 and possibly 2 will be included in the planning stage, and staff probably won’t be engaged full time on this audit. Stages 2, 3 and 4 will form the fieldwork stage of the audit, when staff are likely to be full time. Stage 5 is the reporting stage.

The practical processes for carrying out an audit are shown in the operational manual for risk-based audits, available from www.internalaudit.biz. The notes below provide more details about the audit processes.

### 5.3 Planning - the audit scope

The purpose of the scope document is to set out why the audit is being done, what risks and processes it will involve, what it will deliver, how it will deliver, who will deliver and when they will deliver. We will send it to every manager who has an interest in the audit, with a request to brief his or her staff.
Where possible, we should provide figures to emphasise the monetary value at risk. This could include not only potential losses but also ‘loss of opportunity’.

The scope must state the objectives being covered; ideally relating them back to the agreed objective map. If any objectives are specifically excluded from the audit, this should also be stated. There is a tendency for people to assume the area of an audit is always larger than it actually is. In other words – we need to manage expectations.

We also need to note the objectives because our audit will be providing an opinion on whether the risks threatening these objectives are being properly managed. If they are not, the objectives will not be achieved.

The scope therefore, will have the following headings:

- The reasons for the audit.
- The objectives, risks and related systems and key controls
- The work programme, which should follow the approved methodology.
- Factors which define the limits of the audit including objectives specifically excluded.
- Any special considerations, such as management requests, provided they are acceptable.
- The personnel carrying out the audit, including any special responsibilities.
- The timing of the audit.
- The recipients of the scope, draft and final report (although these may change, depending on the issues found by the audit).

The reasons for the audit should include the objectives of the audit, that is, to conclude on whether:

- Risks have been properly identified, evaluated and managed.
- Internal controls are operating properly to mitigate these risks to levels defined as acceptable by board policy.
- Action is being taken to improve controls, where risks are not being properly managed.
- More monitoring, by management, is necessary to ensure proper internal controls into the future.

The scope will be agreed with our ‘customers’ – although we, the auditors, have the final say! A meeting to discuss the scope is a good opportunity to get everyone, auditors and people affected by the audit, together.

As the audit progresses, we may wish to change the scope. This should be done as soon as possible, in conjunction with those who agreed the original scope and a revised document issued.

### 5.4 Fieldwork - fact-finding and risk assessment

This stage involves finding out, using interviews and following through transactions, to see how the detailed systems work. Don’t lose sight of our aim, there is no need to devote time to minor risks and document systems in fine detail.

We may be outside our ‘comfort zone’ in this type of audit. It is important to remember that we are not trying to do the job of those people who are using the systems we are auditing. We are there to provide an opinion whether management have identified their risks, and are operating controls to manage them. If we don’t think we have the expertise to do this, we should be bringing in help from specialists inside, or outside, the organisation.
Fact-finding often overlaps with risk and control assessment. Feedback from my customers indicates that, during these stages, they like to be involved through meetings where they can have the audit explained to them and get the chance to raise issues. These meetings, which could be used as risk workshops, are also very useful as they encourage buy-in from everyone involved.

Fieldwork serves two purposes:

- Determining the risk maturity of the areas concerned – have they identified and evaluated risks are they operating a system of internal control to manage them?
- Ascertaining the internal controls which manage the risks. Two types are noted in the audit database:
  1. Direct controls – those that address the risk directly, such as authorisation of invoices, bank reconciliations.
  2. Monitoring controls – those processes operated by management to ensure key controls are operating effectively, such as approving the bank reconciliations, scrutinising the overdue debtors' listings.

5.4.1 Risk maturity

Hopefully, we will collect a detailed list of risks from the managers involved, or the organisation’s main risk register may be sufficiently detailed. Where risks have not been determined in detail, and we have decided to proceed with the audit, we will determine risks from risk workshops (appendix E), meetings and best practice guidelines.

Risks will be put into a database and scored (appendix K). This database breaks down the main processes identified in the scope, and therefore contains the next level(s) below those in the risk and audit universe. It would be possible to incorporate these in the risk database, but for most companies this would result in a large database which would be difficult to manage.

The example in appendix K is for the audit of processes 4.2 and 4.3 (grouped into audit K – Transport of food to camps, audit number 146).

The risks we identified in level 3 as part of the initial risk assessment should be incorporated into the audit database, but may need to be amended. The process of risk assessment is one of continual update.

The audit database is the central information source for the audit. It can contain most data related to the audit, and be hyperlinked to notes of meetings and other documents. Thus, we have not only set up a document management system, we have abolished much of the documentation used in a ‘traditional’ audit!

Risks that are present in most processes should also be considered (contingency, competencies, fraud – details in appendix L). These have been added into the audit database as appropriate.

5.4.2 Ascertaining controls

Those processes which control risks will be noted in the audit database, as will those processes which monitor the proper operation of the controls.

Sufficient detail should be recorded so that the residual risk score can be checked and the control's operation can be tested. This applies to direct controls and monitoring controls.
5.5 Fieldwork-testing controls

The existence of controls will be checked, paying particular attention to those which have a significant effect on inherent risk; that is they have a high control score (inherent risk score less residual risk score). The types of tests used, for example compliance, reconciliation, computer assisted, will be no different from those used in financial-style audits and so I'm not providing details. The aim may be slightly different in that the tests are designed to prove the existence and proper operation of internal controls, NOT to find errors.

The emphasis of testing will depend on the risk maturity of our organisation. If it is highly mature (risk enabled) we should have the confidence that management have implemented good internal controls and we can concentrate on testing their monitoring of these controls. For a less risk mature organisation (risk defined) we will spend more time looking at the direct controls as well as the monitoring controls.

Internal auditing is not part of the day-to-day control process, but to draw a conclusion as to how controls have operated to manage risks in the past, in order to draw a conclusion as to how successfully they will manage risks in the future. The important question to ask is, “If these controls fail in the future – how will management know?”

The managers with whom we are working should be provided with a report showing objectives, risks and controls, and asked to confirm the existence of these controls. This can be done as an appendix to the audit report (appendix M).
5.6 The opinions

This is the difficult bit – assessing whether the risks are being properly managed by the system of internal control.

The score of the *residual risks*, re-assessed after our testing of the controls actually in operation, should be our guide, and the chart below is similar to that we have used for inherent risks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood of residual risk</th>
<th>Consequence of residual risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rare (1)</td>
<td>Insignificant (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely (2)</td>
<td>Minor (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible (3)</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable (4)</td>
<td>Major (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost certain (5)</td>
<td>Catastrophic (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Risk appetite, as defined by the board

- **Unacceptable**: Immediate action required to control the risk
- **Issue**: Action required to control the risk
- **Supplementary issue**: Action is advisable if it is cost-effective
- **Acceptable**: No action required

This chart implies:

- A residual risk scoring 15 or above, is ‘unacceptable’. The risk is not being managed to an acceptable level by the control(s) and it is probable that some objectives will not be, or are not being, achieved (red).
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- A residual risk scoring 9 or above is an ‘Issue’. The risk is not being mitigated to an acceptable level by the control(s). There is the possibility that some objectives will not be achieved.

- The grading of a risk with a score of 5 or above (that is one with a high likelihood or consequence and low consequence or likelihood) is difficult. In practice, it may not be possible to manage and it has to be accepted (green). If there are cost-effective controls which can mitigate it, then it is considered a ‘supplementary issue’ in the report.

- A residual risk scoring 4, or below, falls within our risk appetite and is ‘acceptable’. The risk is being mitigated to an acceptable level by the control(s) and no further action is required.

We are now able to form a preliminary opinion on the management of each of the risks, from the following options:

- The risk is being managed to within the risk appetite of the organisation or,
- Action has been agreed to bring to the risk within the risk appetite or,
- The risk will have to be tolerated or,
- The risk is being terminated or transferred, or
- The risk is not being managed to within the risk appetite, and no suitable action is being taken.

Where residual risks are above the risk appetite, these will be listed for discussion with management. The opinion on each risk will determine the overall conclusions.

Where we are reporting ‘unacceptable risks’, or ‘issues’, should we make recommendations as to how these can be reduced to acceptable risks? Theoretically, since management are responsible for implementing controls, we should not need to provide recommendations – they should put forward their solution to us. This will happen with risk enabled and risk managed organisations, but with risk defined organisations they may want advice. This should go under the heading of ‘consultancy’. This issue is discussed in more detail in the section on the benefits of RBIA.

Appendix K shows the detail for the audit. Since it is a long spreadsheet, I suggest you download it from the web site (www.internalaudit.biz).

5.7 Reporting to management

There are various points in an audit when we need to report the issues found back to management. Risk-based audits are no different from any other audit methods, although the format may be slightly different.

5.7.1 Update reports

We should have kept the managers (of the objectives being audited) informed of progress throughout the audit, particularly if significant risks were found. This gives them the opportunity to implement additional controls as soon as possible and avoids nasty surprises at the close down meeting.
5.7.2 The close down meeting

We will hold a ‘close down’ meeting, with all interested parties, to discuss those residual risks above the risk appetite and any other issues found during the audit. The outcome from this meeting is a record of the action management will take to bring risks within the risk appetite, or risks they will terminate, transfer, or tolerate. These last three risks should be included in our report and referred to senior management, or the audit committee, to ensure that they are satisfied the response is appropriate. Where risks are to be tolerated, we will check the existence, and testing, of any contingency plans, where possible. We should have discussed any contentious issues before this meeting to ensure ‘no surprises’. It is important that we start this meeting by stressing the good points that we found during the audit.

If we agreed with management at the start of the audit those risks which threaten the objectives, and the controls actually operating, there should not be too much discussion over whether risks are being properly managed. (That's the theory anyway!)

5.7.3 The report

The primary aim of the report is to conclude whether the risks hindering the achievement of those objectives noted in the scope, are being managed to an acceptable level. The report is the highly visible ‘product’ of our internal audit department. It must not only achieve the above aim but must be clear, concise, free from grammatical and punctuation errors, well designed and relevant.

I suggest that individual reports should have a conclusion against each objective, plus an overall conclusion as required by the IIA Framework. These can then be easily summarised for the annual report to the audit committee.

The conclusion against each objective will be one of:

- ‘Unacceptable’ (red): significant weaknesses that prevent the objective being achieved.
- ‘Issues’ (amber): some weaknesses which might prevent the objective being achieved.
- ‘Acceptable’ (green): Minor, or no, weaknesses and the objective is being, and will continue to be, achieved.

The grade is determined by considering the opinions made against each of the risks. For example, if there are any risks with the opinion ‘The risk is not being managed to within the risk appetite, and no suitable action is being taken,’ then the conclusion on the effectiveness of controls is likely to be ‘unacceptable’. More details are provided in the audit manual (section I – draft report), and related database.

Our overall conclusion will depend on the all the results from the audit – there is no simple formula. For example, the conclusion on objectives which have only one significant weakness, which is being immediately addressed by management, may be an ‘amber’, However, the conclusion on objectives which have no ‘reds’, but many ‘ambers’, which the management are totally ignoring, may be a ‘red’.

How you report your conclusion will depend on your organisation. Some like the report to be given a numerical score – depending on how good the controls are. Comments from auditors who have to use this method suggest it should be avoided, as much time is spend haggling over the score and not enough time on controlling the risks!

Reports can be in four parts, reflecting the findings of the audit:
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1. **Executive Summary**, containing the conclusions, actions to be taken (if any), reasons for the audit and the objectives and risks audited. Sent to the audit committee, main board directors (or trustees or owners), business directors responsible, managers directly involved.

2. **Key issues**, (these result from red or amber risks) detailing the risk, the consequence if the risk event occurs, recommendations for lowering it to an acceptable level (if appropriate), actions to be taken, by whom and when. Sent to business directors responsible, managers directly involved.

3. **Supplementary issues** (these result from green risks which can be further reduced by simple cost-effective measures) detailing the risk and consequences if it occurs. Recommendations (if appropriate), and action to be taken will depend on the issue. Sent to managers directly involved.

4. **Objectives, risks and controls report** (appendix M). Sent to managers directly involved. This report, derived from the audit database, can be long but has several advantages:
   - It shows the work that the auditors have done to support their conclusions. This is especially useful if the auditors worked for two weeks and came up with a two page executive summary giving a ‘green’ conclusion!
   - It can put any significant risks into context. If we have found one significant uncontrolled risk out of 20 properly controlled key risks, the manager concerned can point to this when talking to his/her boss about the report. (Because audit reports tend to stress the negative, I am considering whether it is possible to give some measure in the executive report – such as “95% of key risks are well controlled”.
   - It provides managers with a list of objectives, risks and controls. Thus, if they wish to change their systems in any way, they can see how they might affect their residual risks. Similarly the auditors can see the effect of any changes.

5.8 **Projects**

The audit of projects, for example the implementation of a new computer system, is different from the risk-based audit of an ongoing system for two reasons:

1. The timescales are much longer. An audit of a major project would last over its life, possibly several years.

2. An opinion is required whether that the following risks are being managed:
   - Risks hindering the project from delivering the objectives on time and within budget.
   - Risks which will be present from day one of the project implementation (for example when the system goes ‘live’)

The identification of risks hindering the project should be relatively straightforward; for example, we can hold risk workshops with the project team. These should help us identify most risks, but we will have to update the risk database every month, to take account of risks changing as the project progresses. For the same reason, we will issue a brief report every month, assuring management that risks are being managed, reporting those that are not and indicating the action being taken.
The risks that will be present when the project is implemented are more difficult to assess. For a start, we are unlikely to know the controls which will be in place; in fact we’ll probably have to advise on them. It’s difficult to maintain objectivity here, but we can hardly refuse – since we’re meant to be the experts! However, in a large project, the team should have their own control experts – leaving us to assure management that they are operating properly. In practice, the least we should expect in the early stages of a project is an objectives map with risks attached and possible controls. As the project progresses this should become more detailed, until it resembles our audit database. As with the project risks, we should issue regular monthly reports.

5.9 Stage 5 - Report to the audit committee

Regulations often require an ‘annual report to the board (or Board Audit Committee)” from management on the effectiveness of internal controls. The frequency and contents of the report to the audit committee will depend on the internal audit activity’s charter but will normally include:

1. Opinions on whether
   - The significant risks have been identified, evaluated and managed.
   - The related system of internal control has been effective in managing the significant risks, having regard, in particular, to any significant failings or weaknesses in internal control that have been reported.
   - Necessary actions are being taken promptly to remedy any significant failings or weaknesses.
   - The findings indicate a need for more extensive monitoring of the system of internal control.

2. The audit plan, agreed with the audit committee at the start of the year, has been achieved. If it has not, why not. (If the report is an interim one, the progress towards achieving the plan).
6 What is the impact of risk-based auditing?

6.1 How the delivery of internal auditing is changed

One major change is demonstrated by the audit report. The 'traditional' audit report usually consists of a confirmation that controls are operating properly (a term not often defined), and makes recommendations where they are not. The making of recommendations by internal auditors, which managers were expected to accept, could result in the assumption that internal audit were responsible for controls and, by implication, risk management.

However, the guidance issued in many countries emphasises the reality: managers are responsible for developing the responses to risks and for deciding the action to be taken if risks are not properly controlled.

The impact on internal audit is to clarify its role:

- **Internal Audit’s core role is to provide an opinion to the management and board on the effectiveness of risk management.**

- **Where the opinion states risk management to be ineffective, the onus is on management to implement the appropriate response. Internal audit may still make recommendations, but this is part of a ‘consultancy’ role.**

Splitting the role of internal audit in this way has a major implication for the internal audit department:

- **If no risk management framework is in place (risk naïve or risk aware organisations) risk based internal auditing cannot be carried out as there is nothing on which to base the audit work. Only consultancy work to facilitate the implementation of a risk management framework is possible.**

In practice there has to be compromise, and this book provides practical advice. However, the clarification of the role does show the importance of the organisation’s risk maturity to the internal audit approach.

The change to a risk-based approach is a fundamental change which affects the delivery of internal auditing from start (planning the audits) to finish (report), and all stages in between (staffing, time budgets, field work).

The biggest change is the relationship with the rest of the organisation – it has to play a major part in all stages of the audit. This is hardly surprising, since it owns the risks on which the audit process depends.

We can only talk about the change to risk-based auditing if we know what it is changing from. That's not easy, since there are many different way of delivering internal auditing at present. The best way of seeing what is happening is to type ‘internal audit’ into a search engine and look at the sites it finds.
We can summarise the change below, although this involves some assumptions regarding ‘Previous Methodology’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit process</th>
<th>Risk-based auditing</th>
<th>Previous methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit universe</td>
<td>All activities of the business</td>
<td>Primarily financial areas but also involving compliance with laws and regulations, and ‘operations’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit objective</td>
<td>Provide an opinion as to whether risks are being managed to acceptable levels</td>
<td>Confirm internal controls are operating. Improve efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual plan</td>
<td>Audits directed at high risks</td>
<td>Cyclical plan of audits, not necessarily dependent on risk levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit types</td>
<td>Only distinction is between project (systems development) audits and ongoing processes</td>
<td>Distinguishes between financial, operational, compliance and other types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of the rest of the organisation</td>
<td>Involved at all stages of planning and the audit, since they own the risks and must provide assurance to the stakeholders</td>
<td>Minimal. May approve the audit plan and be involved at the end of an audit to agree the points found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff plan</td>
<td>Several audits allocated to one or more staff at any one time</td>
<td>One audit allocated to one or more staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time budgets</td>
<td>Difficult to set. May be a first-time audit, or one where systems have changed</td>
<td>Easy to set – since the audit has usually been done before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
<td>Ensures the organisation has identified all its risks, and is controlling them</td>
<td>Based on a set work programme, where there may be no clear objective set, just tests to carry out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Similar tests as used at present but aimed at confirming that important controls are operating. Changes emphasis of testing depending on risk maturity of the organisation.</td>
<td>Confirms the operation of controls – but may not prioritise these in order of importance. May also be directed towards finding errors, however immaterial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Provides an opinion to management as to whether its risks are being managed to acceptable levels, and reports if they are not</td>
<td>Confirms internal controls are operating and reports where they are not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RBIA – The benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit process</th>
<th>Risk-based auditing</th>
<th>Previous methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>No recommendations are made as management have responsibility for deciding on the internal controls required. Any recommendations made are part of a consultancy exercise.</td>
<td>Recommendations are made to correct weaknesses found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual report to the ‘board’</td>
<td>Provide an opinion as to whether risks are being managed to acceptable levels. Can give an indication as to the proportion of risks covered</td>
<td>Confirms that the audit plan has been completed, and highlights controls not operating. Cannot give any indication as to the proportion of significant risks covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>Self-motivated, experienced staff used to working with senior management. May be specialists who are not accountants, and may be seconded.</td>
<td>Usually accountants and career internal auditors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.2 Relationship with management

One major, positive, impact can be changes in the relationship with management. The traditional audit approach is to notify management that an audit will take place, probably have an initial meeting to discuss the audit and any management concerns over controls. The auditors then carry out their tests and, unless any serious weaknesses are found, the next contact with management is a discussion of the issues found, with recommendations.

The RBIA approach involves management to a far greater extent:

- The risks to be covered in audits will exist in all parts of the organisation and audits will therefore involve managers in departments never visited before. Many risks will be very significant to the organisation and the discussion of their controls will involve more senior managers and directors than might be involved in traditional finance orientated audits.

- RBIA emphasises management’s responsibility for managing risks. Audits will involve more discussion with managers about their risks and their responses to them. There will be an initial meeting with managers, possibly involving a risk workshop to examine risks in greater depth, and contact throughout the audit to discuss issues.

- The close-down meeting will be less about management’s (sometimes passive) acceptance of internal audit’s recommendations and more about what management are going to do about risks which are not properly managed.

The impact of this greater involvement by management is:

- The Head of Internal Audit (HIA) will be required to ‘sell’ the concept and need for internal audit. A much higher profile may be necessary in non-financial areas in order to pave the way for audits which managers can understand and, hopefully, support.
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Audit staff will have to use more ‘people’ and ‘business’ skills, such as interviewing, influencing and problem solving. While most audit staff will welcome the opportunity to move away from audit programmes to more risk and business based audits, some members of staff may find this move difficult. Training will certainly be required and some staff may have to be transferred.

6.3 Management responsibility for risk management

RBIA requires managers to face up to their responsibility for risks. It is easy for managers to compile a list of risks; it is a different matter to accept responsibility for them.

In taking responsibility for risks, managers will understand that controls are not the responsibility of internal audit, and hence imposed by that department, but are their own responsibility.

6.4 Management of the internal audit department

RBIA has some drawbacks; it is difficult to manage. If the department is used to working to defined audit programmes, the time taken to carry out these is known and audits can be planned sequentially. With audits based on risks, many of which will be carried out for the first time and involve contact with senior managers and directors, it is not possible to plan with any degree of accuracy. In practice, staff work on three audits simultaneously, planning for one, carrying out fieldwork for the second and agreeing the report for the third. Setting targets and appraising staff on their achievement can become more difficult. Monitoring progress against the annual plan also becomes more difficult.

The annual plan will change. Audits may be removed, for example if the operation involved is terminated, and additional audits will be included, where new risks are identified. The audit committee should be informed of these changes, as part of the regular reporting.

6.5 Staff expertise

The expansion of the audit universe to cover all risks threatening the organisation’s objectives requires that the auditor has sufficient knowledge to come to an opinion on the management of risks covered by the audit.

Specialist knowledge may be acquired as follows:

- We use specialist skills available in our internal audit activity. For example, the knowledge of computer auditors where controls over access to a computer system require verification.

- We provide specialist training to our auditors who have general expertise. For example, provide training on the auditing of Value Added Tax payments to an auditor who is a qualified accountant with a basic knowledge of tax calculations. In this case, the plan for the individual audit, including the risks identified, could be checked by a specialist, possibly from our external auditors.

- We recruit specialists from inside our organisation. This might be done on a permanent basis, temporary (a year, for example) or for a specific audit. Such specialists would have to be independent of the area they were auditing. For example, a warehouse manager from one overseas subsidiary could audit warehouse processes in another. Training in the internal audit methodology would have to be provided, and the specialist auditor probably teamed up with an internal auditor.
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- We use specialists from outside our organisation. For example a health and safety expert to audit our health and safety processes. Although such specialists may work alone, they should follow our audit methodology and the scope of the audit should be clearly defined. Their audit documentation should meet our standards, and be reviewed to ensure it meets the quality we expect.

6.6 The benefits

The benefits of risk-based auditing are considerable:

- Risk-based auditing is a simple concept. There is no need for a complex definition of internal control, or internal auditing, and it involves the whole organisation and its processes – so no need to define which functions internal auditing should involve – all of them.

- Alongside this simplicity, there is a unity. The recommendations made can be traced back through controls and risks to the organisation's objectives, using the RAU and audit databases. Similarly, we can easily demonstrate what proportion of significant risks we have audited, and the results, to provide assurance to the board about the "effectiveness of the company's system of internal control". RBIA ties all aspects of internal auditing together; objectives, risks, controls, tests and reports. The relevance of any test can be seen in relation to the opinion on the entire risk management framework because of the relationships set up in the risk and audit universe. This is not always possible where audit programmes are used, as it is not always clear why the test is being carried out; the significance if a control is found to be defective; what risk the control is treating and what objective is being threatened by that risk. RBIA provides an ‘audit trail’ from an individual audit report back through tests, controls and risks to objectives, and forward to the audit committee report on whether those objectives are threatened.

- The organisation buys in to the audit process. Because it has to be closely involved in the process, and should be able to clearly see the benefits of our output, it is far more likely to support the audit work, as opposed to treating it like an unwanted imposition. (No-one does that – do they?).

- Resources can be justified. Because the audit plan is driven by the proportion of risks on which the audit committee requires assurance, this determines the resources required. This differs from the alternative approach, whereby the resources available determine the audits which can be carried out. It also ensures that resources are directed towards checking the management of the most significant risks.

- The work is more challenging and interesting to staff. They have to work in non-finance areas, with staff that may be seconded in for the audit. There is no handle-turning of work programmes, without really understanding why the test is being done.

- Risk-based auditing is more efficient, because it directs audits at the high-risk areas, as opposed to financial areas, which may not represent such a great risk.

- We can rank recommendations, to provide the greatest value added in terms of the risks mitigated.

- RBIA should highlight risks which are over-controlled, and therefore improve efficiency.
RBIA – The benefits

Fundamentally, the internal audit function is now much more part of the organisation and less introspective. It involves the organisation more in the audit process and produces recommendations which contribute to its objectives. At the same time it has to be careful not to lose its independence and objectivity, as a result of getting closer to the operations.

6.7 Disadvantages

With every advantage there are always some disadvantages:

- The closer relationship with the rest of the organisation may reduce the independence of the internal audit function. We should prevent this by making the responsibility of internal auditing clear and by adopting the ‘iron fist in a velvet glove’ approach.
- It’s hard work! We have to sell the risk-based process to the organisation, get it to tell us its risks, score them and then have to carry out some difficult audits which we have never done before! Stakeholder management is vital, and takes time.
- While the principles are simple, the delivery can be complex, as we can see from the spreadsheets.
- Existing staff may need retraining.
- By concentrating on audits of inherent risks above the risk appetite, some audits previously considered important by senior management might disappear. These might include audits of small overseas subsidiaries, ‘petty cash’ and the Staff Social Club.

6.8 Some questions

6.8.1 What happened to the consultancy responsibilities of internal auditing?

I believe that the activity of internal auditing should be solely directed towards providing an opinion, and fulfilling the requirements of the local regulations. To include consultancy changes the focus of the activity, and could be a contradictory aim, in some cases.

This does not mean that internal audit activity doesn’t give advice on the controls to be expected, or facilitate the identification of risks but this role must not hinder the primary objective.

6.8.2 Do I have to throw away my work programmes and questionnaires?

Ideally – yes! The danger of using programmes is:

- They can be incomplete. In particular, they might not check the management of all significant risks.
- Since many are not linked to risks, there is no indication as to the importance of the test and the consequence if the control tested is found to be ineffective.
- They can lead to a ‘box ticking’ exercise by staff anxious to hit the budgeted time, without gaining an understanding of what they are doing. In this way, major risks which are not being managed properly may be missed.
- They don’t encourage management to identify and control their risks.

The only reason for retaining them is to act as a useful checklist to ensure we have identified all the risks and controls for the processes we are auditing.
RBIA – The benefits

I hope in future that published work programmes will disappear, to be replaced by lists of typical risks and controls.

6.8.3 Do financial audits disappear?

No, but the risks included in these audits have to be judged alongside all the risks faced by the organisation. Which is the more important, the failure to get food through to famine areas because lorries have broken down, or an incorrect calculation of depreciation?

6.8.4 Where does Control Self-assessment (CSA) fit in?

I have great doubts about CSA. I have used it, and seen it fail to achieve its objectives. There is a fundamental contradiction:

- Conscientious managers will always be aware of the limitations of their systems, and are likely to answer “No” to some questions.
- Managers who don’t really care about controls will just answer, “Yes” to every question.

So what do you audit? The processes with some “No” answers or those with all “Yes” answers? If you still have any doubts, consider this question from a CSA form, ‘Unreconciled financial transactions are researched and corrected in a reasonable period of time’. Who is going to answer “No” to that question?

I know that the defence of CSA is to say that it must be backed up by audits and disciplinary action, but that only disguises the fundamental problem.

So is all lost? No – look at the problem from the point of view of a manager:

- Help them to identify the significant risks they face
- Agree the controls necessary to mitigate these risks
- Advise on tests, which the manager can carry out (or ask his/her staff to carry out) which proves the control is working.
- Put these on a questionnaire for staff to confirm, monthly, to the manager, that the controls are operating. (So no opportunity for a “No” answer!). Put this confirmation in their job targets.
- Tell the manager to file the document. It is his, or her, responsibility to ensure risks have been identified and are being controlled, not ours.

The internal audit activity can confirm the correct operation of this procedure as part of its risk-based agenda.

I have used this procedure as a manager of an accounting department (100 staff) and it works. It would also form useful evidence to support local requirements.

6.8.5 What’s Enterprise Risk Management (ERM)?

Sometimes known as Enterprise-wide risk management (EWRM). It has been defined as:

“A structured and continuous process across the whole organisation for identifying, assessing, deciding on responses to and reporting on opportunities and threats that affect the achievement of its objectives” The role of internal audit in enterprise-wide risk management IIA – UK and Ireland
RBIA – The benefits

It is no different to the approach that we have seen in this report; it’s just that if you are a bank, or chemical company, it’s a lot more complex. A bank will have credit risks and a chemical company will have environmental hazards. Both will probably have specialist departments to ensure these risks are managed. The role of the internal audit activity may be to provide an opinion as to whether these specialist departments are ensuring effective risk management. However, the Board may decide to obtain assurance directly from these departments. The danger of this approach is that risks may fall between the various areas of responsibility.

6.8.6 Where do fraud investigations fit in?

Theoretically the consequence and likelihood of frauds occurring in all processes should be considered and, if this results in a high-risk score, that risk will be audited. Unfortunately frauds are rather emotional, often small frauds resulting in a reaction out of proportion to their loss. This is not surprising, since they often represent a betrayal of trust which makes everyone around feel ashamed. There may therefore be a need to artificially inflate the consequence score to recognise this.

Otherwise the detection of fraud is management’s responsibility. Similarly, ‘embedded monitoring’ carried out by the internal activity is work management should be doing. If management like the results from CATTs (computer aided audit techniques), tell them where to buy a copy of the program.
Glossary

Beware – these are not 'official' definitions!

**Audit Plan**: A list of audits to be carried out in a specified time frame.

**Board**: An organisation’s governing body, such as a board of directors, supervisory board, head of an agency or legislative body, board of governors or trustees of a non-profit organisation.

**Control**: a process which manages a risk.

**Control Score (gap)**: The difference between the inherent and residual risk scores. The higher the value, the more important the control.

**Director**: Member of a controlling board, such as a company director, trustee, councillor or governor.

**Enterprise-wide Risk Management (ERM)**: A structured, consistent and continuous process across the whole organisation for identifying, assessing, deciding on responses to and reporting on opportunities and threats that affect the achievement of its objectives.

**Facilitating**: Working with a group (or individual) to make it easier for that group (or individual) to achieve the objectives that the group has agreed for the meeting or activity. This involves listening, challenging, observing, questioning and supporting the group and its members. It does not involve doing the work or taking decisions.

**Inherent (gross) Risk**: a risk evaluated without any responses being taken into consideration.

**Internal auditing**: provides an independent and objective opinion to an organisation’s management as to whether its risks are being managed to acceptable levels.

**Internal audit activity**: the function (department) which delivers internal auditing to the organisation. It may also be responsible for other activities such as providing accounting staff to cover vacancies and facilitating risk management. It will usually consist of internal audit staff, managed by a Head of Audit (HIA), governed by a charter established by the organisation’s audit committee.

**Internal control**: a term usually used to indicate the response to a risk, the options being; terminate; transfer; tolerate; treat.

**Management of Risks**: The implementation of responses to risks, which reduce their threat to below the level of the risk appetite or, where this is not possible, reports the risk to the board.

**Monitoring**: Processes which report to management, at appropriate intervals, the success, or otherwise, of the responses to risks.

**Process**: a task which assists in delivering an organisation’s objectives (for example, despatch of goods), or controls risks (authorisation of invoices), or provides a risk framework (identifies risks).

**Residual (net) Risk**: a risk evaluated with any responses being taken into consideration.

**Risk**: a set of circumstances that hinder the achievement of objectives.

**Risk Appetite**: The level of risk that is acceptable to the board or management. This may be set in relation to the organisation as a whole, for different groups of risks or at an individual risk level. Risks above the risk appetite are considered a threat to the reasonable assurance that an organisation will achieve its objectives.
RBIA – Glossary

Risk and Audit Universe: The risk register showing the audits which are intended to provide assurance that each risk is properly managed.

Risk based internal auditing: see ‘Internal auditing’!

Risk Management Framework: all the processes which aim to identify, assess and manage risks.

Risk Maturity: An assessment of how well an organisation understands its risks and is managing them.

Risk Register: A complete list of risks, identified by management, which threaten the objectives of the organisation.

Significant Risk: A risk, inherent or residual, above the risk appetite.
8 Further reading

8.1 Links
As it difficult to keep links up-to-date and add new information as it becomes available, I am making this available on www.internalaudit.biz.

8.2 You want to manage information or teach computing??
You might like to look at my other sites, which consider the management of information (www.managing-information.org.uk) and provide resources for tutors www.learncomputing.org.uk.
## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Original*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal auditing objectives</td>
<td>A PowerPoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives and risks</td>
<td>B PowerPoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives map</td>
<td>C PowerPoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing tips</td>
<td>D This doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk workshop tips</td>
<td>E PowerPoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The risk register</td>
<td>F This doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk and Audit Universe – Audit planning</td>
<td>G Excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk and Audit Universe – Audit plan 2014</td>
<td>H Excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly plan</td>
<td>I Excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of the individual audit process</td>
<td>J PowerPoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit risk database</td>
<td>K Excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks to be considered</td>
<td>K This doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process, risks and controls report</td>
<td>M This doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures in this document:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excel and PowerPoint appendices may be downloaded from http://www.internalaudit.biz
A Internal auditing objectives

The main aim of internal auditing is to assist the organisation to achieve its objectives.

Objectives

An internal control is a process which manages a risk.

A risk is a set of circumstances that hinder the achievement of objectives.

Internal auditing
provides an independent and objective opinion to an organisation’s management as to whether its risks are being managed to acceptable levels.

The management of an organisation have

The main aim of internal auditing is to assist the organisation to achieve its objectives.
B Objectives and risks

Objective level 1

Relieve famine in central Africa

- No clear strategy as to how to achieve our objective
- Unable to predict where and when famines will occur
- Unable to obtain food
- Unable to deliver the food to the starving
- Do not have the staff and systems to support the operation

Objective level 2

- Devise a strategy for the next five years to deliver our objectives
- Set up a system which enables us to predict famine areas
- Set up agreements with donors to obtain food
- Establish delivery systems to deliver food when and where it is required
- Establish functions to support the field operations

Establish a supply chain to ensure prompt delivery of food to the highest priority area

- Unable to obtain space on ships
- Insufficient lorries to transport grain
- Lorries break down
- Insufficient drivers
- Roads are impassable
- Do not know where food is required most urgently

Objective level 3

- Establish contacts with shipping companies to anticipate problems
- Decide how future needs are to be met, by local carrier or own lorries
- Lorries to be properly maintained
- Identify how to recruit at short notice
- Set up possible alternative routes
- Set up strategy for prioritizing camps
C Objectives map

1. Devise a strategy for the next five years to deliver our objectives
   1.1 Agree a strategy
   1.2 Communicate strategy

2. Set up a system which enables us to predict famine areas
   2.1

3. Set up agreements with donors to obtain food
   3.1

4. Establish delivery systems to deliver food when and where it is required
   4.1 Establish contacts with shipping companies to anticipate problems
   4.2 Decide how future needs are to be met, by local carrier or own lorries
   4.3 Lorries to be properly maintained
   4.4 Identify how to recruit drivers at short notice
   4.5 Set up possible alternative routes for delivery
   4.6 Set up strategy for prioritizing camps

5. Establish functions to support the field operations
   5.1 Raise money
   5.2 Provide financial advice
   5.3 Provide transaction processing
   5.4 Provide legal services
   5.5 Provide information technology
   5.6 Provide human resources

Relieve famine in central Africa
D Interviewing

Tips are:

- Find a ‘champion’ for risk assessment among the group of people you are to interview. This is typically the finance director (chief financial officer). Discuss the best approach with them and get them to sell risk assessment to any doubters.

- Do your homework. Ensure you know the organisation’s objectives and any specific targets the director (or equivalent) may have. Think about the risks yourself – you may have to provide examples. Talk to other parts of the business that have regular contact with the directors, to get their advice.

- Have someone to take notes, while you question. This doesn’t inhibit the conversation, provided you tell the person being interviewed what is happening. You can then classify these notes and discuss them at the later risk workshop. The advantage of this approach is that it limits the possible wide ranging discussion about risks at the workshop and enables you to concentrate on the necessary action to take on the major risks. However, limiting the discussion could be a disadvantage.

- At the start of the interview explain what a risk is, and why it’s important to determine them. Focus on the output of the exercise (it will help deliver the objectives), so people can see, at the start, that their time in the meeting will have benefits.

- Interview people individually, with an agenda circulated before.

- Allow an open discussion, don’t try and direct it.

- Bear in mind that one of the biggest risks to any organisation is the directors, and the decisions they make. There are plenty of examples over the past few years to illustrate this point! You should therefore expect to have ‘Make poor decisions’ as at least one risk.

- When you have determined the risks from the interviews, these should be documented and circulated. They can be used as the basis for a risk workshop to decide on the significance of the risks, who is to ensure they are mitigated, and when by.
E  Running a risk workshop

In giving the detail below, I have omitted the essential points of running any meeting, such as preparing the room in advance, having a ‘warm-up’ session and rehearsing presentations.

Preparation:

- Identify the people who can best identify the risks. In the case of high-level risks this will be the board (or equivalent). Avoid numbers of people more than 10. Have two meetings if necessary.
- Invite them to the workshop. Send an agenda, explaining why the output from the workshop is important.
- Experience has shown the workshop will last two hours to identify risks and their consequence and likelihood. After two hours everyone will be too tired to carry on. If you want a meeting to assign actions to risks, set up another meeting.
- If you have difficulty in getting everyone together try:
  - Adding the workshop onto a meeting that most of your people attend (for example, board meetings)
  - Have a long lunchtime workshop with a working buffet.
- Prepare an introduction, which will define a risk and illustrate the output from the meeting, and how it will be used.
- Make sure you understand the objectives that are threatened by the risks you are hoping to find.

The workshop

- You will need a chairman, to ensure that everyone gets a chance to say something and a ‘scribe’, to write down the risks. The role of the scribe is very important, it is not a silent role - they will ask for clarification before writing down a risk.
- Don’t use complex technology as it may slow down the meeting and hence stifle lively debate. When people are shouting out risks you need a good supply of pens and flipchart paper (or chalk/white board).
- Start by giving a short (no longer than 10 minutes) presentation that you prepared earlier. This is when you can use technology.
- Ascertain, from people at the meeting, the objectives of the organisation, project or area being audited. I believe this stage to be essential, as without objectives, how can you begin to talk about risks? If people don’t know their objectives, you have just found a significant risk!
- You should have no more than 6 objectives. Any more will result in people being uncertain as to priorities (another risk). These objectives should be those of the organisation, project, or area being audited, not your objectives!
- Write each objective on the top of a flip chart page, or whatever you are using to record the risks. They must be visible to the entire meeting.
• For each objective, ask members of the team to shout out the risks which might hinder the achievement of this objective. The scribe writes them down for all to see, giving each a unique number. This is where the scribe is important, as he, or she, will ask for clarification if a risk is not understood by all. Don’t worry if one risk affects more than one objective, or you can’t easily allocate a risk to an objective, the important task is to record the risk once against any relevant objective. This risk identification takes about an hour.

• When wording risks, try not to make them just the failure to deliver a process. For example the risk hindering 5.4 “Organise door to door collections” should not be “Fail to organise door to door collections”.

• More importantly risks should not be the absence of a control. For example, the risk “Invoices are not authorised” presupposes a control. The risk is “Invoices may be paid for goods or services not required”; the control is “All invoices are authorised by a senior manager”. If a risk occurs a loss will result. If there is an absence of a control, a loss will not necessarily result.

• You should now have individually numbered risks noted on flip charts or similar. The next stage is to get the meeting to agree how likely these are to occur and what their consequence will be if they do occur.

• Draw two axes on a large piece of paper (I use four flip chart sheets stuck together) and label them as below. If you are really sophisticated you can have a large laminated sheet set up, with the most significant risks highlighted in red (see below). You may also be able to use an interactive white board, if one is available.
For each risk, ask the meeting where it fits on the graph. This can be done by writing the number on a ‘Post-it’ note and sticking on the paper. The advantage of this method is that you can change your mind easily. Whatever you do, write the agreed numbers directly on the paper after the meeting, as the post-it notes fall off when you take it down!

Don’t be surprised if many of our absolute risks are scored as 25. We are looking at significant risks, with no controls. External risks, such as “Information predicting next year’s harvest is not available” may have likelihoods less than high.

For some risks there is a link between consequence and likelihood. For example take the risk, “lorries may break down”. If we have many lorries, we could score this risk as the possibility of all lorries breaking down at once (consequence = very high, likelihood = low) or the possibility of one lorry breaking down (consequence = low, likelihood = very high). Either way the risk score is the same (10). In these circumstances, the risk should be clearly stated.

We have defined likelihood and consequences measures for a 5X5 grid but you may wish to make up your own, particularly assigning monetary values to ‘consequence’

So you now know what risks are threatening your objectives, and which ones are considered significant. Experience shows that you also have a group of people who now understand, if they didn’t before, the importance of understanding risks.

You will have taken about two hours to reach this point and everyone is exhausted. STOP NOW!

Assigning risks

The next stage is to consider how each risk is being, or should be mitigated, by internal controls, who should be accountable and when they should have completed their task.

This can be done using another meeting of all the people involved, an individual meeting, for example with the project sponsor, or several meetings, for example if you are wanting to determine the internal controls present as part of an audit.
### Level 1 objective: Relieve famine in central Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2 objective</th>
<th>Level 3 objective</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Consequence of risk</th>
<th>Risk source</th>
<th>Inherent risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish a strategy</td>
<td>The trustee's of the charity define the future aims and plans</td>
<td>Management team do not unanimously support it</td>
<td>Strategy not actioned with the result that it does not achieve its aims</td>
<td>Risk workshop with directors 15-Dec-2005</td>
<td>Cons. 5  Like. 5  Sig. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a strategy</td>
<td>The trustee's of the charity define the future aims and plans</td>
<td>Strategy might not be the best to achieve our objectives</td>
<td>Charities aims not achieved effectively and efficiently. Possible loss of funds</td>
<td>Risk workshop with directors 15-Dec-2006</td>
<td>Cons. 5  Like. 5  Sig. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a strategy</td>
<td>Tell all staff about the strategy and its importance to them</td>
<td>People in the organisation are unaware of the strategy</td>
<td>Charities aims not achieved effectively and efficiently. Possible loss of funds</td>
<td>Risk workshop with directors 15-Dec-2005</td>
<td>Cons. 5  Like. 5  Sig. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a strategy</td>
<td>The strategy is converted into targets and action for all staff</td>
<td>Strategy not converted into action</td>
<td>Charity does not achieve its objectives</td>
<td>Risk workshop with directors 15-Dec-2005</td>
<td>Cons. 5  Like. 5  Sig. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a strategy</td>
<td>The strategy is converted into targets and action for all staff</td>
<td>People in the organisation do not have personal targets linked delivering the strategy</td>
<td>Charity does not achieve its objectives. Loss of morale, staff leave</td>
<td>Risk workshop with directors 15-Dec-2005</td>
<td>Cons. 5  Like. 5  Sig. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a strategy</td>
<td>The strategy is converted into targets and action for all staff</td>
<td>New projects do not add value</td>
<td>Loss of funds</td>
<td>Risk workshop with directors 15-Dec-2005</td>
<td>Cons. 5  Like. 5  Sig. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a strategy</td>
<td>Aims and plans regularly updated</td>
<td>Strategy not updated to take account of changing circumstances</td>
<td>Charity does not achieve its objectives</td>
<td>Risk workshop with directors 15-Dec-2005</td>
<td>Cons. 5  Like. 5  Sig. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate famine areas</td>
<td>Receive weather reports and assess their long term impact</td>
<td>Reliable rainfall figures for Central Africa are unavailable</td>
<td>Do not foresee the effects of drought</td>
<td>Risk workshop with Aid directors and her staff 10-Jan-2006</td>
<td>Cons. 4  Like. 2  Sig. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate famine areas</td>
<td>Understand how much planting has been carried out</td>
<td>Information on successful planting for next year's harvest is not available</td>
<td>Do not anticipate food shortage</td>
<td>Risk workshop with Aid director and her staff 10-Jan-2006</td>
<td>Cons. 3  Like. 3  Sig. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate famine areas</td>
<td>Understand what harvest is likely to be, using weather and planting reports</td>
<td>Information predicting next year's harvest is not available</td>
<td>Do not anticipate food shortage</td>
<td>Risk workshop with Aid director and her staff 10-Jan-2006</td>
<td>Cons. 3  Like. 3  Sig. 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## G Risk and audit universe – planning (part)

As at 3 April 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 3 objective</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Consequence of risk</th>
<th>Inherent risks</th>
<th>Last Audit</th>
<th>Adjusted inherent score</th>
<th>Process owner</th>
<th>Audit Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The trustee's of the charity define the future aims and plans</td>
<td>Management team do not unanimously support it</td>
<td>Strategy not actioned with the result that it does not achieve its aims</td>
<td>5 5 25</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trustee's of the charity define the future aims and plans</td>
<td>Strategy might not be the best to achieve our objectives</td>
<td>Charities aims not achieved effectively and efficiently. Possible loss of funds</td>
<td>5 5 25</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell all staff about the strategy and its importance to them</td>
<td>People in the organisation are unaware of the strategy</td>
<td>Charities aims not achieved effectively and efficiently. Possible loss of funds</td>
<td>5 5 25</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategy is converted into targets and action for all staff</td>
<td>Strategy not converted into action</td>
<td>Charity does not achieve its objectives</td>
<td>5 5 25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Never done</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategy is converted into targets and action for all staff</td>
<td>People in the organisation do not have personal targets linked delivering the strategy</td>
<td>Charity does not achieve its objectives. Loss of morale, staff leave</td>
<td>5 5 25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Never done</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategy is converted into targets and action for all staff</td>
<td>New projects do not add value</td>
<td>Loss of funds</td>
<td>5 5 25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Never done</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims and plans regularly updated</td>
<td>Strategy not updated to take account of changing circumstances</td>
<td>Charity does not achieve its objectives</td>
<td>5 5 25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Never done</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive weather reports and assess their long term impact</td>
<td>Reliable rainfall figures for Central Africa are unavailable</td>
<td>Do not foresee the effects of drought</td>
<td>4 2 8</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand how much planting has been carried out</td>
<td>Information on successful planting for next year's harvest is not available</td>
<td>Do not anticipate food shortage</td>
<td>3 3 9</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## H Risk and audit universe – ongoing (part)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Process owner</th>
<th>Audit Group</th>
<th>Next audit number</th>
<th>Next audit name</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Auditor</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>2006 opinion on risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy not converted into action</td>
<td>Chairman of Trustees</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Strategy roll-out</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>20-Mar-06</td>
<td>21-Mar-06</td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy not updated to take account of changing circumstances</td>
<td>Chairman of Trustees</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Strategy roll-out</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>20-Mar-06</td>
<td>21-Mar-06</td>
<td>green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in the organisation are unaware of the strategy</td>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Person target setting</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>planned</td>
<td>17-Jul-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in the organisation do not have personal targets linked delivering the strategy</td>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Person target setting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>planned</td>
<td>17-Jul-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New projects do not add value</td>
<td>Chairman of Trustees</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Project Approval</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td></td>
<td>29-Sep-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor countries will not provide food</td>
<td>Aid Director</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Obtaining food - donation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>fieldwork</td>
<td>12-May-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay too much for the food</td>
<td>Aid Director</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Obtaining food - purchase</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>fieldwork</td>
<td>25-May-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not have sufficient funds</td>
<td>Finance Director</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Obtaining food - purchase</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>fieldwork</td>
<td>25-May-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routes become impassable due to the weather</td>
<td>Logistics Director</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Route planning</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>planned</td>
<td>23-Jun-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routes become impassable due to bandits</td>
<td>Logistics Director</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Route planning</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>planned</td>
<td>23-Jun-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to plan passable routes to the camps</td>
<td>Logistics Director</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Route planning</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>planned</td>
<td>23-Jun-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know where camps are</td>
<td>Aid Director</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Route planning</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>planned</td>
<td>23-Jun-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know where the people in most need are</td>
<td>Aid Director</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Route planning</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>planned</td>
<td>23-Jun-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Process owner</td>
<td>Audit Group</td>
<td>Next audit number</td>
<td>Next audit name</td>
<td>Next audit Budget</td>
<td>Next timing</td>
<td>Next auditor</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Next final report Target</td>
<td>Next final report Achieved</td>
<td>2006 opinion on risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current requirement for Corporate Governance are not understood</td>
<td>Audit Committee Chairman</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Corporate Governance</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>report</td>
<td>21-Apr-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No policy on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) set up</td>
<td>Chairman of Trustees</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>report</td>
<td>21-Apr-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lose money through failure of high risk investments</td>
<td>Finance Director</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>scoping</td>
<td>9-Jun-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of the Charity's assets</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Security of assets</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>scoping</td>
<td>9-Jun-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management team do not unanimously support it</td>
<td>Chairman of Trustees</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>planned</td>
<td>30-Jun-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know quantities to order</td>
<td>Aid Director</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Forecasting</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>planned</td>
<td>14-Jul-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ships available</td>
<td>Logistics Director</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Transport to docks</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>15-Feb-06</td>
<td>8-Mar-06</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No suitable docking facilities near to famine area</td>
<td>Logistics Director</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Transport to docks</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>15-Feb-06</td>
<td>8-Mar-06</td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not negotiate best rates</td>
<td>Logistics Director</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Transport to docks</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>15-Feb-06</td>
<td>8-Mar-06</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour to load lorries not available</td>
<td>Logistics Director</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Transport to camps</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Smith / Khan</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>1-Mar-06</td>
<td>2-Mar-06</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorries not available to move food inland</td>
<td>Logistics Director</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Transport to camps</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Smith / Khan</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>1-Mar-06</td>
<td>2-Mar-06</td>
<td>amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel not available for lorries</td>
<td>Logistics Director</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Transport to camps</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Smith / Khan</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>1-Mar-06</td>
<td>2-Mar-06</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorries break down</td>
<td>Logistics Director</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Transport to camps</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Smith / Khan</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>1-Mar-06</td>
<td>2-Mar-06</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spares not available</td>
<td>Logistics Director</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Transport to camps</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Smith / Khan</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>1-Mar-06</td>
<td>2-Mar-06</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics not available</td>
<td>Logistics Director</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Transport to camps</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Smith / Khan</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>1-Mar-06</td>
<td>2-Mar-06</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers not available</td>
<td>Logistics Director</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Transport to camps</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Smith / Khan</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>1-Mar-06</td>
<td>2-Mar-06</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Process owner</td>
<td>Audit Group</td>
<td>Next audit number</td>
<td>Next audit name</td>
<td>Next audit Budget</td>
<td>Next timing</td>
<td>Next auditor</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Next final report Target</td>
<td>Next final report Achieved</td>
<td>2006 opinion on risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money may be fraudulently removed</td>
<td>Finance Director</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Bank and cash</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>planned</td>
<td>15-Sep-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactions posted to incorrect general ledger accounts</td>
<td>Finance Director</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>General ledger</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>31-Mar-06 23-Mar-06</td>
<td>green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy might not be the best to achieve our objectives</td>
<td>Chairman of Trustees</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Strategy re-think</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>planned</td>
<td>7-Jul-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL (days) for planned audits in 2006: 339

**Resource calculation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available (3 auditors)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Holidays</td>
<td>-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Training</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Projects</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Secondments</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for audits</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for other audits</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Quarterly plan (part)

As at 3 April 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Audit</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>03-Apr</th>
<th>10-Apr</th>
<th>17-Apr</th>
<th>24-Apr</th>
<th>01-May</th>
<th>08-May</th>
<th>15-May</th>
<th>22-May</th>
<th>29-May</th>
<th>05-Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Obtaining food - donation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>SAP implementation project</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Obtaining food - purchase</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Route planning</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Forecasting</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Bank and cash</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Corporate Governance</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Security of assets</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Strategy re-think</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Person target setting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Secondment to accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total days**: 65

Key to plan: **scope**, **fieldwork**, **report**
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J Summary of the audit process

The management of an organisation have

Objectives

An internal control is a process which manages a risk

A risk is a set of circumstances that hinder the achievement of objectives

The audit

Internal auditing
Internal auditing: provides an independent and objective opinion to an organisation’s management as to whether its risks are being managed to acceptable levels.

Works with the business to identify risks hindering the processes

Tests the controls mitigating the risks

Determines processes and their objectives

Reports where risks are not sufficiently mitigated by controls

Assures that risks are mitigated to an acceptable level

Significant risks generate the audit plan

1

2

3

4
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### K Audit database (146 Transport of food to camps)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk on register</th>
<th>Level 4 objective</th>
<th>Risk for this audit</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Conc</th>
<th>Conc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(appendix H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks are not known</td>
<td></td>
<td>Risks are not known</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Examine processes to set up the risk register and examine the register</td>
<td>No register</td>
<td>A risk assessment will be carried out as part of the contracting process (see below)</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant risks are not understood</td>
<td>Significant risks are not understood</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Examine the process to score the risks</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant risks are not controlled</td>
<td>Significant risks are not controlled</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>A risk assessment will be carried out as part of the contracting process (see below)</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2.1 Receive instructions from country office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Conc</th>
<th>Conc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructions not received</td>
<td>Country office confirms receipt.</td>
<td>HQ chases if no confirmation received</td>
<td>Checked all instructions and confirmations for 2003. All satisfactory</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions are late</td>
<td>No controls at HQ to ensure instructions are sent on time</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No controls at HQ to ensure instructions are sent on time</td>
<td>Country Director to assume responsibility for notifying the country office</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2.2 Hire drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Conc</th>
<th>Conc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drivers not available</td>
<td>List of drivers available for hire is kept by the compound office</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Checked list. It is not regularly updated</td>
<td>Drivers may not be available</td>
<td>The use of contractors is to be considered</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers not properly qualified</td>
<td>Drivers documents are checked and copies made</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Checked copies exist.</td>
<td>Documents could be forged</td>
<td>The use of contractors is to be considered</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2.3 Plan route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Conc</th>
<th>Conc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route is blocked</td>
<td>Work with other agencies and the military to plan routes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Check the last plan.</td>
<td>HQ also tries to plan routes</td>
<td>Local office to plan routes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2.4 Plan route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Conc</th>
<th>Conc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route is dangerous</td>
<td>The army escorts convoys</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Ask drivers and supervisor about escorts</td>
<td>None - escorts are provided</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2.4 Arrange to collect food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Conc</th>
<th>Conc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No food available!</td>
<td>HQ arrange for food to available in the warehouses</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Check loading sheets for the lorries</td>
<td>None - food was available</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk on register</td>
<td>Level 4 objective</td>
<td>Risk for this audit</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Tests</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(appendix H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel not available for lorries</td>
<td>Load fuel</td>
<td>Fuel not available for lorries</td>
<td>Fuel is stored in the compound</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Check fuel tanks</td>
<td>Tanks were empty, although stock records showed they should be full</td>
<td>The use of contractors is to be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour to load lorries not available</td>
<td>4.2.5 Load food</td>
<td>No loaders</td>
<td>The warehouse provides loaders</td>
<td>The supervisor maintains day-to-day control</td>
<td>Supervisor said no problem in the past</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered to camp</td>
<td>4.2.6 Food is stolen</td>
<td>Army and police provide some protection</td>
<td>The supervisor maintains day-to-day control</td>
<td>Question staff and other agencies about problem</td>
<td>Theft is a problem, but as well controlled as possible</td>
<td>No extra action possible</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorries not available to move food inland</td>
<td>Check lorries are working</td>
<td>Lorries are found to be unsuitable for the journey</td>
<td>Lorries are serviced and tested</td>
<td>The supervisor maintains day-to-day control</td>
<td>Request a ride in the lorries</td>
<td>2 lorries were not working due to lack of maintenance (bad brakes)</td>
<td>The use of contractors is to be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check lorries</td>
<td>4.3.1 Check lorries</td>
<td>Check is not complete</td>
<td>Maintenance schedules are signed by the senior mechanic</td>
<td>The supervisor maintains day-to-day control</td>
<td>Check schedules</td>
<td>Scheduled checks not always carried out due to a lack of mechanics</td>
<td>The use of contractors is to be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check lorries</td>
<td>4.3.1 Action is not taken on faults</td>
<td>Maintenance schedules are signed by the senior mechanic</td>
<td>The supervisor maintains day-to-day control</td>
<td>Check schedules</td>
<td>Repairs not always carried out due to a lack of mechanics</td>
<td>The use of contractors is to be considered</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics not available</td>
<td>Check lorries</td>
<td>Lack of mechanics</td>
<td>Two mechanics are on the permanent staff</td>
<td>The supervisor maintains day-to-day control</td>
<td>Talk to mechanics. Examine work sheets day control</td>
<td>Only one, inexperienced mechanic on the staff</td>
<td>The use of contractors is to be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out maintenance checks as per the lorry manual</td>
<td>4.3.2 Maintenance checks not carried out thoroughly</td>
<td>Maintenance checks are signed by the senior mechanic</td>
<td>The supervisor maintains day-to-day control</td>
<td>Check schedules</td>
<td>Scheduled checks not always carried out due to a lack of mechanics</td>
<td>The use of contractors is to be considered</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair lorries as necessary</td>
<td>4.3.3 Repairs not satisfactory</td>
<td>Lorries checked by compound supervisor</td>
<td>The supervisor maintains day-to-day control</td>
<td>Request a ride in the lorries</td>
<td>Request for repairs and spare parts is approved by the compound supervisor</td>
<td>1 lorry was badly damaged</td>
<td>The use of contractors is to be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair lorries as necessary</td>
<td>4.3.3 Repairs not necessary</td>
<td>Request for repairs and spare parts is approved by the compound supervisor</td>
<td>The supervisor maintains day-to-day control</td>
<td>Check request documents day control</td>
<td>No documents exist</td>
<td>The use of contractors is to be considered</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk on register (appendix H)</td>
<td>Level 4 objective</td>
<td>Risk for this audit</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Tests</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spares not available</td>
<td>4.3.3 Repair lorries as necessary</td>
<td>Spares not available</td>
<td>HQ arrange for spares to be shipped out</td>
<td>The supervisor maintains day-to-day control</td>
<td>Talk to supervisor and mechanic. Examine any available documentation</td>
<td>Spares can take months to arrive</td>
<td>The use of contractors is to be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.1 Maintain systems</td>
<td>Data lost through computer failure</td>
<td>Not applicable. No computer on site</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff are not competent</td>
<td>6.7.1 Establish job descriptions</td>
<td>Staff competencies required have not been identified</td>
<td>Job descriptions are maintained for all jobs</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Check for job descriptions of all staff levels</td>
<td>No job descriptions</td>
<td>Job descriptions will be written by the end of March 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7.2 Carry out regular appraisals</td>
<td>Actual competencies of the staff have not been matched with required competencies</td>
<td>All staff have two appraisals every year</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Check appraisal files</td>
<td>No appraisals are carried out.</td>
<td>Targets will be set by the end of March and staff will be appraised on these by the end of September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7.3 Training of staff</td>
<td>Training is not provided</td>
<td>Appraisals identify training needs</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Check appraisal files</td>
<td>Mechanics are not trained - but move on too quickly</td>
<td>The use of contractors is to be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7.3 Training of staff</td>
<td>Staff not allowed to attend training</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Question staff who have been on courses</td>
<td>No courses available</td>
<td>We will ensure staff are trained as part of the introduction of contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of the Charity's assets</td>
<td>6.8.1 Provide security assets</td>
<td>Loss of the Charity's assets</td>
<td>The compound is surrounded by a high fence</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Asked staff about security</td>
<td>The fence is regularly broken down - hence the fuel has been stolen</td>
<td>The use of contractors is to be considered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is only part of the audit database. It should be downloaded from www.internalaudit.biz
L Risks to be considered

The following key risks should be considered in any audit although, in practice, they may be more specific, and extensive, depending on the audit area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Possible controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks are not being managed</td>
<td>Risk workshops to determine risks, allocate owners, determine controls and how their operation is monitored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraud</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets could be removed from the company</td>
<td>Physical controls (for example a safe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preventive controls (for example division of duties, authorisation levels, passwords)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detection controls exist (tagging of goods, reconciliations, stock counts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff competencies required have not been identified</td>
<td>Job descriptions for all staff, showing competencies required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual competencies of the staff have not been matched with required competencies</td>
<td>Regular appraisals. Linked to training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training is not provided</td>
<td>Appropriate training courses available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff not allowed to attend training</td>
<td>Monitoring attendance at courses and follow up by a senior manager committed to training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major 'incident' destroys important company resources</td>
<td>A Business Contingency Plan exists, has been tested and kept up to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many risks connected with computers. The controls over some of these, such as viruses and access to change programs, can be checked as part of audits to look specifically at the risks. Controls over other risks, such as access to change data, can be considered in the audit which involves testing this data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## M Transport of food - objectives, risks and controls report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 4 objective</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify risks</td>
<td>Risks are not known</td>
<td>Risks not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate risks</td>
<td>Significant risks are not understood</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mange risks</td>
<td>Significant risks are not controlled</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrange land transport</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1 Receive instructions from country office</td>
<td>Instructions not received</td>
<td>Country office confirms receipt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1 Receive instructions from country office</td>
<td>Instructions are late</td>
<td>No controls at HQ to ensure instructions are sent on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 Hire drivers</td>
<td>Drivers not available</td>
<td>List of drivers available for hire is kept by the compound office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1 Hire drivers</td>
<td>Drivers not properly qualified</td>
<td>Drivers documents are checked and copies made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 Plan route</td>
<td>Route is blocked</td>
<td>Work with other agencies and the military to plan routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3 Plan route</td>
<td>Route is dangerous</td>
<td>The army escorts convoys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4 Arrange to collect food</td>
<td>No food available!</td>
<td>HQ arrange for food to available in the warehouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4 Load fuel</td>
<td>Fuel not available for lorries</td>
<td>Fuel is stored in the compound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.5 Load food</td>
<td>No loaders</td>
<td>The warehouse provides loaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.6 Deliver to camp</td>
<td>Food is stolen</td>
<td>Army and police provide some protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintain lorries</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1 Check lorries are working</td>
<td>Lorries are found to be unsuitable for the journey</td>
<td>Lorries are serviced and tested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1 Check lorries</td>
<td>Check is not complete</td>
<td>Maintenance schedules are signed by the senior mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1 Check lorries</td>
<td>Action is not taken on faults</td>
<td>Maintenance schedules are signed by the senior mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1 Check lorries</td>
<td>Lack of mechanics</td>
<td>Two mechanics are on the permanent staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2 Carry out maintenance checks as per the lorry manual</td>
<td>Maintenance checks not carried out thoroughly</td>
<td>Maintenance schedules are signed by the senior mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3 Repair lorries as necessary</td>
<td>Repairs not satisfactory</td>
<td>Lorries checked by compound supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3 Repair lorries as necessary</td>
<td>Repairs not necessary</td>
<td>Request for repairs and spare parts is approved by the compound supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3 Repair lorries as necessary</td>
<td>Spares not available</td>
<td>HQ arrange for spares to be shipped out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.1 Maintain systems</td>
<td>Data lost through computer failure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.2 Maintain systems</td>
<td>2 Not applicable. No computer on site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide human resources</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.7.1 Establish job descriptions</td>
<td>Staff competencies required have not been identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.2 Carry out regular appraisals</td>
<td>Actual competencies of the staff have not been matched with required competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.3 Training of staff</td>
<td>Training is not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.3 Training of staff</td>
<td>Staff not allowed to attend training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.4 Training of staff</td>
<td>2 Appraisals identify training needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.5 Training of staff</td>
<td>2 None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide security</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.8.1 Provide security</td>
<td>Loss of the Charity’s assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8.2 Provide security</td>
<td>The compound is surrounded by a high fence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide continuity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.9.1 Identify documents required to achieve the objective of these processes</td>
<td>Documents may not be recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.2 Decide on arrangements to safeguard these processes</td>
<td>Level of protection may not be sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9.3 Decide on arrangements to safeguard these processes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Version control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version number</th>
<th>Date issued</th>
<th>Changes made to previous version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16-Feb-2003</td>
<td>Issue of first version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0.1</td>
<td>2-Mar-2003</td>
<td>More links, biography. Note re IIA UK position statement on RBIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0.3</td>
<td>9-Mar-2003</td>
<td>Link to draft position paper. Definition of Enterprise-wide risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.0</td>
<td>13-Nov-2003</td>
<td>Updated notes on Combined Code, SarbOx, PCAOB. Updated links plus other minor amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Link added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.0</td>
<td>14-May-2004</td>
<td>Amendments to chapter 2 and chapter 3 to make it consistent with the manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>1-Jul-2004</td>
<td>The useful information section has been re-arranged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>26-Aug-2004</td>
<td>Link to David McNamee site added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0.0</td>
<td>6-Oct-2005</td>
<td>Major revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0.2</td>
<td>30-Jan-2006</td>
<td>Changes made to take account of IIA Guidance Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0.3</td>
<td>15-Mar-2006</td>
<td>Minor changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>28-May-2013</td>
<td>Processes renamed as 'Objectives' or 'systems' depending on the context in order to simplify the classification of risks. References to regulations removed, as these change over time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>