

## EXPOSURE DRAFT SURVEY QUESTIONS

### 1. MISSION OF INTERNAL AUDITING

#### 1.1 To what extent do you support the addition of a Mission of Internal Auditing to the IPPF?

Completely Support Do not support

5 ④ 3 2 1

Comments:

1) The addition of “Reliable” will create confusion with the IA definition (“independent” and “objective”) – the two are not fully aligned and this might create confusion with our stakeholders.

2) “Insight” is not defined, and needs to be added to the glossary, and explained as it would need to withstand scrutiny (as a defined word) in a context which is very legally driven/ regulated)

#### 1.2 To what extent do you agree that the proposed Mission of Internal Auditing captures what internal audit strives and/or aspires to accomplish in organizations?

Completely Agree Do not agree

5 ④ 3 2 1

Comments:

### 2. CORE PRINCIPLES FOR THE PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE OF INTERNAL AUDITING

#### 2.1 To what extent do you support adding Core Principles for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing as an element of the IPPF?

Completely Support Do not support

5 4 ③ 2 1

Comments:

1) The code of Ethics already contains Principles; some of which are common (integrity, objectivity competence, but surprisingly not confidentiality. There are also some repetition with teh standards (organization authority for instance). This creates confusion. It would be better to integrate all principles in one single set.

2) Further “insightful” is not defined (#11)

#### 2.2 Do you agree with the three “input-related” Principles as proposed?

Completely Agree Do not agree

⑤ 4 3 2 1

Comments: --

#### 2.3 Do you agree with the six “process-related” Principles as proposed?

Completely Agree Do not agree

5 4 3 ② 1

Comments:

#4 does not belong to “process”; it is a fundamental governance matter.

#5 includes “enterprise” – since the IPPF also applies to the public sector, better to use a neutral word, like “organization”

#### 2.4 Do you agree with the three “output-related” Principles as proposed?

Completely Agree Do not agree

5 4 ③ 2 1

Comments:

- 1) There seems to be a confusion between an output (product/service) and an outcome (effect) in the top list
- 2) #11 does not belong to outcome; it is a description of an attitude and should be better included in "process"; further, Insightful is not defined
- 3) #11 "future-oriented" gives the impression that the past does not matter whereas our stakeholders (also) want assurance on past events, with a view to learn and improve the future.

2.5 Do you agree with the order of the 12 Principles as proposed?

Completely Agree				Do not agree
5	4	3	②	1

Comments:

- # 11 does not belong to outcome; it is a description of an attitude and should be better included in "process"
- #4 should be in a category on its own

2.6 To what extent do you agree with the view that all Principles must be "present and operating effectively" for an internal audit function to be considered effective?

Completely Agree			Do not agree	
5	4	③	2	1

Comments:

- A four because the "principles" are in fact a good description of what it takes to have an effective function.
- But a two because of the complexity of having too many references to comply with (at present, the proposal is five: the IA definition, the code of ethics, IA mission, standards, then the 12 principles) which will be difficult to use in practice and refer to, not to mention explain to the lay person). Also the issue of not only being future-oriented but giving assurance on the past.
- The average is therefore a three

2.7 Do you agree that the Principles, if adopted, would require guidance to help demonstrate to practitioners what the Principles might look like in practice?

Completely Agree			Do not agree	
5	4	3	②	1

Comments:

- This should come through the Standards and Implementation Guidance instead
- Having references to comply with (at present: the IA definition, the code of ethics, IA mission, standards, then the 12 principles) is too complex – reduce complexity and the number of guidance documents /implementation practice documents necessary.

**3. IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE & SUPPLEMENTAL GUIDANCE**

3.1 To what extent do you support the restructure of guidance elements from "Practice Advisories" to a more comprehensive layer entitled "Implementation Guidance" as part of the framework?

Completely Support			Do not support	
⑤	4	3	2	1

Comments: --

3.2 To what extent do you support the restructure of guidance elements from "Practice Guides" to "Supplemental Guidance" as part of the framework?

Completely Support			Do not support	
⑤	4	3	2	1

Comments: --

#### 4. ADDRESSING EMERGING ISSUES

##### 4.1 To what extent do you support the introduction of new IPPF element to address emerging issues?

Completely Support Do not support  
5 4 3 2 ①

Comments:

Not supported: “emerging” by itself mean an evolving guidance which at a point in time may become contradicted by events and the right solution / guidance may be opposite the ‘emerging’ guidance. This is potentially very challenging to explain to stakeholders why guidance has evolved.

##### 4.2 To what extent do you agree that Emerging Issues Guidance, due to its quicker development process, should be less authoritative than Supplemental Guidance as part of the framework?

Completely Agree Do not agree  
⑤ 4 3 2 1

Comments:

In the context of not supporting “emerging guidance”, whatever is called “emerging” cannot have any authoritative value without having undergone a thorough vetting process which gives ‘guidance’ its credibility.

However, there should be a way to exchange ideas on emerging issues which undergoes a ‘maturing’ process before becoming guidance. Hence, a Five as “emerging guidance” should be less (not) authoritative.

#### 5. Position Papers

##### 5.1 To what extent do you support the deletion of “position Papers” as an element of the IPPF?

Completely Support Do not support  
⑤ 4 3 2 1

Comments: --

#### 6. REQUIRED AND RECOMMENDED

##### 6.1 To what extent do you support revision of the words “Mandatory” and “Strongly Recommended” to “Required” and “Recommended”, respectively?

Completely Support Do not support  
⑤ 4 3 2 1

Comments: --

#### 7. SUMMARY OF THE ELEMENTS OF THE PROPOSED REVISED IPPF

##### 7.1 Overall, to what extent do you support the changes regarding the IPPF as detailed on the previous page?

Completely Support Do not support  
5 4 ③ 2 1

Comments:

- Support new thoughts and clarification, but not the entire structure and the complexity of five compulsory elements.
- But there are fundamental issues to address:
  - 1) Alignment Mission language/IA definition language
  - 2) IA definition still not revised to replace “consulting” with “advisory”, which would be more neutral (rather than be confused with a consulting firm); the term “Add value” should also be removed to avoid some negative

comments from stakeholders (interpreting the inclusion of the term as unnecessary unless the auditors themselves are not convinced they add value).

3) The definition of “Insight” / “insightful” is missing

4) Defining the reporting line of the function is a (fundamental) Governance principle, and not just a process matter.

5) There is confusion between output and outcome which are used interchangeably although these are fundamentally different concepts.

Hence, a middle rating

7.2 To what extent do you agree that the pictorial representation adequately depicts the hierarchy and interrelationships of each element of the new proposed IPPF?

Completely Agree				Do not agree
⑤	4	3	2	1

Comments: --

7.3 To what extent do you agree that the pictorial representation of the proposed new IPPF is visually appealing?

Completely Agree				Do not agree
⑤	4	3	2	1

Comments: --