

IIA-Exposure

From: Hugh Penri-Williams
Sent: Sunday, November 2, 2014 3:35 PM
To: iia-exposure
Subject: Proposed enhancements to the IPPF - additional remarks

Hello Everyone,

... especially Beatrice, Bob, Norman, Michael, whom I have the pleasure of knowing personally.

So that neither my coming remarks, nor comments already submitted on-line (*) are taken too harshly, please rest assured that – like you all – I only have the best interests of our institutes / chapters, profession and members at heart!

Let me jump right in then, for what it's worth, at the risk of immediately being branded an outcast. Regarding the title, "Re-look" Task Force, I think someone's been watching too much TV. It's a dreadful, common expression, not deign of The IIA, IMHO. Too late for now but worth avoiding in future, I contend.

It would have been nice to slightly revise the *Definition*, for example to slip in *reasonable assurance*, replace *consulting* (always thought this to be a very presumptuous role, especially as 'real' consultants are much more listened to – and more expensive – than internal auditors!) by *advisory*, perhaps adding what IFACI did in their French version but with a slight modification as we can't really guarantee the effects:

“... et en faisant des propositions pour renforcer leur efficacité.”

“... by making recommendations **seeking** to reinforce their effectiveness.”

Apart, obviously, from Beatrice, how many of you were aware of that? Please don't misunderstand, I consider it a good addition but from a governance perspective (sic), how did IFACI manage to do this?

Please also bear with because I am a stickler for consistency in the use of words, especially in the context of internal audit, hence I feel obliged to make the following observations, not to say criticisms.

Now, should it be *Definition of Internal Auditing* or *Internal Audit*? After all, our body is called *The Institute of Internal Auditors*, so neither *Auditing*, nor *Audit*. Strange. On p1 of your proposal you even talk about “all internal auditor (sic) practitioners! Very odd. Furthermore, the relevant board is the **International Internal Audit** (not Auditing) **Standards Board**!

Only reason I mention it is because your text constantly switches between them. Personally, I advocate that we gradually migrate to employing **Audit** exclusively, as in **Internal Audit Activity** (never Function, to which you also resorted).

More food for thought for when we eventually do get to revisit the Definition.

You also like to use overhyped, trendy terms: *insight* (p2, p3 Mission), *insightful* (p4x2, p5). Absolutely awful. Reminds me of the *Institute of Clairvoyants* whose conference was cancelled due to unforeseen circumstances!

When & where did ‘insight’ creep into our profession’s vocabulary? It used to be ‘thoughtful, thoughtfulness’, then came ‘thought leadership’ (which always sounded rather Orwellian to me!), before ‘insight, insightful’ crept in to replace them. Much like the Cloud replacing service bureaus.

Whereas in the past we (collectively) were too often seen as providing *hindsight*, we should be striving for *foresight*. Much more difficult, but that is what brings real value.

Wishing you success in your challenging analysis and deliberations on our behalf, Hugh.



(* the attached photo needs to viewed in conjunction with my 7.3 comments, please)