Time to think big

ECIIA delegates in Rome debate how the fallout from the financial crisis is affecting internal audit

INSIDE: Claude Cargou on the ECIIA's strategy, report from the Dresden congress, advocacy corner, news and much more
Executives across Europe must be feeling fed-up right now – particularly if they work in the financial services sector. After being the apple in every government’s eye for the last twenty years, their fortunes have suddenly turned sour. From being held in high esteem as wealth creators, they are suddenly regarded as a bunch of irresponsible, gambling fools.

The G20 summit, representing the world’s largest economies, met in Pittsburgh in the US this September to discuss what could be done to curb excessive pay – among other pressing issues, such as climate change and global regulation. The French and German delegations argued for strict caps on bonuses – Great Britain and the US prevaricated. Tough words were spoken. But it became clear, as Axel Weber, a European Central Bank Governing Council member remarked, that any changes to the global financial structure is likely to be a long time coming.

In the meantime, governments in Europe have been promising their own reforms. Dutch executives, for example, have seen their bonuses capped at 100% of salary, while their severance packages are now limited to one-year’s pay. In France, some executives have been forced to defer the existing bonuses and the amount of bonus that can be guaranteed has been slashed. Bankers in the UK could see the regulators effectively cancel their remuneration agreements if they have been awarded bonuses that would “cause instability” to the financial system. Some businesses are responding to the crisis voluntarily. Commerzbank, for example, has said that it intends to adopt a new bonus structure for its executives. Others may follow suit.

If you’re not feeling sorry for executives, that’s fine, but there is a serious point behind the complaints that they are making. That is because one of the major causes of the credit crunch was not just executive pay, although that played a part, but a failure of risk management. Pay was a symptom of the crisis, not its cause. Banks failed to look at the bigger picture outside of their own organizations. Governments are in danger of doing the same. Punishing executives in the short term may feel good, but if it fails to deal with the longer-term risks posed by a hugely complex global financial system, it is not the complete answer.
The European Commission made a commitment to produce a report on corporate governance practices in financial institutions, according to its communication Driving European recovery, which was published on 4 March 2009. As part of this exercise, the Commission organised a Seminar in Brussels on 12 October 2009, which is available to listen to via the link below.

The seminar, which was attended by ECIIA representatives, brought together expert panelists from different member states to discuss important issues, such as the role and competences of boards of directors, governance matters on internal control and risk management, shareholder control, supervision and external audit. David Wright, deputy director general DG Internal Market and Services chaired the seminar.

Readers of this column would have been most interested in how the seminar dealt with the topic of the contribution of internal auditing to effective governance and risk management frameworks. Richard Barfield, a director in the risk and capital advisory services team at the accounting firm PWC's UK Financial Services practice, emphasised the “three lines of defence” framework, as a way of thinking about what organizations might be doing to monitor risks and associated controls. He argued that the fundamental roles that boards and risk management frameworks have in organisations is to ensure that regulatory risk appetite – the appetite for avoiding downside risks – plays a very strong part in any discussion around risk management and the ways to enforce risk culture throughout organisations.

According to Barfield, the role of the risk management function as the second line of defence should be to provide a strong challenge to the front line in terms of how risks are assessed, how risk appetite is articulated and expressed, and how risk has an influence on strategy selection and making decisions. He further claimed that for this second line of defence to work effectively, it requires many characteristics similar to those required for non-executive directors. That includes risk management having the ability to provide strong challenge and create constructive tension, at the same time as operating effectively as a team within the overall management structure of the organization. In Barfield’s opinion, the latter may present a real challenge for each risk management function, as may possessing the right expertise and skills to effectively play this role. Finally, he stressed the importance for the risk management function to adopt a holistic, integrated view of risk, rather than an isolated, silo approach through which dependencies between risk types may not be fully understood.

The ECIIA supports the three lines of defence framework and appreciates the fact that it is now formally discussed at the European Commission level as a mechanism for ensuring effective governance and risk management in Europe. ECIIA also believes that this framework should not be limited to the financial services industry but may equally apply to other sectors.

A recording of the entire seminar is available: http://bit.ly/6OKva4
For an outline of the three lines of defence framework: Click Here.
Send your advocacy stories to Arthur@sdw.co.uk
Insurance regulation must speed up

Authorities in Europe should hurry up and agree on a new European supervisory framework for the insurance sector, the European Central Bank President Jean-Claude Trichet told an industry conference in Frankfurt in November.

“The European Commission’s proposals to enhance the EU’s financial architecture are aimed in precisely the right direction,” he said. “I strongly encourage a political agreement to be reached by the end of the year.”

He said that the European Systemic Risk Board and the European Supervisory Authorities would provide a decisive contribution to financial stability in the EU. He described the proposed setup as a “quantum leap” in the European Union’s supervisory architecture.

In particular, he said, they would help establish a single European rulebook, enhance the efficiency of supervisory colleagues, help coordination in times of stress, help to translate risk warnings into action, and assess systemic risks.

He also said that the insurance industry must act to ensure that it has sufficient capital buffers. While he said that there were no current major solvency concerns, he said that insurers should take action on the issue soon. “There is no room for complacency in this environment,” he said. “Insurers will have to be mindful of having sufficient capital buffers in place.”

He said that recent improvements in the results reported by insurers should not be a sign that things were getting back to normal. “There are reasons to be cautious about the durability of the recent recovery of insurers’ profitability,” he said. “The supportive environment for investment income is unlikely to continue once market conditions begin to normalize.”

“At the same time, underwriting income is subject to the existing downside risks in the overall macroeconomic outlook,” he added.

Internal audit reaches deeper

Lord Smith of Kelvin, a leading figure in corporate governance reform in the UK, has said that internal audit is the key to effective governance. Speaking at a recent forum of non-executive directors, he said that only internal auditors can penetrate deep into businesses to identify errors and weak procedures at all levels.

He also said that non-executives had to play a bigger part in the boardroom, and had to have the personal qualities that would make that possible. “The personal ability to challenge strong boards and chairman, particularly over high-risk decisions, is a quality that should be valued as highly as any other,” he said. “It should be a key factor when it comes to appointing non-executive directors.”

Lord Smith said that non-executives needed an effective induction, but said that they should do their own due diligence before joining an organisation – including site visits, if necessary.

Fraud grows

Fraud is a growing problem across Europe, according to a recent survey by the accountancy firm PricewaterhouseCoopers and the Paris-based business school INSEAD.

Four out of ten respondents to the survey said that they had suffered from economic crime in the past twelve months, with almost 10% of crimes costing them over €3m. The most common types of crime were theft, financial statement fraud and money laundering.

“Organisations need to ensure that when a fraud or economic crime occurs, they have enforceable and enforced policy where people do not appear to get away with it,” said PwC forensic expert Billy O’Riordan. He said that appropriate forensic investigations should be carried out.

About half of serious crimes were detected by risk management systems and internal audit, with one quarter of fraud detected through tip-offs.
When Claude Cargou, the ECIIA’s president, talks about internal auditing, it is with a sense of urgency. He believes that the current uncertainty about the future of corporate governance has created a unique opportunity for the ECIIA to get its voice heard.

“External audit’s role is well-defined in the relevant directives,” he says. “But there is an equal need to clarify and define the role that internal audit plays within organisations. And the point of doing that, is so that internal auditors are put in a better position to do their jobs well.”

He hopes that the ECIIA can persuade those responsible for drafting legislation to see the benefits internal audit can provide to organisations of all shapes and sizes. The ECIIA’s overarching goal is to make sure that internal audit is mentioned in relevant European Council Directives as a cornerstone of effective governance.

Strengths Cargou believes that internal auditors have a lot to offer and, as a profession, derive strength from having a well-defined set of International Standards and a »
Code of Ethics that every member has to adhere to. “The fact that a single set of professional practices is followed by every internal auditor in the world is a great strength,” he says. “Having worked in IT, where it does not exist, I appreciate just how important that is.” He believes that the ECIIA needs to leverage that strength and use it to demonstrate how internal audit adds real value.

He worries that if the ECIIA does not act now, those in Brussels will define the role of risk management without taking internal audit into account.

Not that the ECIIA has been sitting idle. As part of its mission to be “the consolidated voice for the profession of internal auditing in a widely defined Europe,” it has been working towards achieving its four stated goals: carrying out advocacy work with other organisations, working on enhancing professionalism, supporting and developing the 36 national institutes of internal audit that make up its members, and communicating its message more broadly.

Relationships
After an initial period of research and discussion with external professional bodies, the ECIIA is now working to build bridges with the five that it has identified as potentially its most important allies. Those bodies comprise ECODA, the European institute of directors; FERMA, the Federation of European Risk Management Associations; EUROSAI, the European Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions; European Issuers, which represents the interests of companies listed in Europe; and, FEE, the

“The ECIIA’s mission is to be the consolidated voice for the profession of internal auditing in a widely defined Europe”
Exploring the potential of these relationships should give more focus and depth to the ECIIA’s advocacy efforts, says Cargou. In addition, the ECIIA hopes to develop a set of issues about which the bodies can speak in a unified voice to give them a greater say in European affairs. “Working in the Brussels environment is not that easy,” he says. “It takes time to develop contacts in the European councils and government.” The recent elections in Brussels, for example, have lead to changes in personnel, so building relationships is an ongoing project and working in tandem with other professional bodies will give the ECIIA more clout.

Communications
The ECIIA is also enhancing the way it communicates its message to both members and the business community. The website is being refreshed in a way that will make it more attractive and easy to use, as well as making connections with other professional bodies possible. European internal audit briefing is to be published on a regular, quarterly basis and distributed more widely. But the ECIIA can only do so much on its own and is dependent on the ongoing support of its members – the national institutes of internal auditing. In particular, Cargou says that it is essential for the national institutes across Europe to be promoting and pursuing their own advocacy initiatives too.

“Working in the Brussels environment is not that easy,” he says. “It takes time to develop contacts in the European councils and government.” The recent elections in Brussels, for example, have lead to changes in personnel, so building relationships is an ongoing project and working in tandem with other professional bodies will give the ECIIA more clout.

The ECIIA aims to give more support to the developing national institutes of internal auditing across Europe. While the ECIIA does not have the financial resources to launch a major initiative in this area, it is drawing on its considerable depth of expertise and knowledge to help the newer institutes develop. It is currently working out its longer-term strategy in this area.

Cargou reflects that just a year in the post of president seems a very short time. His two main objectives are to foster better co-operation between the ECIIA and those working at a more local level. “If someone is meeting with the head of the institute of directors in their country,” he says, “we need to know so that we can be present and influence the debate as it relates to Europe.” That entails the national institutes becoming more proactive in communicating their activities to the ECIIA.

The ECIIA aims to give more support to the developing national institutes of internal auditing across Europe. While the ECIIA does not have the financial resources to launch a major initiative in this area, it is drawing on its considerable depth of expertise and knowledge to help

“The fact that a single set of professional practices is followed by every internal auditor in the world is a great strength”
There have been many official reports on the causes of the financial crisis and none of them point the finger of blame at the internal audit profession. This ought to be good news; it suggests that internal audit did a good job, or the best it could. But there is another way of interpreting the lack of criticism: nobody is accusing internal audit of underperforming, because nobody expected internal audit to contribute very much in the first place. In which case, is the profession’s claim to be integral to good corporate governance just empty rhetoric?

Rod Winters, chairman of the IIA’s global board, summed up the problem in his opening comments to the ECIIA’s annual conference in Rome this October. “My fear is that if we are a true cornerstone of good governance, and we have the kind of crisis we have experienced during the last year, it is something we should be held accountable for,” said Winters. “It’s perverse, but I’m kind of disappointed.”

“There need to be a trusted adviser, at the table providing insights, not reports afterwards”
Aractingi has made changes in two main areas. He has introduced greater standardisation into his function’s audit methods and processes. It is now more flexible, both in how it plans and executes audits. He has also rethought how the function’s work is relevant to the company. His conclusion: Renault’s audit team adds value through its capacity to generate fresh insights by working across different parts of the business, something other functions could not do, said Aractingi.

There is another potential response to budget cuts: simply claim that the internal audit function is an indispensable governance tool. Aractingi advised against it. “We had to demonstrate a real solidarity with the company in terms of costs,” he said. “We are not untouchable, we are corporate citizens.”

The governance failings in the financial sector hold lessons for internal auditors in every organisation. Daniel Nelson, assistant director at the International Monetary

European Internal Audit Briefing - November 2009
Fund’s Office of Internal Audit, picked out some of the most important ones, using bailed-out insurance company AIG as an example. The company’s internal audit function did not have sufficient access to key parts of the business and there was a lack of clarity around roles and responsibilities relating to risk and control, he said. The lessons: internal must have the right mandate, its role should be clear and it must have an “escape valve” relationship with a non-executive director or independent board, said Nelson.

**Regulation**
Rising stakeholder expectations and budget constraints are not the only factors likely to change the way internal audit is performed across Europe. There is also the spectre of new regulation, the need for which was hotly debated at the conference.

Carmine di Noia, deputy director general at Assonime, the Italian business association, told delegates that further corporate governance regulation was not needed, at least not for general corporates. “The governance problems that we have seen were related to financial institutions,” he said. “In general, listed companies have been behaving and the rules were working, so be careful about talking about new rules.”

And in any case, he argued, corporate governance practices across the European Union remain highly diverse. As part of its response to the crisis, the European Commission has revamped the supervisory committees that advise it on financial industry issues, “but they are too big to make decisions and do not have enough power,” he said.

However, Marcello Bianchi, chairman of an OECD steering group on corporate governance, said new governance rules might be needed. “Most of the structural weaknesses that we have seen are common to large and complex listed companies, so there are lessons to learn,” he told delegates. “It is not the principles that are a problem; we had implementation gaps that caused failure.”

The answer: “We need better systems for peer review and dialogue to monitor the implementation of existing principles and to identify any emerging problems,” he said. “We failed to identify implementation gaps in the past; we want to prevent future failures.”

Key areas of failure were remuneration practices, effective risk management, the quality of board practices and the exercise of shareholder rights, said Bianchi. The OECD wanted to develop guidance for better implementation of its rules on these issues. “What we need are not more rules, but better rules and better implementation of existing rules,” he said, adding: “More effective disclosure and enforcement are the most effective tools for policymakers.”

However, like di Noia, Bianchi warned about the dangers of writing new governance rules aimed at financial firms and applying them to general corporates. **CEO view**

A “one size fits all approach” would create problems within...
detailed rules, but some very basic rules.” Leverage, for example, “had been allowed to go to the moon,” he argued, adding it was obvious that the funding strategy deployed by a bank such as the UK’s Northern Rock would lead to disaster.

Regulation aside, Passera argued that attitudes in the financial industry needed to change. The crisis had shown that markets do not always self-correct and that size and diversification were not virtues in themselves. “Those that were the most arrogant in terms of ‘I will do everything, everywhere’ are the ones that have folded before others that were more focused,” he said. “The cost of complexity that comes with growing size and growing diversification at a certain point makes companies weaker, not stronger.”

Financial firms, and general corporates, had tried to manage this complexity by creating a greater number of specialised risk and compliance functions, said Passera. But that was the wrong response. “If control functions become too specialised you can miss the bigger picture,” he said, “And if you subdivide too much between those that manage the business and those that control, you can end up with some people who want to say ‘no’ to everything and some who want to say ‘yes’.”

Passera told delegates that was a “politically incorrect” view to hold just now, but it was one that captured the tone of the conference. As Winters argued at the beginning, the challenge for internal auditors is to make sure that, despite budget cuts or regulatory changes, they provide that independent, “big picture” view. It’s something organisations need now more than ever.

“Those that were the most arrogant in terms of ‘I will do everything, everywhere’ are the ones that have folded”
Our mission

» To be the consolidated voice for the profession of internal auditing in a widely defined Europe by dealing with the European Union, its Parliament and Commission and any other European or global institutions of influence.
» To represent and develop the internal auditing profession throughout the wider geographic area of Europe and the Mediterranean basin.
» To represent the European internal auditing profession on the global stage in tandem – and in consultation – with IIA Inc.
» To promote the profession in economically emerging countries, as appropriate, within the wider geographic area of Europe and the Mediterranean basin.
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