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1. **Background**

1.1 **Purpose**

An entity's compliance framework is designed to ensure that the entity achieves compliance with both externally and/or internally imposed requirements, and includes governance structures, programs, processes, systems, controls and procedures.

1.2 **Background**

Entities across all sectors - private, public and not-for-profit - need to comply with obligations associated with their establishing legislation or constitution, as well as broader legislative and regulatory obligations on how they operate, account and report.

Compliance continues to be a primary concern for the boards and senior management of most entities with reputation risk pushed to new levels as a consequence of the complexity and pace of legislative and regulatory change, coupled with an increase in regulatory scrutiny and enforcement.

A compliance framework is an important element in the governance of entities for:

- Preventing, identifying and responding to breaches of laws, regulations, codes or standards,
- Demonstrating a solid compliance regime to regulators,
- Promoting a culture of compliance, and
- Assisting the entity to be a good corporate citizen.

Regulators have the right to independently validate that an entity in their jurisdiction is compliant with legislation and regulations by conducting documentary and/or onsite reviews of the entity's policies, procedures, operations, activities, systems, premises and related information. The outcomes of the regulatory review might be reported publicly and/or to parliament.

Auditing compliance is one of the basic elements of internal auditing. Many issues identified during ‘traditional’ internal audits of an entity’s policies, external reporting, safety, security, and environmental areas can relate directly to compliance obligations. The outcomes of internal audit’s compliance reviews are reported internally.

This paper does not cover instances where public sector entities are regulatory bodies that monitor compliance of other public, private, and not-for-profit entities.

2. **Discussion**

2.1 **Issue**

Audit committees are looking to internal audit to evaluate the overall compliance framework, not just micro-level ‘bits and pieces’ of compliance.

These evaluations are required to address identified criteria and are expected to cover all elements that reflect an effective compliance framework, including identification, risk assessment, awareness, monitoring, handling breaches, continuous improvement, the compliance register, reporting, and cross-border obligations.

2.2 **History**

The Chief Audit Executive (CAE) is directed by Standard 2010 of the International Professional Practices Framework (IPPF) to establish a risk-based plan to determine the priorities of internal audit, consistent with the entity’s goals.
The strategic risks of entities often include compliance-related obligations for external reporting, safety, security and environment/sustainability (amongst others).

There are numerous layers of compliance obligations within entities.

- At the top level, there may be specific regulatory and licensing obligations that allow entities to operate in their discrete industries (from financial institutions through to energy, aviation, and rail providers and many in-between).
- Within different jurisdictions there may be requirements over privacy, freedom-of-information/transparency, taxation, anti-bribery and corruption.
- Service providers need to demonstrate compliance with contractual conditions.
- Motor vehicles in the entity’s fleet will have compliance plates, and software licences underpin technology solutions.
- At an individual level, train drivers, security guards, forklift operators and so forth need to be personally licensed.

The international standard for compliance management AS/ISO19600(1) was rolled out in December 2014 and is intended to serve as a global standard and benchmark for compliance management programs.

According to the IPPF glossary, ‘compliance’ encompasses adherence to policies, plans, procedures, laws, regulations, contracts or other requirements.

The importance of auditing compliance was emphasised in two global studies in 2014.

- Firstly the results of a survey of audit committees reflected that over 70% of respondents believe internal audit’s role should extend beyond financial reporting and controls, and one of the top four areas that respondents would like internal auditors to devote more time to is compliance/regulation (45%).
- Secondly a separate study relating to audit committee focus areas identified compliance/regulatory as one of the top three ranked areas of focus (ranked behind strategic business risks and operational, but ranked ahead of information technology and risk management effectiveness).

Internal auditors are encouraged to adopt a structured risk based approach to auditing compliance. Internal audit is able to ‘step-up’ its compliance activities in line with its resourcing, objectives, and capability, as illustrated in Exhibit 1. Examples of these maturing compliance-focused activities are contained in Exhibit 3 and Exhibit 4.

Exhibit 1 – Stepping-up the maturity level of audit’s compliance activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Control</th>
<th>Maturity Level of Internal Audit Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA Maturity</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing your entity’s compliance framework</td>
<td>Potential Internal Audit Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Compliance framework (overall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Compliance committee meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Central regulatory coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Compliance activities (micro-level ‘bits and pieces’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Discussion

Effective compliance programs ensure that entities are adhering to laws, regulations, standards, licences, policies, plans, procedures, contracts, guidelines, specifications or other requirements relevant to their business.

Some compliance obligations are mandatory (eg legislation, licences, permits) whereas others are voluntary (eg internal codes of conduct, industry codes).
An entity’s reputation can be severely impacted when serious non-compliances occur and lead to prosecution, fines, or imprisonment of company officials. According to a 2014 global survey, approximately 87% of executives across the world see reputation risk as the most important strategic risk.

The core elements of a typical compliance framework are outlined in Exhibit 2.

### Exhibit 2 - Core elements of a typical compliance framework

- Well-defined policies and procedures for identifying and updating compliance obligations, including escalation and/or reporting arrangements for breaches.
- Staff training and awareness programs, including arrangements to identify, create awareness, promote compliance, deliver associated training courses, and foster continuous improvement.
- Establishment and maintenance of a comprehensive compliance register to record relevant laws, regulations, standards, licenses, policies, plans, procedures, contracts, guidelines, specifications or other requirements.
- Risk assessment of compliance obligations, and identification of appropriate compliance strategies that reflect the impact on key business activities and drive a compliance culture.
- Clear allocation of responsibilities for ensuring that effective controls are embedded within key business processes to maintain compliance, monitor and record any changes, provide assurance and report exceptions, and maintain quality control.
- Well-established monitoring and reporting arrangements internally (including the board, CEO and responsible executives) with periodic sign-offs by management and external third party outsourced service providers as to compliance with obligations.
- A compliance governance structure that establishes oversight of compliance control activities including periodic compliance reporting to the audit committee and / or others charged with governance.
- Well-defined internal processes for identifying, assessing, rectifying and reporting potential or actual compliance incidents and breaches to the regulators.

The availability of an up-to-date and complete compliance register is pivotal to all other elements of a structured compliance framework. Depending on the nature of the entity and its specific obligations, a compliance register might include information on laws, regulations, standards, licenses, policies, plans, procedures, contracts, guidelines, specifications or other requirements.

Effective monitoring mechanisms aimed at identifying changes to legislation, regulations, standards and other under-pinning content are critical to maintaining an up-to-date compliance register.

In framing internal audit’s coverage of the compliance framework, the CAE will need to draw on available information gained from assurance maps (which will often identify the related ‘lines of defence’) and insights from stakeholder relationship management.

The following diagram (Exhibit 3) illustrates the various compliance-focused activities of an experienced CAE in a regulated industry.
Exhibit 3 – Example of a CAE’s compliance focused activities

Internal audit’s stakeholder relationship program is likely to include relevant compliance specialists, such as ‘watchers’ (person or entity conducting directed compliance assessments), ‘advisors’ (qualified person or entity providing advice on compliance achievement), ‘assurers’ (qualified person or entity providing expert advice and guidance to achieve assurance), and a ‘capability partners’ (entity providing prescriptive direction and assistance that helps to achieve compliance and enhance capability).

Exhibit 4 – Practical example of an internal audit function’s compliance activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Key Elements of Corporation</th>
<th>Related Internal Audit Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maturity Level – Foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance activities</td>
<td>A high-level policy and procedures register (aligned where necessary to the compliance register) listed all of the corporation’s significant policies and procedures, approval dates, related legislation/regulations, accountabilities, and review dates.</td>
<td>Individual audits in the approved internal audit plan considered whether established controls over compliance risks were operating in practice in line with established policies and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maturity Level – Positioning for Success</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal audit capability</td>
<td>CAE developed a Strategic Competency Plan (using the IPPF Practice Guide - Creating a Competency Process in the Public Sector).</td>
<td>Internal audit staff were suitably trained and developed to fulfil the full ambit of their responsibilities under their charter and in the risk-based internal audit plan. Internal resources were complemented with specialist technical resources from a service provider firm secured by the CAE through a co-sourcing arrangement. As an example, the CAE identified a competency gap in respect to the absence of recognised ‘safety auditor’ capabilities with suitable national accreditation. A senior internal auditor undertook the safety training course and achieved accreditation as a ‘safety auditor’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>There were four board committees, all of which covered different elements of compliance – audit and risk; retail trading risk; remuneration / human resources; and transaction approval. There were five executive committees, each with a substantial compliance focus – major contract review; environmental; network capital governance; occupational health and safety; and financial services licence.</td>
<td>CAE attended key executive committee meetings occasionally as an observer, and participant. Each of the committee charters contained suitable wording to preserve audit independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maturity Level – Mature</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance framework</td>
<td>The entity had a compliance framework consistent with the features in Exhibit 2.</td>
<td>A periodic high-level internal audit assessed the compliance baseline, the register of compliance risks, and the overarching compliance framework to determine how well the core elements were operating in practice. Focussed on arrangements for undertaking compliance risk assessments, identifying compliance strategies, creating awareness, promoting compliance, fostering continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regulatory Reviews

Regulators have the right to independently assure themselves that the entity is compliant with legislation and regulations related to their jurisdiction. They have the right to periodically conduct documentary and/or onsite reviews of the corporation’s policies, procedures, operations, activities, systems, premises and related information.

In some situations, the outcomes of the regulatory review might be reported to the parliament and/or the public.

To ensure a smooth and seamless regulatory review, the CAE was assigned responsibility by the CEO to be the entity’s central coordination point for the regulator’s review team. At the request of the audit committee, the CAE included the monitoring of significant regulatory recommendations in the internal audit activity’s process for monitoring and reporting on the implementation of recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Reviews</th>
<th>Improvement, establishing monitoring mechanisms, maintaining the compliance register, and producing meaningful compliance reporting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 2.4 Five Action Steps

Five compliance-related activities to consider for your annual audit plan through an appropriately credible and capable internal audit cohort:

1. Include individual audits in the approved internal audit plan to consider discrete ‘at risk’ compliance activities at a micro level, including whether established controls over compliance risks are operating in practice in line with established policies and procedures. (A high-level register should list all of the entity’s policies and procedures, approval dates, related legislation/regulations, accountabilities, and review dates).

2. Facilitate the CAE or a senior delegate to periodically attend key board or executive compliance committee meetings as an observer, and report on significant insights to the audit committee. (Each of the compliance committee charters should contain suitable wording to preserve audit independence).

3. Complete a high-level assessment of compliance governance to ensure adequate coverage of the entity’s respective licence conditions, legislative / regulatory obligations, and elements of its sustainability platform. Assess the entity’s related risk management arrangements covering compliance obligations and reporting.

4. Conduct a periodic high-level internal audit to assess the compliance framework at a macro level, including:
   a. benchmarking against the international compliance standard AS/ISO 19600,
   b. assessing the soundness of compliance policy and its alignment to the entity’s strategies and business/statutory objectives,
   c. determining how well the core elements are embedded into business processes and operating in practice,
   d. evaluating the availability of appropriate resources to develop, maintain and improve the compliance program,
   e. assessing the effectiveness of compliance reporting to the board, audit committee and senior management, and
   f. forming an opinion on the overall culture of compliance.

5. Provide a central regulatory coordination point for the regulator’s review team for any high risk or high profile regulatory reviews. Then monitor the implementation of significant regulatory recommendations in the internal audit activity’s process for monitoring and reporting on the implementation of recommendations.
3. Conclusion

3.1 Summary and Options

The board, audit committee and senior management have responsibilities to champion, comply, risk-manage, and oversight a range of mandatory and voluntary compliance obligations.

Internal audit is well-placed to provide independent insights on the entity’s compliance framework, including how the entity:

- identifies, facilitates, creates awareness and promotes compliance;
- undertakes risk assessment and identifies strategies;
- establishes monitoring and assurance mechanisms;
- fosters continuous improvement;
- maintains a compliance register;
- handles compliance breaches (including escalation and/or breach reporting); and
- provides internal and external compliance reporting.

Internal audit reviews of this nature help to minimise the risk of compliance failures and associated reputational risks, as well as the consequent potential impacts of fines, prosecution, complaints, and litigation for the entity and its senior officers, and potentially imprisonment for senior officers.

3.2 Conclusion

An effective compliance framework is a critical element of good governance. Given that almost nine out of ten executives across the world believe that reputation risk is the most important strategic risk, it is essential for the compliance framework to be factored into internal audit planning.
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