



**INTOSAI  
PSC**

Professional  
Standards  
Committee

[www.psc-intosai.org](http://www.psc-intosai.org)

## Minutes from the PSC Subcommittee meeting 16/06/2021

### Participants:

CAS: Vani Sriram, Vishnukanth, Meenakshi Sharma, Sachin Kumar

PAS: Hege Larsen, Morten Nordberg, Lene Siljeholm Christiansen

FAAS: Daniel Boutin

ICS: Paweł Banas, Kamila Żyndul

PSC: Paula Hebling, Raisa Ojala, Geoffrey Simpson, Alan Findlay, Radek Majer

1. INTOSAI Strategic Planning: presentation of the current text, TFSP meeting next week, detailed comments may be sent by email

General comments from the floor included:

- The importance of improving the current ISSAIs since they are not all in a state where simple development would suffice, in particular objectives and overlaps need to be focused on;
- The PSC secretariat recalled that the third bullet (Ensure the IFPP material is clearly drafted and presented and makes appropriate use of modern technologies to ensure it is accessible in a way that is meaningful to users) refers to existing pronouncements.
- The PSC has other documents that focus on more technical aspects, such as the SDP.

**Resolved:** The PSC will work on the wording of the draft and present at the PSC SC meeting 24<sup>th</sup> of June.

2. Working together – document

The PSC secretariat explained that this is an internal document but will serve as input to future update of the due process. It will also be shared with the other Goal Chairs for their own use.

A particular question was raised about the role of the subcommittees and project groups and whether the project-lead should not be totally voluntary but rather decided by the PSC on technical terms. Once decided, the project-lead should have authority and not be dismissed mid-way. Currently divergences are not well dealt with; new people enter the process, and the progress of project groups goes back to zero because of individual diverging opinions.

The PSC Secretariat commented that we have currently the revision of ISSAI 140 which includes all subcommittees. There is a need to create a project group and voluntary SAIs and subcommittees will be called on to help.

The PSC secretariat also noted that the PSC should guide the process of forming the project group to include those parties that are needed to make the document legitimate; however, this is a challenge since INTOSAI's work is based on voluntary contributions.

One idea is that an agreement with all parties before submitting the project plan would avoid many problems as the project advances. Any professional discussion about disagreements would include a document stating the points and the arguments for the disagreement on a technical level. It is important to take proper note of any disagreements in the development of projects since they may represent a wider view and we would not wish to develop documents that the SAls immediately disagree with.

In sum, The PSC Secretariat suggested that the selection of the project lead is discussed on a case by case basis, since on some projects this will be easier to decide due to the topic, and other times we will need a volunteer. In any case this has to be agreed between those involved.

What comes to the identification of the experts an agreement on who should be involved can be done by discussions between the PSC secretariat and the subcommittees when the project is initiated.

In consultation projects, the PSC has suggested the project groups deal with the input by the experts in the same way they deal with exposure comments, by giving feedback on why the comment was or wasn't accepted, and if not, the reason for the decision. This was suggested in a recent meeting with the project groups on PPP and procurement. But, as it is not a requirement from due process, it was a suggestion, one that we hope they take in.

Finally, participants noted that we also have to figure out a way to solve the pending issues from the previous SDP.

**Resolved:**

The meeting discussed if it would be feasible to ask the PSC Steering Committee for its position on any disagreements in documents. This issue is to be further discussed with the PSC subcommittees before any decisions are taken.

The PSC Secretariat agreed to provide minutes for all meeting from now on.

The PSC Secretariat called for any further comments from the subcommittees by email.

3. Standard setting discussions

The PSC secretariat thanked all those who participated in the recent discussions on standard setting. These discussions outlined the main points and were felt by participants to be very fruitful. Subcommittees were asked to send any specific comments by email.

Specific points raised in today's discussion were:

- the difficulties in getting comments from the wide INTOSAI Community due to language issues;
- improving the exposure draft commenting process by using the regional organisations to translate the exposure draft to their languages and set online meetings with the LO network to encourage commenting
- on the exposure draft on privatisation: the announcement is on the [issai.org](http://issai.org) website (where it is possible to follow projects to get email updates) and the announcement was also posted twice in INTOSAI Journal social media, and sent by email to all SAls and to the ISLO network.
- the idea of *virtual meetings* where the Project group could present their draft document and answer questions received some support, especially where FIPP liaison officers could also participate.
- There was a worry amongst some subcommittees that their comments were not taken sufficiently into account. Whilst the PPP and procurement project groups were asked to give written feedback to the subcommittees, this is not mandatory under due process;

- Challenges with the FIPP were causing disquiet among some of the subcommittees. The PSC secretariat recalled that the Goal Chairs choose the FIPP members through an open call, analysis of curricula and interviews with the candidates. In addition, the liaison officers who comment on projects may not be the best qualified for that area.
- There is no mechanism to evaluate the FIPP's work or give feedback. Should the objectives of evaluation of the FIPP be more clearly defined?? One expert in FIPP might not be enough faced against a group of subject matter specialists in the subcommittees. All the comments of an independent reviewer are valuable, but the issue is more with the feasibility of the FIPP attempting to be a technical expert on all subject matter presently in the IFPP. It is not feasible to ask the FIPP to be expert in everything. One way forward might be for the FIPP to seek help from outside experts, and indeed, a smaller group of experts could speed up the process instead of involving the whole FIPP with 16 members giving their opinion on every matter. The meeting recalled that in the beginning the FIPP was supposed to be a quality control body. Perhaps is now the moment to evaluate why the FIPP was created, where it is now and where it should go next. The subcommittees also need to have a clear role in the development of the SDP as the specialized working bodies.
- The separation of duties in the FIPP as they are the ones who participate in the whole process, give feedback, and approve all the stages of the projects. The PSC SC has no role at all. Should the FIPP also have representatives from the subcommittees and the Goal Chairs in addition to their independent members? The subcommittee members called for more transparency in all processes related to the FIPP.
- In how far do the FIPP and the PSC have overlapping competencies? The expert knowledge of the working groups and subcommittees should be taken on board, whilst the FIPP's big value is in safeguarding the quality of the whole framework;
- One suggestion is that the FIPP comments regarding the quality aspects could be mandatory while their comments on the aspects could be optional. The expertise working body would have the final say in the subject matter. The PSC could also have a more active role in guiding the project groups and be the link between the expert committees and the project groups.

#### 4. PSC SC Agenda

The PSC presented the agenda for the upcoming Steering Committee meeting. The subcommittees were invited to notify to the PSC secretariat any items they wished to table on the agenda.