

Dear colleagues

Thank you for this opportunity to provide you with our feedback to PSC operational plan. We understand that this plan has not been given high priority as explained in the PSC-SC meeting. That said we find that this agenda item was presented in a way that made it difficult to prepare for the discussions and to understand what we voted for. Developing a plan that have legitimacy and support from the relevant INTOSAI bodies involved in standard setting require an inclusive and transparent process and relevant and timely discussions in the PSC-SC in due time. We believe there is potential for improving the process for this plan as well as other PSC documents that is sent to the PSC-SC for approval.

We also find that the relationship/division between this operational plan and the SDP needs to be clear. We agree to the proposed solution, which implies that the initiatives under strategic objectives 1-3 will be defined by the SDP and is therefore not covered by the operational plan. This allows the content of the operational plan to focus on the strategic level and the operation of the PSC rather than the improvements of the IFPP and its content, which will be defined in the SDP. It may improve readability to state this scope more clearly up-front in the operational plan.

We would also like to provide comments to the different parts of the plan:

Prioritization of the planned action items and initiatives

Using Kahoot in a meeting such as this is something new and exciting. However if the result should be considered legitimate, the alternatives must be relevant, the respondents must be given enough time to consider the alternatives and understand how the results should be used. In this case none of these conditions are met. Our summary of the discussion is that the PSC-SC agree that the three projects on each of the classes of pronouncements including a preparation for digitizing the framework have high priority. We suggest to remove this part of the plan.

Risks

In the joint seminar in Copenhagen we discussed constraints for the standard setting. This was also included in FIPPs presentation to the PSC-SC meeting and we are under the impression that the constraints were accepted by the PSC-SC. If possible risks are vague the risk reducing measures will also be vague and less efficient to reduce the risk. In addition appointing someone responsible for the mitigation of the risk as well as a systematic way to follow up the risk identified is also important to ensure the risk is dealt with in due time.

As mentioned in the PSC-SC meeting, the risks should as a minimum include in-kind contributions to standard setting, vehicle to drive the development of new ISSAIs are missing and that drafting support is not available.

External evaluation of INTOSAI standard-setting

In our report to the PSC-SC FIPP proposed that an external evaluation of INTOSAI's standard-setting is carried out. The proposal was a result of the FIPP meeting and joint seminar in Copenhagen. We also understood that there was generally a positive response from members of the PSC-SC. We therefore suggest that this is included in the operational plan.