



INTOSAI

Goal Chairs
Collaboration
PSC – CBC – KSC

QUALITY ASSURING INTOSAI PUBLIC GOODS THAT ARE DEVELOPED AND PUBLISHED OUTSIDE DUE PROCESS

A JOINT PAPER FROM THE INTOSAI GOAL CHAIRS AND THE INTOSAI DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE (IDI)

1. The revision of due process, along with some of the novelties that it introduces, is designed to ensure – amongst other things – that documents that enter the INTOSAI Framework of Professional Pronouncements (IFPP) have been subject to rigorous quality control procedures and are of the highest possible quality. The revised due process includes the following elements:
 - a) Quality processes built into the project proposal;
 - b) Transparent and open public exposure processes giving all stakeholders the opportunity to comment on the exposure draft;
 - c) Oversight and approval throughout the process by the Forum for INTOSAI Professional Pronouncements (FIPP);
 - d) Assurance from the responsible Goal Chair to the Governing Board that due process has been followed in all aspects.
2. INTOSAI, its working groups and other constituent organisations produce and make available a wide range of public goods outside the IFPP. Examples are the SAI PMF and 3i tools available on the IDI website and innumerable guides, checklists and manuals available on the websites of INTOSAI working groups. These all carry - in some way or another - the INTOSAI brand, which has two implications:
 - a) Users have the right to expect that these goods have been subjected to appropriate quality assurance procedures and should be informed what these processes were;
 - b) Public goods that are of poor quality represent a risk to INTOSAI's reputation.
3. It is quite possible that the introduction of the IFPP and revised due process will lead to an increase in the number of INTOSAI public goods published outside the IFPP. This possibility increases the necessity to put in place an appropriate system of quality assurance for these products, whilst guarding against such a system being excessively costly or bureaucratic. Such a system, which gives rise to a quality assurance statement, should have the following elements:



- a) It should recognise that different levels of quality assurance are appropriate for different public goods. Three such levels might be considered:
 - i) Products that have been subjected to quality assurance processes equivalent to INTOSAI due process, including an extended period of transparent public exposure¹;
 - ii) Products that have been subjected to more limited quality assurance processes involving stakeholders from outside the body or working group responsible for the products' initial development. Quality assurance processes might, for example, include piloting, testing and inviting comments from key stakeholders, although not go as far as full 90-day public exposure;
 - iii) Products that have been subjected to rigorous quality control measures within the body or working group responsible for their development;
- b) These arrangements would not cover products such as draft documents, works-in-progress, discussion documents, blog postings and similar. It should be transparent. Users of INTOSAI public goods should be able to quickly establish the level of quality assurance to which the product was subjected. A quality assurance statement should appear prominently on or immediately after the cover page of the document. For all three levels outlines above, it should become standard practice to publish – as part of the document – an annex succinctly outlining the quality assurance measures that were taken and their outcome.
- c) All public goods carrying the INTOSAI brand name that originate from the INTOSAI goal chairs, their subcommittees and working groups, from FIPP or from IDI should be accompanied by a statement of quality assurance. The INTOSAI regional organisations should be encouraged to also adopt this practice.
- d) Where appropriate, the quality assurance statement for public goods might include either a revision or expiry clause, stating clearly the latest date by which the product will be reviewed and updated or the date upon which the guidance in the product will cease to be valid (normally, of course, the product should be removed from public access on or before this date).

¹ In INTOSAI due process, the exposure comment period is normally 90 days.



INTOSAI

Goal Chairs
Collaboration
PSC – CBC – KSC

- e) All new public goods published on or after 1st December 2017 (i.e. about three weeks after the 2017 Governing Board meeting) should conform to the principles in this paper and carry a quality assurance statement and, where appropriate, an explanatory annex. A quality assurance statement will be added to existing public goods as and when they are revised or updated.
4. The Goal Chairs and IDI will oversee this process for their own products and those of their subcommittees and working groups. Together, they will draw up a workable definition of “INTOSAI public goods”² and develop the procedures and templates necessary. These procedures may involve the Goal Chairs “signing off” statements of quality assurance for products developed by the subcommittees and working groups under their responsibility.
5. The Governing Board is invited to take note of this paper. It may also wish to consider whether the statement of quality assurance system should apply to goods produced by bodies that report to it other than the goal chairs.

² IDI’s strategic plan 2014-2018 defines global public goods: “as products and tools that help in global knowledge creation for capacity development of the SAIs. These products and tools are freely available to the SAIs and all other stakeholders involved in SAI capacity development and members of public at large, such that the use by one party does not preclude use by another”. The term does not cover the IDI training material, courseware, tests, etc developed.