



IT CONTROL OBJECTIVES FOR SARBANES-OXLEY, 2ND EDITION

THE IMPORTANCE OF IT IN THE
DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION AND
SUSTAINABILITY OF INTERNAL
CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL
REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE

EXPOSURE DRAFT—30 APRIL 2006

IT Governance Institute®

The IT Governance Institute (ITGI™) (www.itgi.org) was established in 1998 to advance international thinking and standards in directing and controlling an enterprise's information technology. Effective IT governance helps ensure that IT supports business goals, optimizes business investment in IT, and appropriately manages IT-related risks and opportunities. The ITGI offers electronic resources, original research and case studies to assist enterprise leaders and boards of directors in their IT governance responsibilities.

Disclosure

Copyright © 2006 IT Governance Institute. All rights reserved. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be used, copied, reproduced, modified, distributed, displayed, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise), without the prior written authorization of the IT Governance Institute. Reproduction of selections of this publication for internal and noncommercial or academic use only is permitted and must include full attribution of the material's source. No other right or permission is granted with respect to this work.

IT Governance Institute

3701 Algonquin Road, Suite 1010
Rolling Meadows, IL 60008 USA
Phone: +1.847.590.7491
Fax: +1.847.253.1443
E-mail: research@itgi.org
Web site: www.itgi.org

IT Control Objectives for Sarbanes Oxley, 2nd Edition

Printed in the United States of America

Disclaimer

The IT Governance Institute, ISACA® and other contributors make no claim that use of this document will assure a successful outcome. This publication should not be considered inclusive of IT controls, procedures and tests, or exclusive of other IT controls, procedures and tests that may be reasonably present in an effective internal control system over financial reporting. In determining the propriety of any specific control, procedure or test, US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) registrants should apply appropriate judgment to the specific control circumstances presented by the particular systems or information technology environment.

Readers should note that this document has not received endorsement from the SEC, which is responsible for regulating public companies, or the US Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB), which is responsible for regulating the public accounting profession. The issues that are dealt with in this publication will evolve over time. Accordingly, companies should seek counsel and appropriate advice from their risk advisors and/or auditors. The contributors make no representation or warranties and provide no assurances that an organization's use of this document will result in disclosure controls and procedures and the internal controls and procedures for financial reporting that are compliant with the requirements and the internal control reporting requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (the Act), nor that an organization's plans will be sufficient to address and correct any shortcomings that would prohibit the organization from making the required certification or reporting under the Act.

Internal controls, no matter how well designed and operated, can provide only reasonable assurance of achieving an entity's control objectives. The likelihood of achievement is affected by limitations inherent to internal control. These include the realities that human judgment in decision making can be faulty and that breakdowns in internal control can occur because of human failures such as simple errors or mistakes. Additionally, controls, whether manual or automated, can be circumvented by the collusion of two or more people or inappropriate management override of internal controls.

Acknowledgments

From the publisher

The IT Governance Institute wishes to recognize:

The principal contributors, for their tireless efforts in the development of the document

Christopher Fox, ACA

Paul Zonneveld, CISA, CA

The focus group, for their guidance and ideas

Gordon Bloom, CISA, RSM McGladrey Inc., USA

Michael Cangemi, CISA, CPA, Cangemi Company LLC, USA

Nancy Cohen, CPA, AICPA, USA

Roger Debreceny, Ph.D., FCPA, University of Hawaii, USA

Robert Frelinger, CISA, Sun Microsystems Inc., USA

Kenneth S. Gabriel, CPA, KPMG LLP, USA

Michael Garber, CIA, CPA, Motorola Inc., USA

John Gimpert, CPA, Deloitte & Touche LLP, USA

John Hainaut, Jefferson Wells, USA

Hussain Hasan, CISM, CISSP, RSM McGladrey Inc., USA

Edward Hill, CIA, CPA, Protiviti, USA

Tara Janos, BP Amoco, USA

Peter Koltun, Jefferson Wells, USA

Phillip Lageschulte, CPA, KPMG LLP, USA

Elsa Lee, CISA, CSQA, Crowe Chizek LLP, USA

Anthony Noble, CISA, CCP, Viacom Inc., USA

Heriot Prentice, MIIA, FIIA, QiCA, The Institute of Internal Auditors, USA

Debbie Sanneman, Motorola, USA

Sheryl Skolnik, CISA, CISM, CPA, BDO Seidman LLP, USA

Tracy Stewart, CISA, CISSP, CCP, CIA, Allstate Insurance Company, USA

Doug Underwood, CPA, McGladrey & Pullen, USA

Mickey Vaja, CISA, CCNA, CISSP, Grant Thornton LLP, USA

Kenneth Vander Wal, CISA, CPA, CSP, Ernst & Young LLP, USA

Timothy Van Ryzin, CISA, CISM, Harley-Davidson, USA

Jeffrey Ward, CISA, CPA, CITP, Stone Carlie & Company LLC, USA

Margaret Yocher, United Technologies-Carrier, USA

Paul Zonneveld, CISA, CA, Deloitte & Touche LLP, Canada

The ITGI Board of Trustees

Everett C. Johnson, CPA, Deloitte & Touche LLP (retired), USA,
International President
Abdul Hamid Bin Abdullah, CISA, CPA, Auditor General's Office,
Singapore, Vice President
William C. Boni, CISM, Motorola, USA, Vice President
Jean-Louis Leignel, MAGE Conseil, France, Vice President
Lucio Augusto Molina Focazzio, CISA, Colombia, Vice President
Howard Nicholson, CISA, City of Salisbury, Australia, Vice President
Bent Poulsen, CISA, CISM, VP Securities Services, Denmark,
Vice President
Frank Yam, CISA, CIA, CCP, CFE, CFS, FHKCS, Focus Strategic
Group, Hong Kong, Vice President
Marios Damianides, CISA, CISM, CA, CPA, Ernst & Young LLP, USA,
Past International President,
Robert S. Roussey, CPA, University of Southern California, USA,
Past International President
Emil G. D'Angelo, CISA, CISM, Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi, USA, Trustee
Ronald Saull, CSP, The Great-West Life and IGM Financial, Canada, Trustee
Erik Guldenops, CISA, CISM, Belgium, Advisor

The ITGI Affiliates and Sponsors

ISACA chapters
ASIS International
The Center for Internet Security
Commonwealth Association of Corporate Governance
ISACA
Solvay Business School
University of Antwerp Management School
Bindview
CA
Hewlett-Packard
IBM
Phoenix Business and Systems Process Inc.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	8
Enhancements to the Publication	8
Alignment With PCAOB and COBIT	9
Considerations for Smaller Companies	9
Using This Publication	10
THE FOUNDATION FOR RELIABLE FINANCIAL REPORTING	11
A Need for IT Control Guidance	11
PCAOB Requirement for IT Controls	11
Where to Find IT Controls	12
Information Technology Controls—A Unique Challenge	13
Controls Over IT Systems	15
Compliance and IT Governance	17
MANAGING THE HUMAN ELEMENT OF CHANGE	18
Committing to Change	18
Assess the Current State	18
Overcome the Obstacles	19
SETTING THE GROUND RULES	21
COSO Defined	21
Applying COSO to Information Technology	21
ROAD MAP FOR COMPLIANCE	27
Sarbanes-Oxley Compliance	27
APPENDIX A—SARBANES-OXLEY PRIMER	43
APPENDIX B—IT GENERAL CONTROLS	51
APPENDIX C—APPLICATION CONTROLS	74
APPENDIX D—SAMPLE APPLICATION AND TECHNOLOGY LAYERS INVENTORY	88
APPENDIX E—PROJECT ESTIMATING TOOL	89

APPENDIX F—INHERENT RISK ASSESSMENT AND CONTROL PRIORITIZATION GRID	90
APPENDIX G—SAMPLE CONTROL DOCUMENTATION AND TESTING TEMPLATE	93
APPENDIX H—SAMPLE DEFICIENCY EVALUATION DECISION TREE	94
APPENDIX I—SAMPLE APPROACH FOR SPREADSHEETS.....	95
APPENDIX J—LESSONS LEARNED	97
REFERENCES.....	100

Executive Summary

In April 2004, the IT Governance Institute issued *IT Control Objectives for Sarbanes-Oxley* to help companies assess and enhance their internal control systems. Since that time, the publication has been used by companies around the world as a tool for evaluating information technology controls in support of Sarbanes-Oxley compliance.

Many lessons have been learned with respect to financial reporting and IT controls since the publication was issued—most significantly, the need to take a top-down, risk-based approach in Sarbanes-Oxley compliance programs to help ensure that sufficient and appropriate attention is given to areas of highest risk.

As a result, ITGI has revised the publication to provide additional IT guidance on areas of greater importance to internal control over financial reporting, as well as to share lessons learned regarding IT compliance with Sarbanes-Oxley.

Enhancements to the Publication

While much has been learned since the initial release of the publication, the fundamental guidance provided in April 2004 is still sound. Companies should not be concerned that the enhancements to the publication will significantly alter their approach or otherwise expose deficiencies in their process. Rather, the purpose of enhancing the publication is to share lessons learned from companies and provide additional guidance on how to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of compliance using a risk-based approach. A summary of enhancements to the publication follows:

- Managing the human element of change—Insights into cultural and people management issues have been added to highlight the human factors that need to be considered when complying with Sarbanes-Oxley.
- Prioritization of controls—Guidance has been added to assist companies in defining “key controls.” Using this guidance, certain controls in appendix B have been flagged as key controls.
- Enhanced focus on scoping and risk assessment—Guidance has been added to assist companies in applying a top-down, risk-based approach. In particular, guidance has been added to assist in performing an IT risk assessment for Sarbanes-Oxley.
- Enhanced guidance on application controls—Guidance has been added to assist companies in identifying and addressing various types of application controls, as well as providing a business case for using application controls.
- Approach for spreadsheets—Guidance has been added to assist companies in addressing spreadsheets, including best practices for controls.

- Simplification of the readiness road map—Changes have been made to the readiness road map to simplify the process.
- Lessons learned—A summary of lessons learned has been added to share the compliance experiences of companies worldwide, including steps to consider in realizing benefits or avoiding common pitfalls.

Alignment With PCAOB and CobIT

In all, 12 IT control objectives, which align to the PCAOB Accounting Standard No. 2 and *Control Objectives for Information and related Technology* (COBIT®), were defined for Sarbanes-Oxley. **Figure 1** provides a high-level mapping of the IT control objectives for Sarbanes-Oxley described in this document, the PCAOB IT general controls and the COBIT® 4.0 processes.

Figure 1—Control Processes Mapping to PCAOB and CobIT

IT Control Objectives for Sarbanes-Oxley	Mapping to CobIT 4.0 Processes	PCAOB IT General Control Heading			
		Program Development	Program Changes	Computer Operations	Access to Programs and Data
1. Acquire and maintain application software.	AI2	●	●	●	●
2. Acquire and maintain technology infrastructure.	AI3	●	●	●	
3. Develop the IT processes, organization and relationships.	P04	●	●	●	●
4. Install and accredit solutions and changes.	AI7	●	●	●	●
5. Manage changes.	AI6		●		●
6. Define and manage service levels.	DS1	●	●	●	●
7. Manage third-party services.	DS2	●	●	●	●
8. Ensure systems security.	DS5			●	●
9. Manage the configuration.	DS9			●	●
10. Manage problems and incidents.	DS8, DS10			●	
11. Manage data.	DS11			●	●
12. Manage the physical environment and operations.	DS12, DS13			●	●

Considerations for Smaller Companies

In November 2005, the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO) released an exposure draft titled *Guidance for Smaller Public Companies Reporting on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting*. In the document, COSO highlights the challenges faced by smaller companies in complying with regulations such as Sarbanes-Oxley and provides suggestions to address these challenges.

Similarly, smaller companies may find it difficult to address the IT control considerations that are expected under Sarbanes-Oxley. This is why it is important not to take a one-size-fits-all strategy, but instead to take a risk-based approach and implement only those IT controls that are necessary and relevant in the circumstances. For instance, smaller companies often use relatively simple off-the-shelf (OTS) financial applications rather than large, customizable enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems. In such cases, the risk of financial statement errors resulting from the application is typically less than that of a larger, more complex system. Accordingly, the nature and extent of controls required for the smaller company should be less than those of the larger company. While there are always exceptions to the rule, smaller companies should carefully assess their risks and implement only the controls that are necessary. To assist in this regard, enhancements have been made to the risk assessment guidance provided in this publication.

Using This Publication

The information contained in this document provides useful guidance and tools for companies trying to prepare and sustain their IT organizations relative to Sarbanes-Oxley compliance. **However, each organization should carefully consider the appropriate IT control objectives necessary for its own circumstances. Organizations may choose not to include all the control objectives discussed in this document, and, similarly, they may choose to include others not discussed in this document.** In either case, it is expected that changes to the description of control objectives, illustrative controls and illustrative tests of controls provided in this document will be necessary to reflect the specific circumstances of each organization.

The Foundation for Reliable Financial Reporting

A Need for IT Control Guidance

In today's environment, financial reporting processes are driven by IT systems. Such systems, whether ERP or otherwise, are deeply integrated in initiating, authorizing, recording, processing and reporting financial transactions. As such, they are inextricably linked to the overall financial reporting process and need to be assessed, along with other important processes, for compliance with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act.

Much has been written on the importance of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and internal controls in general; however, little exists on the significant role that information technology plays in this area. For instance, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act requires organizations to select and implement a suitable internal control framework. COSO's *Internal Control—Integrated Framework* has become the most commonly used framework by companies complying with Sarbanes-Oxley; however, COSO does not provide a great deal of guidance to assist companies in the design and implementation of IT controls.

As a result, organizations need guidance to address IT components as they relate to the overall financial reporting compliance program. This document is intended to assist in this regard.

PCAOB Requirement for IT Controls

PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 2 discusses the relationship of IT and internal control over financial reporting and emphasizes the importance of identifying IT controls and testing their design and operational effectiveness. In particular, it states:

...Controls should be tested, including controls over relevant assertions related to all significant accounts and disclosures in the financial statements. Generally, such controls include [among others]:

- Controls, including information technology general controls, on which other controls are dependent.*

PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 2 continues by describing the process that auditors should follow in determining the appropriate assertions or objectives to support management's assessment:

To identify relevant assertions, the auditor should determine the source of likely potential misstatements in each significant account. In determining whether a particular assertion is relevant to a significant account balance or disclosure, the auditor should evaluate [among others]:

- *The nature and complexity of the systems, including the use of information technology by which the company processes and controls information supporting the assertion.*

PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 2 also specifically addresses information technology in period-end financial reporting:

As part of understanding and evaluating the period-end financial reporting process, the auditor should evaluate [among others]:


- *The extent of information technology involvement in each period-end financial reporting process element;*

Where to Find IT Controls

In understanding where IT controls exist within the typical company, consideration of at least three elements should be given: executive management, business process and IT services.

Executive Management	Business Process	IT Services
Executive management establishes and incorporates strategy into business activities. At the enterprise or entity level, business objectives are set, policies are established and decisions are made on how to deploy and manage the resources of the organization. From an IT perspective, policies and other enterprisewide guidelines are set and communicated throughout the organization.	Business processes are the organization's mechanism of creating and delivering value to its stakeholders. Inputs, processing and outputs are functions of business processes. Increasingly, business processes are being automated and integrated with complex and highly efficient IT systems.	IT services form the foundation for operations and are provided across the organization, rather than segregated by business process or business unit. IT services commonly include network management, database management, operating system management, storage management, facilities management and security administration, and are often managed by a central IT function.

Figure 2 illustrates the common elements of organizations.



More and more, IT systems are automating business processes. In doing so, these systems often replace manual control activities with automated or IT-dependent control activities. As a result, compliance programs need to consider system-based controls to keep pace with changes in business processes and new system functionality.

Information Technology Controls—A Unique Challenge

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act makes corporate executives explicitly responsible for establishing, evaluating and monitoring the effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting. For most organizations, the role of IT will be crucial to achieving this objective. Whether through a unified ERP system or a disparate collection of operational and financial management software applications, IT is the foundation of an effective system of internal control over financial reporting.

Yet, this situation creates a unique challenge: many of the IT professionals being held accountable for the quality and integrity of information generated by their IT systems are not well versed in the intricacies of internal control. This is not to suggest that risk is not being managed by IT, but rather that it may not be formalized or structured in a way required by an organization's management or its auditors.

Organizations need representation from IT on their Sarbanes-Oxley teams to determine whether IT monitoring controls, general controls and application controls exist and support the objectives of the compliance effort. Some of the key areas of responsibility for IT include:

- Understanding the organization's internal control program and its financial reporting process
- Mapping the IT systems that support internal control and the financial reporting process to the financial statements
- Identifying risks related to these IT systems
- Designing and implementing controls designed to mitigate the identified risks and monitoring them for continued effectiveness
- Documenting and testing IT controls
- Ensuring that IT controls are updated and changed as necessary to correspond with changes in internal control or financial reporting processes
- Monitoring IT controls for effective operation over time
- Participation by IT in the Sarbanes-Oxley project management office

The SEC regulations that affect the Sarbanes-Oxley Act are undeniably intricate, and implementation has been both time-consuming and costly. In proceeding with an IT control program, there are two important considerations that should be taken into account:

- There is no need to reinvent the wheel; virtually all public companies have some semblance of IT control. While they may be informal and lacking sufficient documentation of the control and evidence of the control functioning, IT controls generally exist in areas such as security and change management.
- Many organizations are able to tailor existing IT control processes to comply with the provisions of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. Frequently, the consistency and quality of control documentation and evidential matter are lacking, but the general process is often in place, only requiring some modification.

Performing a thorough review of IT control processes and documenting them as the enterprise moves forward can be a time-consuming task. Without appropriate knowledge and guidance, organizations run the risk of doing too much or too little. This risk is amplified when those responsible are not experienced in the design and assessment of IT controls or lack the necessary skill or management structure to identify and focus on the areas of most significant risk.

While some industries, such as financial services, are familiar with stringent regulatory and compliance requirements of public market environments, most are not. To meet the demands of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, most

organizations are in the process of a change in culture. Enhancements to IT systems and processes have been required, most notably in the design, documentation, retention of control evidence and evaluation of IT controls.

Controls Over IT Systems

With widespread reliance on IT systems, controls are needed over such systems, large and small. IT controls commonly include controls over the IT environment, computer operations, access to programs and data, program development, and program changes. These controls apply to systems that have been determined to be financially significant.

IT Control Environment

The control environment has become more important in PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 2. The standard states that:

...Because of the pervasive effect of the control environment on the reliability of financial reporting, the auditor's preliminary judgment about its effectiveness often influences the nature, timing, and extent of the tests of operating effectiveness considered necessary. Weaknesses in the control environment should cause the auditor to alter the nature, timing, or extent of tests of operating effectiveness that otherwise should have been performed in the absence of the weaknesses.

The PCAOB has also indicated that an ineffective control environment should be regarded as at least a significant deficiency and as a strong indicator that a material weakness in internal control over financial reporting exists. These comments apply to the overall control environment, which includes the IT control environment.

The IT control environment includes the IT governance process, monitoring and reporting. The IT governance process includes the information systems strategic plan, the IT risk management process, compliance and regulatory management, and IT policies, procedures and standards. Monitoring and reporting are required to align IT with business requirements.

The IT governance structure should be designed so that IT adds value to the business and IT risks are mitigated. This also includes an IT organization structure that supports adequate segregation of duties and promotes the achievement of the organization's objectives.

Computer Operations

These include controls over the definition, acquisition, installation, configuration, integration and maintenance of the IT infrastructure. Ongoing controls over operations address the day-to-day delivery of information services, including service-level management, management of third-party services, system availability, customer relationship management, configuration and systems management, problem and incident management, operations management scheduling, and facilities management.

The system software component of operations includes controls over the effective acquisition, implementation, configuration and maintenance of operating system software, database management systems, middleware software, communications software, security software, and utilities that run the system and allow applications to function. System software also provides the incident tracking, system logging and monitoring functions. System software can report on uses of utilities, so if someone accesses these powerful data-altering functions, at least that individual's use is recorded and reported for review.

Access to Programs and Data

Access controls over programs and data assume greater importance as internal and external connectivity to entity networks grows. Internal users may be halfway around the world or down the hall, and there may be thousands of external users accessing, or trying to access, entity systems. Effective access security controls can provide a reasonable level of assurance against inappropriate access and unauthorized use of systems. If designed well, they can intercept unethical hackers, malicious software and other intrusion attempts.

Adequate access control activities, such as secure passwords, Internet firewalls, data encryption and cryptographic keys, can be effective methods of preventing unauthorized access. User accounts and related access privilege controls restrict the applications or application functions only to authorized users that need them to do their jobs, supporting an appropriate division of duties. There should be frequent and timely review of the user profiles that permit or restrict access. Former or disgruntled employees can be a threat to a system; therefore, terminated employee passwords and user IDs should be revoked immediately. By preventing unauthorized use of, and changes to, the system, an entity protects its data and program integrity.

Program Development and Program Change

Application software development and maintenance have two principle components: the acquisition and implementation of new applications and the maintenance of existing applications.

The acquisition and implementation of new applications tend to experience a high degree of failure. Many implementations are considered to be outright failures, as they do not fully meet business requirements and expectations or are not implemented on time or within budget.

To reduce acquisition and implementation risks, some entities have a form of system development and quality assurance methodology. Standard software tools and IT architecture components often support this methodology. The methodology provides structure for the identification of automated solutions,

system design and implementation, documentation requirements, testing, approvals, project management and oversight requirements, and project risk assessments.

Application maintenance addresses ongoing change management and the implementation of new releases of software. Appropriate controls over changes to the system should exist so that all changes are made properly. There is also a need to determine the extent of testing required for the new release of a system. For example, the implementation of a major new software release may require the evaluation of the enhancements to the system, extensive testing, user retraining and the rewriting of procedures. Controls may involve required authorization of change requests, review of the changes, approvals, documentation, testing and assessment of changes on other IT components, and implementation protocols. The change management process also needs to be integrated with other IT processes, including incident management, problem management, availability management and infrastructure change control.

Compliance and IT Governance

There is no such thing as a risk-free environment, and compliance with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act does not create such an environment. However, the process that most organizations will follow to enhance their system of internal control to conform to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act is likely to provide lasting benefits. Good IT governance over planning and life cycle control objectives should result in more accurate and timely financial reporting.

The work required to meet the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act should not be regarded as a compliance process, but rather as an opportunity to establish strong governance models designed to result in accountability and responsiveness to business requirements. Building a strong internal control program within IT can help to:

- Enhance overall IT governance
- Enhance the understanding of IT among executives
- Enable better business decisions by providing higher-quality, more timely information
- Align project initiatives with business requirements
- Prevent loss of intellectual assets and the possibility of system breach
- Contribute to the compliance of other regulatory requirements, such as privacy
- Gain competitive advantage through more efficient and effective operations
- Optimize operations with an integrated approach to security, availability and processing integrity
- Enhance risk management competencies and prioritization of initiatives

Managing the Human Element of Change

Implementing controls for Sarbanes-Oxley, where few existed before, has become a significant challenge for most organizations. In many cases, the finance organization within a company has been familiar with the need for controls and related documentation because they have been part of financial audits for years. However, IT organizations are less accustomed to these issues and, therefore, implementing controls that operate effectively over time has proven to be a difficult task.

To successfully implement and sustain controls, IT organizations first need to understand that compliance with Sarbanes-Oxley will likely involve change in current practices. Similarly, IT organizations should recognize that change is more than a process—it has significant cultural and personal undertones that need to be taken into consideration in order to be successful. Therefore, companies must have a strategy for change that reflects the cultural preferences and capability of its people. Change does not just happen—it has to be managed.

Committing to Change

The first step in managing change is obtaining commitment. In seeking this commitment, an organization needs to define what it wants to change and what it should look like after it is changed. Building a vision for the future state allows for commitment to take place. Companies also need to understand how change can be effected within their organizations. For instance, is change best accomplished through a top-down or bottom-up approach? Understanding these issues is important to obtaining commitment.

Assess the Current State

Successful change management starts with an honest assessment of the current state. The current state refers to the readiness of the organization to embrace change. Consider the following factors in assessing the current state:

- Culture—The probability of successful change is most likely to be affected by an organization’s culture. That is, if an organization is used to a flexible, entrepreneurial style, then change is already part of its culture and will be met with acceptance. If the culture is stoic or rigid, then change will be more difficult.
- Extent of change—The more significant the change, the less likely success will result. Organizations need to assess the extent of change they are trying to accomplish and be realistic with their goals.
- Winners and losers—There are always winners and losers with change and it is important to understand how people will be impacted. The winners are often change agents and the losers are often obstacles, so identifying the winners early and engaging them in the process will be a key success factor. Similarly, if there is a high proportion of losers, organizations may need to rethink the extent of change and find ways of building up more winners.

- Bench strength—The ability of an organization to adapt to change is often proportionate to the skills and experience of that organization. If change requires significant retraining or modification in skill set, then to be successful training investments need to be made.

Overcome the Obstacles

Once an organization has assessed its current state, it will have identified the relevant obstacles to change and needs to implement a strategy to overcome them. For instance, evolving an organization toward Sarbanes-Oxley compliance requires the design and implementation of controls, which some may perceive as impediments to “getting the job done.” However, if designed and communicated properly, these controls can be implemented to enhance business process efficiency and effectiveness, resulting in improved business performance.

In overcoming the obstacles, there are important lessons to be learned from companies that have already been through this process, as follows:

1. Communicate—Effective communication is more than just providing regular updates. Organizations are naturally resistant to change, and people need to understand the purpose of change and the benefits of it. Some suggestions in this regard are:
 - Understand the pain points. Figure out what could negatively impact an individual or the organization as a whole and make sure the communication clearly describes how the change will reduce the pain. There are many pain points within Sarbanes-Oxley, the most significant of which is failing to certify. Once people understand how this affects them, they will be much more willing to embrace the changes associated with compliance.
 - Determine the best medium for communicating. Newsletters, e-mail, workshops and lunch-and-learns are all good examples of communication, and in most cases more than one type is required to get the message across. Sarbanes-Oxley projects are long and complicated, so regular communication is important.
 - Obtain feedback. It is just as important to collect and analyze feedback as it is to communicate. Feedback allows organizations to show flexibility and adaptability, demonstrating that they are listening. One of the biggest reasons change is not successful is because organizations do not listen. There are many ways to meet the requirements of Sarbanes-Oxley, and companies would be surprised to see the excitement that is generated when people’s feedback is sought and implemented.
2. Train—if companies want to evolve, it is important to give people the skills they need to get there. Training requirements should be identified for each affected employee, and plans should be implemented to deliver this training. The requirements of Sarbanes-Oxley are complicated and the wide variety of opinions on what constitutes the right amount of work

suggests that training and education are essential for a successful project. For instance, training is particularly important in understanding how general computer controls relate to application controls, as well as many other areas addressed in this publication.

3. Motivate—Change is most successful when incentives are used. Incentives provide a productive and goal-oriented approach for making change happen, and the result is often a win-win for the company and its people. For instance, consider building Sarbanes-Oxley compliance objectives into the performance evaluation process of every employee, and be as specific as possible in defining these objectives so they are relevant to the roles and responsibilities of each individual.

Setting the Ground Rules

COSO Defined

Historically, assertions on control by an organization had been mostly voluntary and based on a wide variety of internal control frameworks. To improve consistency and quality, the SEC mandated the use of a recognized internal control framework established by a body or group that has followed due-process procedures, including the broad distribution of the framework for public comment. Specifically, the SEC referred to COSO.¹

COSO is a voluntary private sector organization dedicated to improving the quality of financial reporting through business ethics, effective internal control and corporate governance. It was originally formed in 1985 to sponsor the National Commission on Fraudulent Financial Reporting, an independent private sector organization often referred to as the Treadway Commission. The sponsoring organizations include the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), American Accounting Association (AAA), Financial Executives International (FEI), Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) and Institute of Management Accountants (IMA). The sections that follow provide further insight into COSO and its implications for IT.

Applying COSO to Information Technology

For years, IT has played an important role in the operation of strategic and managerial information systems. Today, these systems are inseparable from an organization's ability to meet the demands of customers, suppliers and other important stakeholders. With widespread reliance on IT for financial and operational management systems, controls have long been recognized as necessary, particularly for significant information systems. To emphasize this point, refer to the guidance provided in PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 2:

Known as the COSO report, it provides a suitable and available framework for purposes of management's assessment. For that reason, the performance and reporting directions in this standard are based on the COSO framework. Other suitable frameworks have been published in other countries and may be developed in the future. Such other suitable frameworks may be used in an audit of internal control over financial reporting. Although different frameworks may not contain exactly the same elements as COSO, they should have elements that encompass, in general, all the themes in COSO.

¹ Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, www.coso.org

For Sarbanes-Oxley compliance efforts, it is important to demonstrate how IT controls support the COSO framework. An organization should have IT control competency in all five of the components COSO identifies as essential for effective internal control. They are:

- Control environment
- Risk assessment
- Control activities
- Information and communication
- Monitoring

Each of the five is described briefly in the following sections. Following the description are high-level IT considerations as they relate to the specific component. More detailed IT control objectives are included in the appendices as considerations for compliance with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act.

Control Environment

Control environment creates the foundation for effective internal control, establishes the “tone at the top” and represents the apex of the corporate governance structure. The issues raised in the control environment component apply throughout an organization. The control environment primarily addresses the entity level.

However, IT frequently has characteristics that may require additional emphasis on business alignment, roles and responsibilities, policies and procedures, and technical competence. The following list describes some considerations related to the control environment and IT:

- IT is often mistakenly regarded as a separate organization of the business and thus a separate control environment.
- IT is complex, not only with regard to its technical components but also as to how those components integrate into the organization’s overall system of internal control.
- IT can introduce additional or increased risks that require new or enhanced control activities to mitigate successfully.
- IT requires specialized skills that may be in short supply.
- IT may require reliance on third parties where significant processes or IT components are outsourced.
- Ownership of IT controls may be unclear, especially for application controls.

Risk Assessment

Risk assessment involves management’s identification and analysis of relevant risks to achieving predetermined objectives, which form the basis for determining control activities. It is likely that internal control risks could be more pervasive in the IT organization than in other areas of the organization. Risk assessment may occur at the entity level (for the overall organization) or at the activity level (for a specific process or business unit).

At the entity level, the following may be expected:

- An IT planning subcommittee of the company's overall Sarbanes-Oxley steering committee. Among its responsibilities may be the following:
 - Oversight of the development of the IT internal control strategic plan, its effective and timely execution/implementation, and its integration with the overall Sarbanes-Oxley compliance plan
 - Assessment of IT risks, e.g., IT management, data security, program change and development

At the activity level, the following may be expected:

- Formal risk assessments built throughout the systems development methodology
- Risk assessments built into the infrastructure operation and change process
- Risk assessments built into the program change process

Control Activities

Control activities are the policies, procedures and practices that are put into place so that business objectives are achieved and risk mitigation strategies are carried out. Control activities are developed to specifically address each control objective to mitigate the risks identified.

Without reliable information systems and effective IT control activities, public companies would not be able to generate accurate financial reports. COSO recognizes this relationship and identifies two broad groupings of information system control activities: general controls and application controls.

General controls, which are designed so that the financial information generated from an organization's application systems can be relied upon, include the following types:

- Data center operation controls—Controls such as job setup and scheduling, operator actions, and data backup and recovery procedures
- System software controls—Controls over the effective acquisition, implementation and maintenance of system software, database management, telecommunications software, security software, and utilities
- Access security controls—Controls that prevent inappropriate and unauthorized use of the system
- Application system development and maintenance controls—Controls over development methodology, including system design and implementation, that outline specific phases, documentation requirements, change management, approvals and checkpoints to control the development or maintenance of the project

Application controls are embedded within software programs to prevent or detect unauthorized transactions. When combined with other controls, as necessary, application controls support the completeness, accuracy, authorization and validity of processing transactions. Some examples of application controls include:

- Balancing control activities—Controls that detect data entry errors by reconciling amounts captured either manually or automatically to a control total. For example, a company automatically balances the total number of transactions processed and passed from its online order entry system to the number of transactions received in its billing system.
- Check digits—A calculation to validate data. For example, a company's part numbers contain a check digit to detect and correct inaccurate ordering from its suppliers. Universal product codes include a check digit to verify the product and the vendor.
- Predefined data listings—Controls that provide the user with predefined lists of acceptable data. For example, a company's intranet site might include drop-down lists of products available for purchase.
- Data reasonableness tests—Tests that compare data captured to a present or learned pattern of reasonableness. For example, an order to a supplier by a home renovation retail store for an unusually large number of feet of lumber may trigger a review.
- Logic tests—Tests that include the use of range limits or value/alphanumeric tests. For example, credit card numbers have a predefined format.

General controls are needed to support the functioning of application controls, and both are needed to support accurate information processing and the integrity of the resulting information used to manage, govern and report on the organization. As automated application controls increasingly replace manual controls, general controls are becoming more important.

Information and Communication

COSO states that information is needed at all levels of an organization to run the business and achieve the entity's control objectives. However, the identification, management and communication of relevant information represent an ever-increasing challenge to the IT department. The determination of which information is required to achieve control objectives, and the communication of this information in a form and time frame that allow people to carry out their duties, support the other four components of the COSO framework.

The IT organization processes most financial reporting information. However, its scope is usually much broader. The IT department may also assist in implementing mechanisms to identify and communicate significant events, such as e-mail systems or executive decision support systems.

COSO also notes that the quality of information includes ascertaining whether the information is:

- Appropriate—Is it the right information?
- Timely—Is it available when required and reported in the right period of time?
- Current—Is it the latest available?
- Accurate—Are the data correct?
- Accessible—Can authorized individuals gain access to it as necessary?

At the entity level, the following may be expected:

- Development and communication of corporate policies
- Development and communication of reporting requirements, including deadlines, reconciliations, and the format and content of monthly, quarterly and annual management reports
- Consolidation and communication of financial information

At the activity level, the following may be expected:

- Development and communication of standards to achieve corporate policy objectives
- Identification and timely communication of information to assist in achieving business objectives
- Identification and timely reporting of security violations

Monitoring

Monitoring, which covers the oversight of internal control by management through continuous and point-in-time assessment processes, is becoming increasingly important to IT management. There are two types of monitoring activities: continuous monitoring and separate evaluations.

Increasingly, IT performance and effectiveness are being continuously monitored using performance measures that indicate if an underlying control is operating effectively. Consider the following examples:

- Defect identification and management—Establishing metrics and analyzing the trends of actual results against those metrics can provide a basis for understanding the underlying reasons for processing failures. Correcting these causes can improve system accuracy, completeness of processing and system availability.
- Security monitoring—Building an effective IT security infrastructure reduces the risk of unauthorized access. Improving security can reduce the risk of processing unauthorized transactions and generating inaccurate reports, and should result in a reduction of the unavailability of key systems if applications and IT infrastructure components have been compromised.

An IT organization also has many different types of separate evaluations, including:

- Internal audits
- External audits
- Regulatory examinations
- Attack and penetration studies
- Independent performance and capacity analyses
- IT effectiveness reviews
- Control self-assessments
- Independent security reviews
- Project implementation reviews

At the entity level, the following may be expected:

- Centralized continuous monitoring of computer operations
- Centralized monitoring of security
- IT internal audit reviews (While the audit may occur at the activity level, the reporting of audit results to the audit committee is at the entity level.)

At the activity level, the following may be expected:

- Defect identification and management
- Local monitoring of computer operations or security
- Supervision of local IT personnel


Road Map for Compliance

The following section provides a compliance road map that is tailored to the specific objectives and responsibilities of IT departments. The road map has been simplified from the version included in the initial publication, to make the implementation process easier to manage as well as to focus efforts on activities that are most important to Sarbanes-Oxley compliance.

Understanding how Sarbanes-Oxley applies to an organization—based on its business characteristics—can aid in the development of the internal control program. Many factors come into play, and larger companies will face challenges distinct from those of smaller enterprises. Also, the extent to which a strong internal control framework is already in place will have significant bearing on activities.

Sarbanes-Oxley Compliance

The compliance road map, illustrated in **figure 3**, provides direction for IT professionals on meeting the challenges of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act.



1. Plan and Scope

Like all significant projects, careful attention should be given to properly scoping and planning the IT compliance program. Scoping is the process of understanding what is included in the project vs. what is excluded based on the results of the risk assessment process. Planning is the process of developing a time schedule of activities whereby tasks are assigned to people and progress can be monitored.


Assign Accountability and Responsibility

An important first step in the IT control compliance program is to form an IT control subcommittee. The subcommittee should be integrated into, and report to, the overall Sarbanes-Oxley steering committee. It should oversee the IT Sarbanes-Oxley compliance process, facilitate communication and integration with the overall Sarbanes-Oxley project, and facilitate the role of the independent auditors in the Sarbanes-Oxley IT process. Smaller organizations may be able to redeploy, on a part-time basis, existing staff; however, larger organizations may need dedicated full-time personnel. The subcommittee should assign an IT controls lead who is responsible for the project and is given appropriate authority and accountability for completing the project.

Inventory Key Applications and Related Subsystems

Working with the financial compliance team, develop an inventory of in-scope applications (Sarbanes-Oxley applications and related subsystems) by identifying the applications that support key application controls, as shown in **figure 4**. Typically, applications that support online authorizations, complex calculations or valuations, or are responsible for maintaining the integrity of significant account balances such as inventory, fixed assets or loan balances, should be identified in this phase. Appendix C provides guidance on the definition of application controls and examples of where they may exist within a company.

Figure 4—Scoping the IT Control Project



By having an inventory of applications, the IT control project team will be able to identify all applications that need to be considered and identify all subsystems that support the applications, including databases, servers, operating systems and networks (see appendix D for an example of an inventory spreadsheet of key applications and subsystems).

This step in the project will also help the IT organization gain an understanding of how the financial reporting process works and identify where technology is critical in the support of the process, thereby identifying key systems and subsystems that need to be included in the scope of the project.

The inventory of applications and related subsystems should be used for preliminary planning purposes, and will be assessed for risk in the following phase to determine the nature and extent of controls and testing required.

Develop a Preliminary Project Plan and Obtain Approval

Using the inventory of in-scope applications and subsystems, develop a preliminary project plan of activities using the six phases described in **figure 3**. The project plan will be modified and refined later, but it is important to get an overall view of the project's size and approach. In developing the plan, estimate the time required for each phase using the project estimating tool in appendix E.

Once the plan is developed, discuss with the financial compliance team the in-scope applications and appropriateness of the project's scope. Once this is complete, obtain approval to proceed with the project. Obtaining formal approval is very important given the significance of the project and the impact it will have on various members of the organization. Formal approval will solidify the sponsors of the project and obtain buy-in from all relevant stakeholders and staff members that need to participate.

Determine Responsibility for Application Controls

One of the common areas of confusion for IT control projects has been “who is responsible for application controls?” The lack of clarification of this responsibility has led to significant duplication of effort, unnecessary testing of duplicative key controls and the risk that a key control may not be tested because both the financial and IT teams have assumed that the other team is addressing the issue. It is suggested that business owners are responsible for business-process-specific application controls. The responsibility of the IT organization is to assist the process owners in identifying and testing these controls, while ensuring that the general application controls (access restrictions, change controls, backup recovery, etc.) are in place and reliable.

Consider Multilocation Issues

Among the many factors that must be considered in scoping the IT control project are companies with decentralized operations or companies with operations that span geographical boundaries. Such companies need to determine if their IT operations in each geographical location operate within a single control environment or multiple control environments. Single control environments typically have one leadership structure, while multilocation environments typically have multiple leadership structures. Generally speaking, multilocation environments, when significant, have to be treated separately and therefore result in a larger project and more work.

Consider Third-party Service Organizations (Outsourcing)

Some organizations use external service organizations to perform outsourced services. These services are still part of an organization's overall operations and responsibility and, consequently, need to be considered in the overall IT internal control program.

PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 2 specifically addresses the service auditor's reports. It states:

The use of a service organization does not reduce management's responsibility to maintain effective internal control over financial reporting. Rather, management should evaluate controls at the service organization, as well as related controls at the company, when making its assessment about internal control over financial reporting.

In such circumstances, organizations should review the activities of the service organization in arriving at a conclusion on the reliability of its internal control. Documentation of service organization control activities will be required for the attestation activities of the independent auditor, so an assessment is required of the service organization to determine the sufficiency and appropriateness of evidence supporting these controls.

Traditionally, audit opinions commonly known as Statement on Auditing Standards (SAS) 70 reports have been performed for service organizations. If these audit reports do not include tests of controls, results of the tests and the service auditor's opinion on operating effectiveness, they may not be deemed sufficient for purposes of Sarbanes-Oxley compliance. In such cases, organizations may wish to consult with their independent auditors and understand the specific requirements. Particular attention should be paid to the period covered by the SAS 70 and also to whether the controls in the SAS 70 cover the environment, platforms and applications utilized by the company.

2. Assess Risk

One of the most significant lessons learned through the initial years of Sarbanes-Oxley compliance projects is that the project needs to be risk-based. Not all IT systems or processes pose a high risk to the financial statements and, therefore, not all IT systems or processes need to be included or evaluated to the same extent. In performing a risk assessment, consideration needs to be given to “inherent risk” rather than residual risk (the risk left over after considering the impact of controls). A number of tools have been provided in appendix F to assist in the risk assessment process.

Consider Whether Applications Can Be Eliminated From Scope

The fact that an application is included in scope indicates that it supports a key application control required for Sarbanes-Oxley compliance. In most cases, the application and its related subsystems will have to be assessed. However, if the application supports a very limited number of application controls—say, just one control—then consideration could be given to eliminating the application control (and therefore the application itself) and either identifying a relevant manual control or increasing reliance on existing manual controls to reduce overall effort. While this is rare, it is a consideration for companies that have many applications that support very few controls. Care must be taken to ensure that inadvertent reliance does not occur in these situations (e.g., relying on a system-generated report).

Assess the Inherent Risk of Applications and Related Subsystems

Assessing inherent risk of applications and their related subsystems, such as databases, operating systems, networks and physical environments, is necessary to determine the nature and extent of controls needed to manage such risks. Furthermore, it is also necessary to understand application and related subsystem inherent risk to properly plan and perform testing of operating effectiveness of such controls.

In performing an inherent risk assessment, consideration should be given to a number of risk factors; however, the final assessment is judgmental. The purpose of considering common risk factors is to provide companies with relevant information so that a fair and reasonable risk assessment can be made.

The following factors are commonly used in performing the risk assessment, but companies should determine if others need to be added based on their unique circumstances (see appendix F for additional guidance):

- Past experience
- Volume of transactions (workload)
- Nature of systems (complex or simple)
- Nature of people (experienced or inexperienced)
- Nature of processes (centralized or decentralized)

Once a risk assessment has been performed, its results can assist in determining the nature and extent of controls and testing required. Appendix B provides guidance on the recommended IT controls that should be considered for applications and related subsystems (collectively referred to as the “technology layers”). As noted in the matrix provided in appendix F, the risk assessment will allow for the exclusion of certain IT control processes simply because the probability or impact of events related to that technology layer is not sufficient to warrant any work. Regardless of the outcome, documentation of the decisions made and rationale for such decisions should be maintained for discussion with management or the external auditors.

Refine Scope and Update the Project Plan

Once a risk assessment has been performed, the IT controls team should be in a position to refine the project scope and update which applications and related subsystems may be excluded from scope. The risk assessment process and related conclusions should be clearly documented, particularly where systems are excluded from scope. Similarly, the project plan should be updated where changes to scope and the extent of effort is modified to reflect a risk-based approach.

3. Document Controls

The purpose of documenting controls is to manage the risks that threaten reliable financial reporting. For example, if financial applications are heavily relied upon for complex calculations, then there is a risk that unauthorized changes could result in material errors in the financial statements. As a result, controls need to be identified and documented that prevent this from occurring or detect its occurrence.

Identify Application Controls

Identifying application controls that support financial reporting is the first step in this process. Once all application controls have been identified, their supporting IT general controls can be identified as well. Most often, application controls are included in the business process documentation.

Ideally, IT specialists will document a process with a controls specialist and together they may identify the relevant controls for the process. However, in many cases, the process documentation will have already been created.

Therefore, someone will have to review this documentation and identify the application controls. Appendix C provides additional guidance on the identification of application controls.

Identifying automated controls may seem trivial, but in many cases, it is not. Two types of application controls are commonly used by companies and need to be documented:

- Automated controls—Performed by computers and binary in nature, they function as designed and are not subject to intermittent error. Examples include input edit checks validate order quantities, or configured controls in automated purchasing systems that will allow orders only up to preconfigured limits.
- IT-dependent manual controls (hybrid)—These are essentially manual controls that are dependent on IT systems. For instance, some bank reconciliations require that a report of outstanding checks be obtained from the financial application and then reconciled manually. In this case, both the manual control (reconciliation) and the automated control (report of outstanding checks) are needed to conclude that the bank reconciliation process is operating effectively.

IT application controls are becoming more important as the timing of error detection and the cost efficiency of controls receive more attention. For example, whereas years ago it may have been acceptable to wait several weeks for a manual reconciliation to detect an error or fraud, such a delay is becoming increasingly less acceptable. Therefore, manual controls unsupported by an automated process may no longer be tolerable. Further guidance, including examples of application controls, is provided in appendix C.

Hybrid controls, in particular, have not been well documented by many companies despite the emphasis provided by the PCAOB in its November 2004 guidance:

Application controls also may be manual controls that are dependent on IT (for example, the review by an inventory manager of an exception report when the exception report is generated by IT). Although IT general control deficiencies do not result in financial statement misstatements directly, an associated ineffective application control may lead to misstatements. Therefore, the significance of an IT general control deficiency should be evaluated in relation to its effect on application controls, that is, whether the associated application controls are ineffective.

Identify IT General Controls

The relationship between application controls and IT general controls is such that IT general controls are needed to support the reliability of application controls. For example, ensuring database security is often considered a requirement for reliable financial reporting. Without security at the database level, companies would be exposed to unauthorized changes to financial data.

The challenge with IT general controls is that they rarely impact the financial statements directly. Rather, the PCAOB describes IT general controls as having a “pervasive” effect over all internal controls. That is, if a key IT general control fails (e.g., a control restricting access to programs and data), it has a pervasive impact on all systems that rely on it, including financial applications. As a result, without being assured that only authorized users have access to financial applications, companies are unable to conclude that only authorized users initiated and approved transactions.

Identify Which Controls Are Key Controls

Financial risks are not all equal in likelihood and materiality. Similarly, financial controls are also not the same in their effectiveness in mitigating identified risks. Furthermore, management is not required to evaluate all control activities related to a risk. As a result, companies should endeavor to limit their documentation of controls to key controls. The question most companies ask is “what is a key control?” Unfortunately, there is no authoritative definition for key controls, despite the fact that the term is used ubiquitously. While they may sound elusive, key controls are those that companies choose to rely on to meet a control objective—they are the controls that provide the most assurance to the control owners that the financial control objective was met.

When judging whether a control is key, companies should consider the following:

- Key controls commonly include policies, procedures, practices and organization structure that are essential for management to mitigate significant risks and achieve the related control objective.
- Key controls often support more than one control objective. For instance, access controls support the validity of financial transactions, valuation of financial accounts, segregation of duties, and more. In most cases, a combination of key controls is an effective way to achieve a particular objective or series of objectives. Placing too much reliance on a single control could create a single point of failure for the compliance program.
- Controls that directly address significant risks (or directly achieve objectives) are often key. For example, the risk of unauthorized access is a significant risk for most companies; therefore, security controls that prevent or detect unauthorized access are key.
- Preventive controls are typically more effective than detective controls. For example, preventing a fraud from occurring is far better than simply detecting it after the fact. Therefore, preventive fraud controls are often considered key.
- Automated controls are more reliable than manual controls. For example, automated controls that force periodic password changes by users are more reliable than generic policies that have no enforcement. Manual processes are also subject to human error.

In appendix B, a listing of IT general controls has been provided as a guide for preparing IT organizations for Sarbanes-Oxley compliance. Within these lists, certain controls are flagged as “key” controls, indicating that they are the most commonly used in designing a reliable and robust IT general control environment.

Consider IT-based Antifraud Controls

The importance of antifraud controls under Sarbanes-Oxley is something that cannot be understated. Fraud is the principle reason for introducing Sarbanes-Oxley in the first place, so sufficient and appropriate attention must be given to this issue.

Information technology plays a significant role in the prevention and detection of fraud, as many antifraud controls rely on IT systems. The following examples of IT-based antifraud controls should be considered for inclusion for a company’s compliance program:

- Application-enforced segregation of duties—Most systems have the ability to define what privileges are assigned to users within the application. As a result, the system enforces appropriate approvals for transaction processing and prevents users from initiating and authorizing their own transactions.
- Access controls—Most systems have privileged users who can access sensitive information, such as payroll data, allowing them to add fictitious employees and thereby commit fraud. Limiting such access to a few people and making sure that the financial reporting team does not have this access is important to establishing internal control over financial reporting.

Control Documentation

Under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, companies are required to document controls over financial reporting and perform an assessment of their design and operating effectiveness. Documentation may take various forms, including entity policy manuals, IT policies and procedures, narratives, flowcharts, decision tables, procedural write-ups, or completed questionnaires. No single particular form of documentation is mandated by Sarbanes-Oxley, and the extent of documentation may vary, depending upon the size and complexity of the organization.

For most organizations, documentation of IT controls should include the following:

- Entity level
 - Assessment of entity-level controls including evidence to support the responses and opinions of management
- Activity level
 - Description of the processes and related subprocesses (may be in narrative form; however, it may be more effective to illustrate as a flowchart)

- Description of the risk associated with the process or subprocess, including an analysis of its impact and probability of occurrence. Consideration should be given to the size and complexity of the process or subprocess and its impact on the organization's financial reporting process.
- Statement of the control objective designed to reduce the risk of the process or subprocess to an acceptable level and a description of its alignment to the COSO framework
- Description of the control activity(ies) designed and performed to satisfy the control objective related to the process or subprocess
- Description of the approach followed to confirm (test) the existence and operational effectiveness of the control activities
- Conclusions reached about the effectiveness of controls, as a result of testing

4. Evaluate Control Design and Operating Effectiveness


Evaluate Control Design

Control design causes an IT organization to step back and evaluate the ability of its control program to reduce IT risk to an acceptable level. More specifically, it forces management to evaluate the appropriateness of control attributes, including preventive, detective, automated and manual, when concluding on control design. For example, if a change management risk is identified that would result in unauthorized programs being migrated into the production environment, a properly designed control will prevent this from occurring. In this example, a detective control that identifies unauthorized programs in production after the fact may not be appropriate.

Control design in the overall IT control environment cannot be understated. PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 2 points out the importance of IT controls and reinforces the fact that such controls are necessary to support the overall internal control environment. In particular, it states that the effectiveness of a company's overall system of internal control is dependent on the effectiveness of other controls (for example, the control environment or IT general controls). Accordingly, the evaluation of control design is an essential step in evaluating the IT control environment.

To help in this process, consider the IT control design and effectiveness model in **figure 5**. Depending on how the organization measures up, it may be necessary to spend some time enhancing the design and effectiveness of the control program.

Figure 5 demonstrates the stages of control reliability that may exist within organizations. For the purposes of establishing internal control, it is important to note that the higher stages provide a more reliable control environment and the lower stages are less reliable. While there is no specific stage required by Sarbanes-Oxley other than a requirement for controls to be documented and tested, organizations should carefully consider at which stage (maturity) they are currently and whether this presents a risk to compliance.



The table presented in **figure 6** provides insight into the various characteristics of each stage as well as the related implications. IT organizations must realize that there is little definition or guidance regarding the attributes or characteristics necessary to comply with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. The SEC has indicated that no particular form of documentation is approved or required, and the extent of documentation may vary, depending upon the size and complexity of the organization.

Figure 6—Control Quality

	Stage 0—Nonexistent	Stage 1—Initial/ <i>Ad Hoc</i>	Stage 2—Repeatable but Intuitive	Stage 3—Defined Process	Stage 4—Managed and Measurable	Stage 5—Optimized
Sarbanes-Oxley Implications	<p>The organization has a total inability to be in compliance at even the minimum level.</p>	<p>Insufficient controls, policies, procedures and documentation exist to support management's assertion.</p> <p>The level of effort to document, test and remedy controls is very significant.</p>	<p>Although controls, policies and procedures are in place, insufficient documentation exists to support management's certification and assertion.</p> <p>The level of effort to document, test and remedy controls is significant.</p>	<p>Sufficient documentation exists to support management's certification and assertion.</p> <p>The level of effort to document, test and remedy controls may be significant depending on the organization's circumstances.</p>	<p>Sufficient documentation exists to support management's certification and assertion.</p> <p>The level of effort to document, test and remedy controls may be less significant depending on the organization's circumstances.</p>	<p>Implications of stage 4 remain.</p> <p>Improved decision making is enabled because of high-quality, timely information.</p> <p>Internal resources are used effectively and efficiently.</p> <p>Information is timely and reliable.</p>

As discussed earlier, to provide a basis to support management's assertion regarding the adequacy of control design, management needs to document its evaluation of control design. Management's documentation of its evaluation of control design should be sufficiently detailed for the external auditor to review the design, perform a walk-through and test the effectiveness of a control. The external auditor should be able to understand management's evaluation of control design with sufficient detail to reperform the test of design. Generally, it is not sufficient to provide policies and manuals without providing a reconciliation to the design evaluation process.

Evaluate Operational Effectiveness

Once control design has been assessed, as appropriate, its design and effectiveness must be tested. During this stage, initial and ongoing tests—conducted by individuals responsible for the controls and the internal control program management team—should be performed to test the design and operating effectiveness of the control activities.

Although there are many factors that go into selecting sample sizes (e.g., other controls being tested, expected error rate), **figure 7** represents a common (minimum) sample selection methodology used by companies and auditors to test the operating effectiveness of controls. For IT general controls, the sample size selected will correspond with the frequency of control operation.

Figure 7—Guidance for Sample Size Selection

Nature of Control	Frequency of Performance	Minimum Sample Size
Manual	Many times per day	25
Manual	Daily	25
Manual	Weekly	5
Manual	Monthly	2
Manual	Quarterly	2
Manual	Annually	1
Automated	Test one application of each programmed control activity (assumes IT general controls are effective).	
IT general controls	Follow the guidance above for manual and programmed aspects of IT general controls.	

Management needs to document its tests of operating effectiveness and conclusions on whether the key controls evaluated by management are operating as designed. Similar to management's documentation of its evaluation of control design, management needs to document its evaluation of operational effectiveness in sufficient detail for external auditors to reperform the operational effectiveness tests performed by management.

In addition to the information documented in the control design evaluation, the documentation of operational effectiveness may include the following information:

- Nature, timing and extent of test step performed and results from testing
- Individual who performed the test and the date performed
- Sample size and test population
- Reference/location of supporting documentation
- Conclusion on operational effectiveness
- Exceptions identified and related remediation plans

5. Evaluate and Remediate Deficiencies

Consider Guidance From the PCAOB

In November 2004, the PCAOB issued guidance suggesting that IT general control deficiencies in the absence of an application control deficiency could be classified as only a control deficiency. However, the PCAOB goes on to describe three conditions under which an IT general control deficiency could result in more than a deficiency and perhaps a “material weakness.”

They are as follows:

- Application-level deficiencies—The significance of an IT general control deficiency should be evaluated in relation to its effect on application controls, that is, whether the associated application controls are ineffective. If the application deficiency is caused by the IT general control, then they are treated the same. For example, if an application-based tax calculation is materially wrong and was caused by poor change controls to tax tables, then the application-based control (calculation) and the general control (changes) could be classified as material weaknesses.
- Control environment deficiencies—After an IT general control deficiency has been evaluated in relation to its effect on application controls, it also should be evaluated when aggregated with other control deficiencies. Take, for example, management’s decision not to correct an IT general control deficiency and its associated reflection on the control environment; when aggregated with other deficiencies affecting the control environment, it could lead to the conclusion that a significant deficiency or material weakness in the control environment exists.
- Failing to remediate a deficiency for an unreasonable period of time—Based on the directions in the PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 2, the auditor could determine that a prudent official in the conduct of his/her own affairs would conclude that the IT general control deficiency, by itself, was a significant deficiency. In this manner, an IT general control deficiency that has been communicated to management and the audit committee yet remains uncorrected after some reasonable period of time is a strong indicator of a material weakness.

Identify and Assess IT General Control Deficiencies

All deficiencies, including IT deficiencies, should be reviewed with the financial compliance team and evaluated as part of the overall internal control certification. IT control deficiencies should not be evaluated in isolation. Similarly, application controls that directly support the financial statement control objectives also need to be reviewed and evaluated with the financial compliance team.

The general guidance for evaluation of IT general control deficiencies provided in appendix H provides an example of a deficiency evaluation decision tree to assist companies in their preliminary analysis of control deficiencies; however, this is only a preliminary analysis and additional review and conclusion needs to be performed by the overall financial compliance team.

Generally speaking, there are two types of deficiencies that companies will have to address:

1. Design deficiencies—These are issues related to missing controls, inadequate controls, lack of supporting documentation or other flaws in control design that do not sufficiently mitigate the related risk.
2. Operating effectiveness deficiencies—These are issues relating to the consistency with which controls are operating, such as not performing a control as designed consistently throughout the year.

Remediate Control Deficiencies

The remediation phase of most projects is where significant effort and money is spent. In some cases, there may be short-term options for remediation that may not be expensive to implement and can be implemented quickly, but may cost more to operate. For instance, the manual process for adding, changing and deleting users in systems is time-consuming and slow. However, if a company needs a quick solution, the manual approval and entry approach is often the most time-sensitive solution. However, a longer-term solution might include process automation that restricts user access provisioning without appropriate authorization. This approach will definitely cost more in the near term, but tends to be far more reliable and cost-effective in the long term.

6. Build Sustainability

At this point, IT management should be in a position to assess the IT internal control program effectiveness. Effective internal controls, control assessment and management competencies must become part of the IT department's organization and culture and sustain themselves over the long term. Control is not an event; it is a process that requires continuous support and

evaluation to stay current. The ultimate objective is to convert the IT control project into a process. The following activities should be considered to achieve this:

- Performing a postimplementation review of the Sarbanes-Oxley project, identifying what went right and areas for improvement
- Reviewing recent PCAOB and SEC speeches and guidance to determine if changes in interpretation could impact the future approach
- Reviewing other independent material for suggestions and opportunities to improve the approach
- Meeting with peers in other organizations to discuss potential improvements to the process
- Assessing longer-term solutions to address Sarbanes-Oxley issues, such as automation of processes and implementation of program change control software
- Developing a preliminary plan and timetable for the following year, making it an ingrained process
- Building the Sarbanes-Oxley process into the wider IT governance initiatives

Rationalize Controls

Control rationalization (or elimination) is another initiative that should take place in the sustainment phase. Undoubtedly, there will be some controls that are documented that, over time, become less and less useful. Companies should periodically review their controls to identify which controls can be eliminated from the control listing. In doing so, consideration should be given to the impact of removing a control and documentation prepared explaining the rationale as to why the control was removed.

Automate Controls

In most cases, there are a significant number of manual controls that can be automated. The automated control examples provided in appendix C are a great starting point for identifying where to transform manual controls into automated controls. Companies can review the examples in appendix C and the manual controls to determine which can be transformed into automated controls. In many cases, more detailed information will be needed depending on the applications available to a company and the nature of controls that are desired. Some consulting organizations have more detailed control benchmarks that provide such details for a given application, such as SAP and Oracle.

Perform Application Baselingining

The concept of application baselingining was introduced by the PCAOB in their November 2004 guidance, and is described more fully in appendix C. However the idea is that once an application is shown to be reliable, through testing, it may not have to be tested every year. As a result, reductions in effort can be realized making the compliance process more efficient and effective.

Appendix A—Sarbanes-Oxley Primer

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act demonstrates firm resolve by the US Congress to improve corporate responsibility. The Act was created to restore investor confidence in US public markets, which was damaged by business scandals and lapses in corporate governance. Although the Act and supporting regulations have rewritten the rules for accountability, disclosure and reporting, the Act's many pages of legalese support a simple premise: good corporate governance and ethical business practices are no longer optional niceties.

Background

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act was passed by the US Congress and signed into law by the President on 30 July 2002. Among other provisions, section 404 of the Act requires public companies registered with the SEC and their auditors to annually assess and report on the design and effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting.

Much has been written on the importance of the Act and internal controls in general; however, little exists on the significant role that information technology plays in this area. Most would agree that the reliability of financial reporting is heavily dependent on a well-controlled IT environment. Accordingly, there is a need for information for organizations to consider in addressing IT controls in a financial reporting context. This document is intended to assist SEC registrants in considering IT controls as part of their assessment activities.

Many IT controls were considered in developing this document. However, a significant effort was made to limit the consideration of such controls to those more directly related to internal control over financial reporting. As such, this document is deliberate in its exclusion of controls supporting operational and efficiency issues. It is, however, inevitable (and desirable) that operational and efficiency issues will be addressed over time and built into the control structures and processes that are developed. For further guidance in these areas, refer to the *ITGI Board Briefing on IT Governance, 2nd Edition*,² and the *IT Governance Implementation Guide*.³

Sarbanes-Oxley—Enhancing Corporate Accountability

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act has fundamentally changed the business and regulatory environment. The Act aims to enhance corporate governance through measures that will strengthen internal checks and balances and, ultimately, strengthen corporate accountability. However, it is important to

² IT Governance Institute, *Board Briefing on IT Governance, 2nd Edition*, USA, 2003

³ IT Governance Institute, *IT Governance Implementation Guide*, USA, 2003

emphasize that section 404 does not require senior management and business process owners merely to establish and maintain an adequate internal control structure, but also to assess its effectiveness on an annual basis. This distinction is significant.

IT plays a vital role in internal control. Systems, data and infrastructure components are critical to the financial reporting process. PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 2 discusses the importance of IT in the context of internal control. In particular, it states:

The nature and characteristics of a company's use of information technology in its information system affect the company's internal control over financial reporting.

IT professionals, especially those in executive positions, need to be well versed in internal control theory and practice to meet the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. CIOs and others responsible for the reliable operation of IT systems must take on the challenges of:

- Enhancing their knowledge of internal control
- Understanding their organization's overall Sarbanes-Oxley compliance plan
- Developing a compliance plan to specifically address IT controls
- Integrating this plan into the overall Sarbanes-Oxley compliance plan

Accordingly, the goal of this publication is to provide guidance to those responsible for the reliable operation of IT systems—including executive management, IT management, IT control professionals and assurance professionals—with regards to the following:

- Assessing the current state of the IT control environment
- Designing controls necessary to meet the requirements of Sarbanes-Oxley
- Developing an approach for testing and sustaining controls into the future

Auditing Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

In March 2004, the PCAOB approved Auditing Standard No. 2, titled “An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting Performed in Conjunction with an Audit of Financial Statements.” The standard became effective in June 2004, upon approval by the SEC. This auditing standard establishes the requirements for performing an audit of internal control over financial reporting and provides some important directions on the scope and approach required of auditors.

The PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 2 includes specific requirements for auditors to understand the flow of transactions, including how transactions are initiated, authorized, recorded, processed and reported. In many cases, these transactions involve the use of financial applications that help record and process business information. The reliability of these applications is itself dependent on other systems, such as databases, networks and operating systems. Collectively, they define the IT systems that are involved in the financial reporting process and, as a result, need to be considered in the design and evaluation of internal control over financial reporting.

In the PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 2, information technology is described as having a “pervasive” effect on internal control over financial reporting. In essence, the auditing standard recognizes the importance of IT controls to the overall control environment and requires companies to understand how IT is used in the financial reporting process and how controls are designed and implemented to manage risks. In particular, the auditing standard highlights four IT controls that need to be considered for Sarbanes-Oxley: program development, program changes, computer operations, and access to programs and data.

Specific Management Requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act

Much of the discussion surrounding the Sarbanes-Oxley Act has focused on sections 302 and 404. A brief primer to those sections can be found in **figure 8**.

Figure 8—Sarbanes-Oxley Requirements

	302	404
Who	A company’s management, with the participation of the principal executive and financial officers (the certifying officers)	Corporate management, executives and financial officers (“management” has not been defined by the PCAOB)
What	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Certifying officers are responsible for establishing and maintaining internal control over financial reporting. 2. Certifying officers have designed such internal control over financial reporting, or caused such internal control over financial reporting to be designed under their supervision, to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.* 3. Any changes in the company’s internal control over financial reporting that have occurred during the most recent fiscal quarter and have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, the company’s internal control over financial reporting are disclosed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A statement of management’s responsibility for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting for the company 2. A statement identifying the framework used by management to conduct the required assessment of the effectiveness of the company’s internal control over financial reporting 3. An assessment of the effectiveness of the company’s internal control over financial reporting as of the end of the company’s most recent fiscal year, including an explicit statement as to whether internal control over financial reporting is effective 4. A statement that the registered public accounting firm that audited the financial statements included in the annual report has issued an attestation report on management’s assessment of the company’s internal control over financial reporting

*Annual for foreign private issuers

Figure 8—Sarbanes-Oxley Requirements (*cont.*)

	302	404
	4. When the reason for a change in internal control over financial reporting is the correction of a material weakness, management has a responsibility to determine whether the reason for the change and the circumstances surrounding that change are material information necessary to make the disclosure about the change not misleading.	5. A written conclusion by management about the effectiveness of the company's internal control over financial reporting included both in its report on internal control over financial reporting and in its representation letter to the auditor. The conclusion about the effectiveness of a company's internal control over financial reporting can take many forms. However, management is required to state a direct conclusion about whether the company's internal control over financial reporting is effective. 6. Management is precluded from concluding that the company's internal control over financial reporting is effective if there are one or more material weaknesses. In addition, management is required to disclose all material weaknesses that exist as of the end of the most recent fiscal year.
When	Already in effect as of July 2002	Year-ends beginning on or after 15 November 2004**
How Often	Quarterly and annual assessment	Annual assessment by management and independent auditors

**Foreign filers 15 July 2006 and nonaccelerated filers (<US \$75 million) can defer to 15 July 2007.

Section 302 Management Requirements

Section 302:

...Requires a company's management, with the participation of the principal executive and financial officers (the certifying officers), to make the following quarterly and annual certifications with respect to the company's internal control over financial reporting:

- *A statement that the certifying officers are responsible for establishing and maintaining internal control over financial reporting*
- *A statement that the certifying officers have designed such internal control over financial reporting, or caused such internal control over financial reporting to be designed under their supervision, to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles*
- *A statement that the report discloses any changes in the company's internal control over financial reporting that occurred during the most recent fiscal quarter (the company's fourth fiscal quarter in the case of an annual report) that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, the company's internal control over financial reporting*

When the reason for a change in internal control over financial reporting is the correction of a material weakness, management has a responsibility to determine and the auditor should evaluate whether the reason for the change and the circumstances surrounding that change are material information necessary to make the disclosure about the change not misleading.

Disclosure Controls and Procedures

Disclosure controls and procedures refer to the processes in place designed to help ensure that all material information is disclosed by an organization in the reports it files or submits to the SEC. These controls also require that disclosures are authorized, complete and accurate, and recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in the SEC's rules and forms. Deficiencies in controls, as well as any significant changes to controls, must be communicated to the organization's audit committee and auditors in a timely manner. An organization's principal executive officer and financial officer must certify the existence of these controls on a quarterly basis.

Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

Internal control over financial reporting is defined by the SEC as:

A process designed by, or under the supervision of, the registrant's principal executive and principal financial officers, or persons performing similar functions, and effected by the registrant's board of directors, management and other personnel, to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and includes those policies and procedures that:

- (1) *Pertain to the maintenance of records that in reasonable detail accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of the assets of the registrant*
- (2) *Provide reasonable assurance that transactions are recorded as necessary to permit preparation of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and that receipts and expenditures of the registrant are being made only in accordance with authorizations of management and directors of the registrant*
- (3) *Provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use or disposition of the registrant's assets that could have a material effect on the financial statements.*

The PCAOB uses the same definition except that the word "registrant" has been replaced by the word "company."

Section 404 Management Requirements

The directives of Sarbanes-Oxley section 404 require that management provide an annual report on its assessment of internal control over financial reporting in the annual filing. It states:

Management's report on internal control over financial reporting is required to include the following:

- *A statement of management's responsibility for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting for the company*
- *A statement identifying the framework used by management to conduct the required assessment of the effectiveness of the company's internal control over financial reporting*
- *An assessment of the effectiveness of the company's internal control over financial reporting as of the end of the company's most recent fiscal year, including an explicit statement as to whether that internal control over financial reporting is effective*
- *A statement that the registered public accounting firm that audited the financial statements included in the annual report has issued an attestation report on management's assessment of the company's internal control over financial reporting*

Management should provide, both in its report on internal control over financial reporting and in its representation letter to the auditor, a written conclusion about the effectiveness of the company's internal control over financial reporting. The conclusion about the effectiveness of a company's internal control over financial reporting can take many forms; however, management is required to state a direct conclusion about whether the company's internal control over financial reporting is effective.

Management is precluded from concluding that the company's internal control over financial reporting is effective if there are one or more material weaknesses. In addition, management is required to disclose all material weaknesses that exist as of the end of the most recent fiscal year.

Management might be able to accurately represent that internal control over financial reporting, as of the end of the company's most recent fiscal year, is effective even if one or more material weaknesses existed during the period. To make this representation, management must have changed the internal control over financial reporting to eliminate the material weaknesses sufficiently in advance of the "as of" date and have satisfactorily tested the effectiveness over a period of time that is adequate for it to determine whether, as of the end of the fiscal year, the design and operation of internal control over financial reporting are effective.

Auditor Focus Under Sarbanes-Oxley

Section 404 requires a company's independent auditor to attest to management's assessment of its internal control over financial reporting. Not only must organizations determine if appropriate controls (including IT controls) are in place, they must also provide their independent auditors with documentation—evidence of the design and operating effectiveness of controls and the documented results of testing procedures.

Under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, standards for the auditor's attestation are now the responsibility of the PCAOB. While the section 404 attestation is "as of" a specific date, PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 2 specifically addresses financial reporting controls that should be in place for a period before the attestation date and controls that may operate after the attestation date.

It states:

The auditor's testing of the operating effectiveness of such controls should occur at the time the controls are operating. Controls "as of" a specific date encompass controls that are relevant to the company's internal control over financial reporting "as of" that specific date, even though such controls might not operate until after that specific date.

It is suggested that management meet with the independent auditors to determine the period of time a control is required to be operating before the attestation date.

PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 2 discusses the external auditor's responsibilities in regard to section 302. In particular, it states:

The auditor's responsibility as it relates to management's quarterly certifications on internal control over financial reporting is different from the auditor's responsibility as it relates to management's annual assessment of internal control over financial reporting. The auditor should perform limited procedures quarterly to provide a basis for determining whether he or she has become aware of any material modifications that, in the auditor's judgment, should be made to the disclosures about changes in internal control over financial reporting in order for the certifications to be accurate and to comply with the requirements of Section 302 of the Act.

To fulfill this responsibility, the auditor should perform, on a quarterly basis, the following procedures:

- *Inquire of management about significant changes in the design or operation of internal control over financial reporting as it relates to the preparation of annual as well as interim financial information that could have occurred subsequent to the preceding annual audit or prior review of interim financial information;*
- *Evaluate the implications of misstatements identified by the auditor as part of the auditor's required review of interim financial information (See AU sec. 722, Interim Financial Information) as it relates to effective internal control over financial reporting; and*
- *Determine, through a combination of observation and inquiry, whether any change in internal control over financial reporting has materially affected, or is reasonably likely to materially affect, the company's internal control over financial reporting.*

Appendix B—IT General Controls

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act requires that organizations select and implement a suitable internal control framework. COSO's *Internal Control—Integrated Framework* has become the most commonly used framework by companies complying with Sarbanes-Oxley. While COSO makes reference to the importance of IT relative to the overall control environment, it does not provide detailed guidance for companies needing to design and implement specific IT controls for their environment.

In developing this publication, the IT control objectives, illustrative controls and tests of controls were derived using a combination of COBIT, ISO 17799 and the Information Technology Infrastructure Library® (ITIL®). While all of these control frameworks address operational and financial objectives, only the financial objectives were used in this publication.

Generally speaking, IT general controls include objectives at the *entity level* and *activity level*. This publication addresses both; however, the entity-level objectives are presented as “points to consider” since the purpose of entity-level controls is to gain an understanding of the culture and operating style of the organization. Furthermore, entity-level controls are less likely to have specific activities; therefore, trying to define controls and tests for each is not practical. As a result, this publication provides considerations that, when reviewed in aggregate, provide an overall assessment of the design and effectiveness of entity-level controls.

In using these points to consider, companies should be careful not to simply answer “yes” or “no.” The purpose of the questions is to initiate a dialog that will yield examples of how the controls are performed and can be evidenced with documentation or through corroborative inquiry.

Entity-level IT Controls

Figures 9 through 12 provide considerations for the entity-level assessment of an organization’s IT control environment. As most organizations are using the COSO control framework for their internal control program, the figures have been structured in the same order as COSO and address points that could be considered in determining whether an entity-level objective has been achieved.

Control Environment

The control environment creates the foundation for effective internal control, establishes the “tone at the top” and represents the apex of the corporate governance structure. The issues raised in the control environment component apply throughout an IT organization.

Figure 9—Control Environment Considerations	
Points to Consider	Response/Evidence
<i>IT Strategic Planning</i>	
1. Has management prepared strategic plans for IT that align business objectives with IT strategies? Does the planning approach include mechanisms to solicit input from relevant internal and external stakeholders affected by the IT strategic plans?	Response/Evidence:
2. Does the IT organization communicate its IT plans to business process owners and other relevant parties across the organization?	Response/Evidence:
3. Does IT management communicate its activities, challenges and risks on a regular basis with the CEO and CFO? Is this information also shared with the board of directors?	Response/Evidence:
4. Does the IT organization monitor its progress against the strategic plan and react accordingly to meet established objectives?	Response/Evidence:
<i>IT Organization and Relationships</i>	
5. Do IT managers have adequate knowledge and experience to fulfill their responsibilities?	Response/Evidence:
6. Have key systems and data been inventoried and their owners identified?	Response/Evidence:
7. Are roles and responsibilities of the IT organization defined, documented and understood?	Response/Evidence:
8. Do IT personnel understand and accept their responsibility regarding internal control?	Response/Evidence:
9. Have data integrity ownership and responsibilities been communicated to appropriate data/business owners and have they accepted these responsibilities?	Response/Evidence:
10. Has IT management implemented a division of roles and responsibilities (segregation of duties) that reasonably prevents a single individual from subverting a critical process?	Response/Evidence:
<i>Management of Human Resources</i>	
11. Has the IT organization adopted and promoted the company's culture of integrity management, including ethics, business practices and human resources evaluations?	Response/Evidence:
<i>Educate and Train Users</i>	
12. Does IT management provide education and ongoing training programs that include ethical conduct, system security practices, confidentiality standards, integrity standards and security responsibilities of all staff?	Response/Evidence:

Information and Communication

COSO states that information is needed at all levels of an organization to run the business and achieve the company's control objectives. However, the identification, management and communication of relevant information represent an ever-increasing challenge to the IT department. The determination of this information is required to achieve control objectives, and the communication of this information in a form and time frame that allow people to carry out their duties, support the other four components of the COSO framework.

Figure 10—Information and Communication Considerations

Points to Consider	Response/Evidence
<i>Communication of Management Aims and Directions</i>	
13. Has IT management formulated, developed and documented policies and procedures governing the IT organization's activities?	Response/Evidence:
14. Has IT management communicated policies and procedures governing the IT organization's activities?	Response/Evidence:
15. Does IT management periodically review its policies, procedures and standards to reflect changing business conditions?	Response/Evidence:
16. Does IT management have a process in place to assess compliance with its policies, procedures and standards?	Response/Evidence:
17. Does IT management understand its roles and responsibilities related to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act?	Response/Evidence:

Risk Assessment

Risk assessment involves the identification and analysis by management of relevant risks to achieving predetermined objectives, which form the basis for determining control activities. It is likely that internal control risks could be more pervasive in the IT organization than in other areas of the company. Risk assessment may occur at the entity level (for the overall organization) or at the activity level (for a specific process or business unit).

Figure 11—Risk Assessment Considerations

Points to Consider	Response/Evidence
<i>Assessment of Risks</i>	
18. Does the IT organization have an entity- and activity-level risk assessment framework that is used periodically to assess information risk to achieving business objectives? Does it consider the probability and likelihood of threats?	Response/Evidence:
19. Does the IT organization's risk assessment framework measure the impact of risks according to qualitative and quantitative criteria, using inputs from different areas including, but not limited to, management brainstorming, strategic planning, past audits and other assessments?	Response/Evidence:
20. Where risks are considered acceptable, is there formal documentation and acceptance of residual risk with related offsets, including adequate insurance coverage, contractually negotiated liabilities and self-insurance?	Response/Evidence:
<i>Ensure Continuous Service</i>	
21. Has a business impact assessment been performed that considers the impact of systems failure on the financial reporting process?	Response/Evidence:

Monitoring

Monitoring, which covers the oversight of internal control by management through continuous and point-in-time assessment processes, is becoming increasingly important to IT management.

Figure 12—Monitoring Considerations	
Points to Consider	Response/Evidence
<i>Management of Quality</i>	
22. Is documentation created and maintained for significant IT processes, controls and activities?	Response/Evidence:
23. Does a quality plan exist for significant IT functions (e.g., system development and deployment) and does it provide a consistent approach to address both general and project-specific quality assurance activities?	Response/Evidence:
<i>Monitoring</i>	
24. Has IT management established appropriate metrics to effectively manage the day-to-day activities of the IT department?	Response/Evidence:
25. Does IT management monitor IT's delivery of services to identify shortfalls and does IT respond with actionable plans to improve?	Response/Evidence:
<i>Independent Assurance</i>	
26. Does IT management obtain independent reviews of its operations, including policies, procedures, overall IT systems and processes, and do they assess adherence to those policies and procedures?	Response/Evidence:
27. Does the organization have an IT internal audit that is responsible for reviewing IT activities and controls, including general and application controls?	Response/Evidence:

Activity-level IT Controls

Providing information to enable management's reporting to regulators, investors and stakeholders is a life cycle of collecting complete and accurate information and reporting it on a timely basis. As one might expect, this life cycle is highly dependent on information systems, such as applications, databases and other tools used to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of data processing.

Figure 2 illustrates the interrelationships of technologies that are used to provide information to management and applications that operate at the business process layer providing critical information for making business decisions. This topic is discussed more in appendix C. However, the reliability of business applications is dependent on the effective operation of IT controls, specifically those related to program development, program change, access to programs and data, and computer operations.

The balance of appendix B is dedicated to providing guidance on IT controls that are specifically designed to support financial reporting objectives. As noted earlier, these controls are not intended to be an exhaustive list nor are they completely representative of what may be considered by the external auditor. However, they do provide a starting point as companies determine which IT controls are necessary for their environment. Consideration should also be given to IT controls that may not be included in the following tables, but are relevant nonetheless.

In the following tables, certain illustrative controls are highlighted with a key () indicating that the control is a key control. Key internal controls applicable to financial statement assertions can be defined to include activities that prevent or detect and correct a significant misstatement in the financial reporting or other required disclosures, including those over recording amounts into the general ledger and recording journal entries (standard, nonstandard, and consolidation). Relevant controls may be manual or automated, and preventive or detective in nature. This definition has been applied to the controls in **figures 13 to 25** to identify those that are commonly required to comply with Sarbanes-Oxley.

As noted previously, this guidance is not intended to be authoritative. Professional judgment, as always, needs to be applied when determining the necessary controls that should be included in the compliance program, including some which may not be flagged as key controls in this document.

Figure 13—Acquire or Develop Application Software

Control Guidance	
Control Objective —Controls provide reasonable assurance that application and system software is acquired or developed that effectively supports financial reporting requirements.	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
The organization has a system development life cycle (SDLC) methodology, which includes security, availability and processing integrity requirements of the organization. 	Obtain a copy of the organization's SDLC methodology. Review the methodology to determine that it addresses security, availability and processing integrity requirements. Consider whether there are appropriate steps to determine if these requirements are considered throughout the development or acquisition life cycle, e.g., security and availability and processing integrity should be considered during the requirements phase.
The organization's SDLC policies and procedures consider the development and acquisition of new systems and major changes to existing systems.	Review the organization's SDLC methodology to determine if it considers both the development and acquisition of new systems and major changes to existing systems.
The SDLC methodology includes requirements that information systems be designed to include application controls that support complete, accurate, authorized and valid transaction processing. 	Review the SDLC methodology to determine if it addresses application controls. Consider whether there are appropriate steps so that application controls are considered throughout the development or acquisition life cycle, e.g., application controls should be included in the conceptual design and detailed design phases.
The organization has an acquisition and planning process that aligns with its overall strategic direction.	Review the SDLC methodology to determine if the organization's overall strategic direction is considered, e.g., an IT steering committee must review and approve projects so that a proposed project aligns with strategic business requirements and will utilize approved technologies.
IT management involves users in the design of applications, selection of packaged software and the testing thereof, to maintain a reliable environment. 	Review the SDLC methodology to determine if users are appropriately involved in the design of applications, selection of packaged software and testing.
postimplementation reviews are performed to verify that controls are operating effectively.	Determine if postimplementation reviews are performed on new systems and significant changes reported.
The organization acquires/develops systems software in accordance with its acquisition, development and planning process. 	Select a sample of projects that resulted in new financial systems being implemented. Review the documentation and deliverables from these projects to determine if they have been completed in accordance with the acquisition, development and planning process.

Figure 14—Acquire Technology Infrastructure**Control Guidance**

Control Objective—Controls provide reasonable assurance that technology infrastructure is acquired so that it provides the appropriate platforms to support financial reporting applications.

Rationale—The process of acquiring and maintaining technology infrastructure includes the design, acquisition/building and deployment of systems that support applications and communications. Infrastructure components, including servers, networks and databases, are critical for secure and reliable information processing. Without an adequate infrastructure, there is an increased risk that financial reporting applications will not be able to pass data between applications, financial reporting applications will not operate, and critical infrastructure failures will not be detected in a timely manner.

Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
Documented procedures exist and are followed so that infrastructure systems, including network devices and software, are acquired based on the requirements of the financial applications they are intended to support.	Select a sample of technology infrastructure implementations. Review the documentation and deliverables from these projects to determine if infrastructure requirements were considered at the appropriate time during the acquisition process.

Figure 15—Develop and Maintain Policies and Procedures**Control Guidance**

Control Objective—Controls provide reasonable assurance that policies and procedures that define required acquisition and maintenance processes have been developed and are maintained, and that they define the documentation needed to support the proper use of the applications and the technological solutions put in place.

Rationale—Policies and procedures include the SDLC methodology and the process for acquiring, developing and maintaining applications as well as required documentation. For some organizations, the policies and procedures include service level agreements, operational practices and training materials. Policies and procedures support an organization's commitment to perform business process activities in a consistent and objective manner.

Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
The organization has policies and procedures regarding program development, program change, access to programs and data, and computer operations, which are periodically reviewed, updated and approved by management. 	Confirm that the organization has policies and procedures that are reviewed and updated regularly for changes in the business. When policies and procedures are changed, determine if management approves such changes.
The organization develops its systems and applications in accordance with its supported, documented policies and procedures. 	Select a sample of projects and determine that user reference and support manuals, systems documentation and operations documentation were prepared. Consider whether drafts of these manuals were incorporated in user acceptance testing. Determine whether any changes to proposed controls resulted in documentation updates.
	Obtain the policies and procedures and determine if the organization operates its IT environment in accordance with them.

Figure 16—Install and Test Application Software and Technology Infrastructure Control Guidance	
Control Objective —Controls provide reasonable assurance that the systems are appropriately tested and validated prior to being placed into production processes, and associated controls operate as intended and support financial reporting requirements.	
Rationale —Installation testing and validating relate to the migration of new systems into production. Before such systems are installed, appropriate testing and validation must be performed to determine if that systems are operating as designed. Without adequate testing, systems may not function as intended and may provide invalid information, which could result in unreliable financial information and reports.	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
A testing strategy is developed and followed for all significant changes in applications and infrastructure technology, which addresses unit, system, integration and user-acceptance-level testing so that deployed systems operate as intended. 	Select a sample of system development projects and significant system upgrades (including technology upgrades). Determine if a formal testing strategy was prepared and followed. Consider whether this strategy considered potential development and implementation risks and addressed all the necessary components to address these risks, e.g., if the completeness and accuracy of system interfaces were essential to the production of complete and accurate reporting, these interfaces were included in the testing strategy. (Note: Controls over the final move to production are addressed in figure 17 .)
Load and stress testing is performed according to a test plan and established testing standards.	Select a sample of system development projects and system upgrades that are significant for financial reporting. Where it was considered that capacity and performance were of potential concern, review the approach to load and stress testing. Consider whether a structured approach was taken to load and stress testing and the approach taken adequately modeled the anticipated volumes, including types of transactions being processed and the impact on performance of other services that would be running concurrently.
Interfaces with other systems are tested to confirm that data transmissions are complete, accurate and valid. 	Select a sample of system development projects and system upgrades that are significant for financial reporting. Determine if interfaces with other systems were tested to confirm that data transmissions are complete, e.g., record totals are accurate and valid. Consider whether the extent of testing was sufficient and included recovery in the event of incomplete data transmissions.

Figure 16—Install and Test Application Software and Technology Infrastructure (cont.)

Control Guidance	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
<p>The conversion of data is tested between its origin and its destination to confirm that it is complete, accurate and valid.</p> 	<p>Obtain a sample of system development projects and system upgrades that are significant for financial reporting.</p> <p>Determine if a conversion strategy was documented. Consider whether it included strategies to “scrub” the data in the old system before conversion or to “run down” data in the old system before conversion.</p> <p>Review the conversion testing plan.</p> <p>Consider whether the following were considered: data transformations, input of data not available in the old system, edits, completeness controls and timing of conversions. Determine if the conversion was included in acceptance testing and was approved by user management.</p>

Figure 17—Manage Changes

Control Guidance	
Control Objective	Rationale
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
<p>Control Objective—Controls provide reasonable assurance that system changes of financial reporting significance are authorized and appropriately tested before being moved to production.</p> <p>Rationale—Managing changes addresses how an organization modifies system functionality to help the business meet its financial reporting objectives. Deficiencies in this area could significantly impact financial reporting. For instance, changes to the programs that allocate financial data to accounts require appropriate approvals and testing prior to the change so that proper classification and reporting integrity is maintained.</p> 	<p>Requests for program changes, system changes and maintenance (including changes to system software) are standardized, logged, approved, documented and subject to formal change management procedures.</p> <p>Determine that a documented change management process exists and is maintained to reflect the current process.</p> <p>Consider if change management procedures exist for all changes to the production environment, including program changes, system maintenance and infrastructure changes.</p> <p>Evaluate the process used to control and monitor change requests.</p> <p>Consider whether change requests are properly initiated, approved and tracked.</p> <p>Determine whether program change is performed in a segregated, controlled environment.</p>

Figure 17—Manage Changes (*cont.*)

Control Guidance	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
	<p>Select a sample of changes made to applications/systems to determine whether they were adequately tested and approved before being placed into a production environment. Establish if the following are included in the approval process: operations, security, IT infrastructure management and IT management.</p> <p>Evaluate procedures designed to determine that only authorized/approved changes are moved into production.</p> <p>Trace the sample of changes back to the change request log and supporting documentation.</p> <p>Confirm that these procedures address the timely implementation of patches to system software. Select a sample to determine compliance with the documented procedures.</p>
<p>Emergency change requests are documented and subject to formal change management procedures.</p> 	<p>Determine if a process exists to control and supervise emergency changes.</p> <p>Determine if an audit trail exists of all emergency activity and verify that it is independently reviewed.</p> <p>Determine that procedures require emergency changes to be supported by appropriate documentation.</p> <p>Establish that backout procedures are developed for emergency changes.</p> <p>Evaluate procedures ensuring that all emergency changes are tested and subject to standard approval procedures after they have been made. Review a sample of changes that are recorded as “emergency” changes, and determine if they contain the needed approval and the needed access was terminated after a set period of time. Establish that the sample of changes was well documented.</p>

Figure 17—Manage Changes (cont.)

Control Guidance	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
Controls are in place to restrict migration of programs to production by authorized individuals only. 	Evaluate the approvals required before a program is moved to production. Consider approvals from system owners, development staff and computer operations. Confirm that there is appropriate segregation of duties between the staff responsible for moving a program into production and development staff. Obtain and test evidence to support this assertion.
IT management implements system software that does not jeopardize the security of the data and programs being stored on the system.	Determine that a risk assessment of the potential impact of changes to system software is performed. Review procedures to test changes to system software in a development environment before they are applied to production. Verify that backout procedures exist.

Figure 18—Define and Manage Service Levels**Control Guidance**

Control Objective—Controls provide reasonable assurance that service levels are defined and managed in a manner that satisfies financial reporting system requirements and provides a common understanding of performance levels by which the quality of services will be measured.

Rationale—The process of defining and managing service levels addresses how an organization meets the functional and operational expectations of its users and, ultimately, the objectives of the business. Roles and responsibilities are defined and an accountability and measurement model is used to determine if services are delivered as required. Deficiencies in this area could significantly impact financial reporting and disclosure of an entity. For instance, if systems are poorly managed or system functionality is not delivered as required, financial information may not be processed as intended.

Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
Service levels are defined and managed to support financial reporting system requirements.	Obtain a sample of service level agreements and review their content for clear definition of service descriptions and expectations of users. Discuss with members of the organization responsible for service level management and test evidence to determine whether service levels are actively managed.
	Obtain and test evidence that service levels are being actively managed in accordance with service level agreements.
	Discuss with users whether financial reporting systems are being supported and delivered in accordance with their expectations and service level agreements.

Figure 18—Define and Manage Service Levels (*cont.*)

Control Guidance	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
A framework is defined to establish key performance indicators to manage service-level agreements, both internally and externally.	Obtain service-level performance reports and confirm that they include key performance indicators. Review the performance results, identify performance issues and assess how service-level managers are addressing these issues.

Figure 19—Manage Third-party Services

Control Guidance	
Control Objective —Controls provide reasonable assurance that third-party services are secure, accurate and available; support processing integrity; and are defined appropriately in performance contracts.	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
A designated individual is responsible for regular monitoring and reporting on the achievement of the third-party service-level performance criteria.	Determine if the management of third-party services has been assigned to appropriate individuals.
Selection of vendors for outsourced services is performed in accordance with the organization's vendor management policy.	Obtain the organization's vendor management policy and discuss with those responsible for third-party service management if they follow such standards. Obtain and test evidence that the selection of vendors for outsourced services is performed in accordance with the organization's vendor management policy.
IT management determines that, before selection, potential third parties are properly qualified through an assessment of their capability to deliver the required service and a review of their financial viability.	Obtain the criteria and business case used for selection of third-party service providers. Assess whether these criteria include a consideration of the third party's financial stability, skill and knowledge of the systems under management, and controls over security, availability and processing integrity.
Third-party service contracts address the risks, security controls and procedures for information systems and networks in the contract between the parties.	Select a sample of third-party service contracts and determine if they include controls to support security, availability and processing integrity in accordance with the company's policies and procedures.

Figure 19—Manage Third-party Services (cont.)

Control Guidance	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
Procedures exist and are followed that include requirements that a formal contract be defined and agreed upon for third-party services before work is initiated, including definition of internal control requirements and acceptance of the organization's policies and procedures.	<p>Review a sample of contracts and determine whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a definition of services to be performed • The responsibilities for the controls over financial reporting systems have been adequately defined • The third party has accepted compliance with the organization's policies and procedures, e.g., security policies and procedures • The contracts were reviewed and signed by appropriate parties before work commenced • The controls over financial reporting systems and subsystems described in the contract agree with those required by the organization <p>Review gaps, if any, and consider further analysis to determine the impact on financial reporting.</p>
A regular review of security, availability and processing integrity is performed by third-party service providers (e.g., SAS 70, Canadian 5970). 	<p>Inquire whether third-party service providers perform independent reviews of security, availability and processing integrity, e.g., service auditor report. Obtain a sample of the most recent review and determine if there are any control deficiencies that would impact financial reporting.</p>

Figure 20—Ensure Systems Security

Control Guidance	
Control Objective	Rationale
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
Control Objective —Controls provide reasonable assurance that financial reporting systems and subsystems are appropriately secured to prevent unauthorized use, disclosure, modification, damage or loss of data.	Rationale —Managing systems security includes both physical and logical controls that prevent unauthorized access. These controls typically support authorization, authentication, nonrepudiation, data classification and security monitoring. Deficiencies in this area could significantly impact financial reporting. For instance, insufficient controls over transaction authorization may result in inaccurate financial reporting.
An information security policy exists and has been approved by an appropriate level of executive management. 	<p>Obtain a copy of the organization's security policy and evaluate the effectiveness. Points to be taken into consideration include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an overall statement of the importance of security to the organization?

Figure 20—Ensure Systems Security (cont.)

Control Guidance	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have specific policy objectives been defined? • Have employee and contractor security responsibilities been addressed? • Has the policy been approved by an appropriate level of senior management to demonstrate management's commitment to security? • Is there a process to communicate the policy to all levels of management and employees?
A framework of security standards has been developed that supports the objectives of the security policy.	<p>Obtain a copy of the security standards. Determine whether the standards framework effectively meets the objectives of the security policy. Consider whether the following topics, which are often addressed by security standards, have been appropriately covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security organization • Asset classification and control • Personnel security • Software security policy • Physical and environmental security • Workstation security • Computing environment management • Network environment management • System access control • Business continuity planning • Compliance • System development and maintenance <p>Determine if there are processes in place to communicate and maintain these standards.</p>
An IT security plan exists that is aligned with overall IT strategic plans.	Obtain a copy of security plans or strategies for financial reporting systems and subsystems and assess their adequacy in relation to the overall company plan.
The IT security plan is updated to reflect changes in the IT environment as well as security requirements of specific systems.	Confirm that the security plan reflects the unique security requirements of financial reporting systems and subsystems.
Procedures exist and are followed to authenticate all users of the system to support the validity of transactions. 	Assess the authentication mechanisms used to validate user credentials for financial reporting systems and subsystems and validate that user sessions time-out after a predetermined period of time.

Figure 20—Ensure Systems Security (cont.)

Control Guidance	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
Procedures exist and are followed to maintain the effectiveness of authentication and access mechanisms (e.g., regular password changes). 	Review security practices to confirm that authentication controls (passwords, IDs, two-factor, etc.) are used appropriately and are subject to common confidentiality requirements (IDs and passwords not shared, alphanumeric passwords used, etc.).
Procedures exist and are followed relating to timely action to requesting, establishing, issuing, suspending and closing user accounts. 	Confirm that procedures for the registration, change and deletion of users from financial reporting systems and subsystems on a timely basis exist and are followed. Validate that attempts to gain unauthorized access to financial reporting systems and subsystems are logged and followed up on a timely basis. Select a sample of new users and determine if management approved their access and the access granted agrees with the access privileges that were approved.
A control process exists and is followed to periodically review and confirm access rights. 	Select a sample of terminated employees and determine if their access has been removed, and the removal was done in a timely manner. Select a sample of current users and review their access for appropriateness based upon their job functions.
Where appropriate, controls exist so that neither party can deny transactions, and controls are implemented to provide nonrepudiation of origin or receipt, proof of submission, and receipt of transactions.	Inquire whether access controls are reviewed for financial reporting systems and subsystems on a periodic basis by management. Assess the adequacy of how exceptions are reexamined, and if the follow-up occurs in a timely manner.
	Determine how the organization establishes accountability for transaction initiation and approval. Test the use of accountability controls by observing a user attempting to enter an unauthorized transaction. Obtain a sample of transactions, and identify evidence of the accountability or origination of each.

Figure 20—Ensure Systems Security (cont.)

Control Guidance	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
Where network connectivity is used, appropriate controls, including firewalls, intrusion detection and vulnerability assessments, exist and are used to prevent unauthorized access.	<p>Determine the sufficiency and appropriateness of perimeter security controls, including firewalls and intrusion detection systems.</p> <p>Inquire whether management has performed an independent assessment of controls within the past year (e.g., ethical hacking, social engineering).</p> <p>Obtain a copy of this assessment and review the results, including the appropriateness of follow-up on identified weaknesses.</p> <p>Determine if antivirus systems are used to protect the integrity and security of financial reporting systems and subsystems.</p> <p>When appropriate, determine if encryption techniques are used to support the confidentiality of financial information sent from one system to another.</p>
IT security administration monitors and logs security activity at the application and database, and identified security violations are reported to senior management. 	<p>Inquire whether a security office exists to monitor for security vulnerabilities at the application and database levels, and related threat events.</p> <p>Assess the nature and extent of such events over the past year and discuss with management how they have responded with controls to prevent unauthorized access or manipulation of financial systems and subsystems.</p>
Controls relating to appropriate segregation of duties over requesting and granting access to systems and data exist and are followed. 	<p>Review the process to request and grant access to systems and data and confirm that the same person does not perform these functions.</p>
Access to facilities is restricted to authorized personnel and requires appropriate identification and authentication.	<p>Obtain policies and procedures as they relate to facility security, key and card reader access, and determine if those procedures account for proper identification and authentication.</p> <p>Observe the in-and-out traffic to the organization's facilities to establish that proper access is controlled.</p> <p>Select a sample of users and determine if their access is appropriate based upon their job responsibilities.</p>

Figure 21—Manage the Configuration	
Control Guidance	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
Only authorized software is permitted for use by employees using company IT assets.	<p>Determine if procedures are in place to detect and prevent the use of unauthorized software. Obtain and review the company policy as it relates to software use to see that this is clearly articulated.</p> <p>Consider reviewing a sample of applications and computers to determine if they are in conformance with organization policy.</p>
System infrastructure, including firewalls, routers, switches, network operating systems, servers and other related devices, is properly configured to prevent unauthorized access.	<p>Determine if the organization's policies require the documentation of the current configuration, as well as the security configuration settings to be implemented.</p> <p>Review a sample of servers, firewalls, routers, etc., to consider if they have been configured in accordance with the organization's policy.</p>
<p>Application software and data storage systems are properly configured to provision access based on the individual's demonstrated need to view, add, change or delete data.</p> 	<p>Conduct an evaluation of the frequency and timeliness of management's review of configuration records.</p> <p>Assess whether management has documented the configuration management procedures.</p> <p>Review a sample of configuration changes, additions or deletions, to consider if they have been properly approved based on a demonstrated need.</p>
IT management has established procedures across the organization to protect information systems and technology from computer viruses.	<p>Review the organization's procedures to detect computer viruses.</p> <p>Verify that the organization has installed and is using virus software on its networks and personal computers.</p>
Periodic testing and assessment is performed to confirm that the software and network infrastructure is appropriately configured.	<p>Review the software and network infrastructure to establish that it has been appropriately configured and maintained, according to the organization's documented process.</p>

Figure 22—Manage Problems and Incidents**Control Guidance**

Control Objective—Controls provide reasonable assurance that any problems and/or incidents are properly responded to, recorded, resolved or investigated for proper resolution.

Rationale—The process of managing problems and incidents addresses how an organization identifies, documents and responds to events that fall outside of normal operations. Deficiencies in this area could significantly impact financial reporting.

Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
IT management has defined and implemented a problem management system such that data integrity and access control issues are recorded, analyzed, resolved in a timely manner and reported to management. 	Determine if a problem management system exists and how it is being used. Review how management has documented how the system is to be used. Review a sample of problem or incident reports, to consider if the issues were addressed (recorded, analyzed and resolved) in a timely manner.
The problem management system provides for adequate audit trail facilities, which allow tracing from incident to underlying cause.	Determine if the organization's procedures include audit trail facilities—tracking of the incidents. Review a sample of problems recorded on the problem management system to consider whether a proper audit trail exists and is used.
A security incident response process exists to support timely response and investigation of unauthorized activities.	Verify that unauthorized activities are responded to in a timely fashion and that there is a process to support proper disposition.

Figure 23—Manage Data**Control Guidance**

Control Objective—Controls provide reasonable assurance that data recorded, processed and reported remain complete, accurate and valid throughout the update and storage process.

Rationale—Managing data include the controls and procedures used to support information integrity, including its completeness, accuracy, authorization and validity. Controls are designed to support initiating, recording, processing and reporting financial information. Deficiencies in this area could significantly impact financial reporting. For instance, without appropriate authorization controls over the initiation of transactions, resulting financial information may not be reliable.

Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
Policies and procedures exist for the distribution and retention of data and reporting output.	<p>Review the policies and procedures for the distribution and retention of data and reporting output. Determine whether the policies and procedures are adequate for the protection of data and the timely distribution of the correct financial reports (including electronic reports) to appropriate personnel.</p> <p>Obtain and test evidence that the controls over the protection of data and the timely distribution of financial reports (including electronic reports) to appropriate personnel are operating effectively.</p>
Management protects sensitive information—logically and physically, in storage and during transmission—against unauthorized access or modification.	<p>Review the results of security testing. Determine if there are adequate controls to protect sensitive information—logically and physically, in storage and during transmission—against unauthorized access or modification.</p>
Retention periods and storage terms are defined for documents, data, programs, reports and messages (incoming and outgoing), as well as the data (keys, certificates) used for their encryption and authentication.	<p>Obtain the procedures dealing with distribution and retention of data.</p> <p>Confirm that the procedures define the retention periods and storage terms for documents, data, programs, reports and messages (incoming and outgoing), as well as the data (keys, certificates) used for their encryption and authentication.</p> <p>Confirm that the retention periods are in conformity with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act.</p> <p>Confirm that the retention periods of previously archived material are in conformity with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. Select a sample of archived material and test evidence that archived material is being archived in conformance with the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act.</p>

Figure 23—Manage Data (*cont.*)

Control Guidance	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
Management has implemented a strategy for cyclical backup of data and programs. 	Determine if the organization has procedures in place to back up data and programs based on IT and user requirements. Select a sample of data files and programs and determine if they are being backed up as required.
The restoration of backup media is periodically tested. 	Inquire whether the retention and storage of messages, documents, programs, etc., have been tested during the past year. Obtain and review the results of testing activities. Establish whether any deficiencies were noted and whether they have been reexamined. Obtain the organization's access security policy and discuss with those responsible whether they follow such standards and guidelines dealing with sensitive backup data.
Changes to data structures are authorized, made in accordance with design specifications and implemented in a timely manner.	Obtain a sample of data structure changes and determine whether they adhere to the design specifications and were implemented in the time frame required.

Figure 24—Manage Operations	
Control Guidance	
Control Objective —Controls provide reasonable assurance that authorized programs are executed as planned and deviations from scheduled processing are identified and investigated, including controls over job scheduling, processing, error monitoring and system availability.	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
Management has established, documented and followed standard procedures for IT operations, including job scheduling and monitoring and responding to security, availability and processing integrity events. 	Determine if management has documented its procedures for IT operations, and operations are reviewed periodically for compliance. Review a sample of events to confirm that response procedures are operating effectively. When used, review the job scheduling process and the procedures in place to monitor job completeness.
System event data are sufficiently retained to provide chronological information and logs to enable the review, examination, and reconstruction of system and data processing.	Determine if sufficient chronological information is being recorded and stored in logs, and it is usable for reconstruction, if necessary. Obtain a sample of the log entries, to determine if they sufficiently allow for reconstruction.
System event data are designed to provide reasonable assurance as to the completeness and timeliness of system and data processing.	Inquire as to the type of information that is used by management to determine the completeness and timeliness of system and data processing. Review a sample of system processing event data to confirm the completeness and timeliness of processing.

Figure 25—End-user Computing**Control Guidance**

The following illustrative controls for end-user computing have been extracted from the control guidance in figures 24 to 30 and are presented to address the characteristics of a typical end-user computing environment.

Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
End-user computing policies and procedures concerning security, availability and processing integrity exist and are followed. 	Obtain a copy of the end-user computing policies and procedures and confirm that they address security, availability and processing integrity controls. Select a sample of users and inquire whether they are aware of this policy and if they are in compliance with it.
End-user computing, including spreadsheets and other user-developed programs, are documented and regularly reviewed for processing integrity, including their ability to sort, summarize and report accurately. 	Inquire as to management's knowledge of end-user programs in use across the company. Inquire as to the frequency and approaches followed to review end-user programs for processing integrity, and review a sample of these to confirm effectiveness. Review user-developed systems and test their ability to sort, summarize and report in accordance with management intentions.
User-developed systems and data are regularly backed up and stored in a secure area. 	Inquire how end-user systems are backed up and where they are stored.
User-developed systems, such as spreadsheets and other end-user programs, are secured from unauthorized use. 	Review the security used to protect unauthorized access to user-developed systems. Consider observing a user attempting to gain unauthorized access to user-developed systems. Inquire how management is able to detect unauthorized access and what follow-up procedures are performed to assess the impact of such access. Select a sample of user-developed systems and determine who has access and if the access is appropriate.

Figure 25—End-user Computing (*cont.*)

Control Guidance	
Illustrative Controls	Illustrative Tests of Controls
Inputs, processing and outputs from user-developed systems are independently verified for completeness and accuracy. 	Inquire how management verifies the accuracy and completeness of information processed and reported from user-developed systems. Inquire who reviews and approves outputs from user-developed systems prior to their submission for further processing or final reporting. Consider reperforming or reviewing the logic used in user-developed systems and conclude on its ability to process completely and accurately.

Appendix C—Application Controls

The Importance of Application Controls

In the realm of complex IT-dependent financial reporting environments, many organizations still have not focused enough attention on application controls when performing their certification work. The PCAOB has highlighted the importance of this area and organizations that do not properly consider these controls may be at risk of failing Sarbanes-Oxley compliance.

Very frequently, organizations assume that their financial reporting systems are reliable because they have never experienced a problem with them or they believe that testing at some point in the past is sufficiently reliable. In other instances, organizations take a “black box” approach and place all their reliance on manual controls, failing to consider the risks that exist within the system. The challenge in each instance is that undue reliance is being placed on the system—companies are relying on their systems without understanding how they support financial reporting objectives. This can be a significant oversight that could lead to a material weakness in internal control.

In response, many organizations are starting to review their key applications to understand how they support the financial reporting process. In doing so, they are developing application integrity documentation through a process called “baselining” or benchmarking.

Defining Application Controls

At the business process level, controls are applied to specific business activities to achieve financial objectives. Most business processes are automated and integrated with IT application systems, resulting in many of the controls at this level being automated as well. These controls are known as automated application controls.

Automated application controls apply only to the business processes they support. They are controls designed within the application to prevent or detect unauthorized transactions and support financial objectives including completeness, accuracy, authorization and validity of transactions. Before starting the identification and documentation of controls, careful consideration should be given to the type of controls that should be used.

In making the decision on which controls should be documented, it is important to understand the characteristics of each. Generally speaking, there are three types of controls:

- Manual controls—Performed without the assistance of applications or any other technology systems. Examples include supervisory controls; written authorizations, such as a signature on a check; or manual tasks, such as

reconciling purchase orders to good receipts statements. Manual controls are subject to the inherent risk of human error and, as a result, are often considered less reliable.

- Automated controls—Performed by computers and binary in nature, they always function as designed and are not subject to intermittent error. Examples include input edit checks that validate order quantities or configure controls in automated purchasing systems that only allow an order only up to a preconfigured limit. Examples include:
 - Balancing control activities—Controls that detect data entry errors by reconciling amounts captured either manually or automatically to a control total. For example, a company automatically balances the total number of transactions processed and passed from its online order entry system to the number of transactions received in its billing system.
 - Check digits—A calculation to validate data. For example, a company's part numbers contain a check digit to detect and correct inaccurate ordering from its suppliers. Universal product codes include a check digit to verify the product and the vendor.
 - Predefined data listings—Controls that provide the user with predefined lists of acceptable data. For example, a company's intranet site might include drop-down lists of products available for purchase.
 - Data reasonableness tests—Tests that compare data captured to a present or learned pattern of reasonableness. For example, an order to a supplier by a home renovation retail store for an unusually large number of feet of lumber may trigger a review.
 - Logic tests—Tests that include the use of range limits or value/phanumeric tests. For example, credit card numbers have a predefined format.
- IT-dependent manual controls (hybrid)—Essentially a combination of manual and automated controls. For instance, some bank reconciliations require that a report of all outstanding checks be obtained from the financial application and then reconciled manually. In this case, the manual control (reconciliation) and the automated control (report of all outstanding checks) need to work together to conclude that the bank reconciliation process is operating effectively.

The Business Case for Application Controls

There are advantages and disadvantages to manual and automated control activities. In some cases, it is easier to document and gather evidence for manual control activities in small companies of low complexity. However, documenting manual controls can become a very expensive endeavor in large companies of high complexity. For large and complex companies, the effort associated with documenting and testing automated controls is much more appealing in the long term as controls need to be tested only once, whereas manual controls need to be tested based on the frequency of their operation.

It is important to note that while the sample size for manual controls varies with the frequency of performance, the sample size for automated controls does not. This can add up to a very significant savings for companies.


Consider the example of company XYZ. XYZ is large and complex and estimates that it will have approximately 500 controls in its Sarbanes-Oxley compliance program. It is considering whether to document manual or automated controls. The tables in **figure 26** were prepared to assist in their analysis.

Figure 26—Comparison of Manual and Application Control Approaches

Manual Control Approach		Automated Control Approach	
Total controls	500	Total controls	500
Effort to document per control	1 hour	Effort to document per control	3 hours
Total effort to document	500 hours	Total effort to document	1,500 hours
Average sample size per control	10	Average sample size per control	1
Total sample items to test	5,000	Total sample items to test	500
Effort to test per sample	30 minutes	Effort to test per sample	30 minutes
Total effort to test	2,500 hours	Total effort to test	250 hours
Total effort	3,000 hours	Total effort	1,750 hours

A few observations should be noted in this example. First, it shows that the initial effort to document manual controls is less than that required for automated controls. This is due primarily to the complexity of IT systems and the requirement to understand how the application works. Second, the effort required for testing manual controls is greater than that required for automated controls. This is due to the fact that automated controls operate as designed and need to be tested only once provided that the general IT controls are reliable (program development, program change, access to programs and data, and computer operations).

However, if “sustained compliance” is considered over a period of five years, the impact is much more significant. In this example, savings in year one amounts to 1,250 hours, but in year two and thereafter, when the company needs only to retest its controls, this savings increases to 2,250 hours annually. Therefore, after five years of compliance, a company could save 10,250 hours of effort if they selected to document and test automated controls. **Figure 27** illustrates how size and complexity of a company impact the effort and, therefore, cost of documenting and testing manual vs. automated controls.



When one considers that automated controls are generally more reliable, the benefits of taking this approach are very compelling.

Establishing the Application Baseline

Application baselining involves documenting and testing the key controls embedded within financial applications that support the financial statements to confirm their design and operating effectiveness. Once these controls have been identified and tested, they qualify for baselining, which essentially allows for a reduction in the frequency of testing as long as certain conditions are met as described in the following paragraphs.

While there are additional costs required to establish an application baseline (such as understanding how the application works and documenting the relevant controls over its processing), the benefits can be very compelling.

As noted above, the reduction of testing effort alone provides a solid business case. However, there are other benefits, including:

- Further reduction of testing since applications controls qualify for rotational testing typically over three years, under certain conditions described in the next paragraph.
- Improved reliance since application controls are typically preventive and more reliable than manual controls. They often serve as dual-purpose controls since they not only support a financial control objective, but many also support antifraud objectives as well.

Application baselining was addressed by the PCAOB in its November 2004 guidance stating that baselining is an acceptable practice as long as certain conditions are met, specifically that:

- The relevant segments of the application that support the application controls are identified (for instance, the accounts payable module that supports automated aging of accounts or the inventory module that supports complete and accurate listing of inventory balances.)
- The relevant application are appropriately designed
- The relevant application controls have not changed during the year
- The most recent test of the application controls confirms their operating effectiveness
- The relevant supporting IT general controls, particularly access controls and change controls supporting the application, are appropriately designed and operating effectively

Examples of Application Controls Provided by Software Packages

To assist companies in applying an automated control approach, examples of automated controls are provided in **figures 28 to 35**. For the most part, these controls can be enabled through the use of built-in application control functionality. This functionality is commonly found in integrated ERP environments, such as SAP, PeopleSoft, Oracle, JD Edwards and others. Where this functionality does not exist, these control objectives may require a combination of manual and automated control procedures to satisfy the control objective.

The control objectives presented in **figures 28 to 35** should not be considered an exhaustive list, but rather an example of controls that are commonly enabled by application systems. Organizations should consider what additional control objectives are required based on their particular industry and operating environment.

Figures 28 to 35 refer to controls that extend into applications and business processes that contribute to completeness, accuracy, validity, valuation and authorization controls.

Figure 28—Application Control Objectives for the Financial Statement Close Cycle

Illustrative Control Objectives	Financial Assertions
Entries booked in the close process are complete and accurate.	Completeness Validity
Automated amortization timing, periods and methods are appropriate and accurately entered.	Valuation Validity
Variance reports are generated for use to identify posting errors/out-of-balance conditions.	Completeness Validity Valuation Occurrence
Standard, recurring period-end journal entries submitted from subsidiary ledger systems are automated, appropriately approved and entered accurately.	Completeness Validity Valuation Occurrence
Systems generate reports of all recurring and nonrecurring journal entries.	Completeness Validity
All nonstandard journal entries are tracked and are appropriate.	Completeness Validity
Account codes and transaction amounts are accurate and complete, with exceptions reported.	Completeness Validity
General ledger balances reconcile to subledger balances.	Completeness Validity
Recorded amounts undergo an automated comparison to predicted amounts.	Completeness Validity
Out-of-balance entries are prohibited.	Completeness Validity
Enterprisewide consolidation, including standard intercompany eliminations, is automated/Performed using a third-party software product.	Completeness Validity Valuation Occurrence
System functionality supports the segregation of the posting and approval functions.	Validity
Access to general ledger records is appropriate and authorized.	Completeness Validity Valuation Occurrence
Transactions cannot be recorded outside of financial close cutoff requirements.	Completeness Validity Valuation Occurrence
Annually approved recurring accruals are accurately booked in the appropriate periods.	Completeness Validity Valuation Occurrence
System controls are in place for appropriate approval of write-offs.	Validity
Interrelated balance sheets and income statement accounts undergo automated reconciliation.	Completeness Validity

Figure 28—Application Control Objectives for the Financial Statement Close Cycle (cont.)

Illustrative Control Objectives	Financial Assertions
The sources of all entries are readily identifiable.	Validity
Transactions are either rejected or accepted and identified on exception reports in the event of data exceptions.	Completeness Validity
Account mappings are up to date.	Validity

Figure 29—Application Control Objectives for the General Ledger

Illustrative Control Objectives	Financial Assertions
Access to general ledger entries is appropriate and authorized.	Completeness Validity Valuation Occurrence
General ledger balances reconcile to subledger balances and such reconciliations are reviewed for accuracy and approved by supervisory personnel.	Completeness Validity
Interrelated balance sheets and income statement accounts undergo automated reconciliations to confirm accuracy of such accounts.	Completeness Validity
Systems generate reports of all recurring and nonrecurring journal entries for review by management for accuracy.	Completeness Validity
System functionality exists to segregate the posting and approval functions.	Validity
All nonstandard journal entries are tracked and are appropriate.	Completeness Validity
Account codes and transaction amounts are accurate and complete, with exceptions reported.	Completeness Validity
Recorded amounts undergo automated comparison to predicted amounts to confirm accuracy of entries.	Completeness Validity
Out-of-balance entries are prohibited.	Completeness Validity
Enterprisewide consolidation, including standard intercompany eliminations, is automated/Performed.	Completeness Validity Valuation Occurrence
Variance reports are generated for use to identify posting errors/out-of-balance conditions.	Completeness Validity Valuation Occurrence
System controls are in place for appropriate approval of write-offs.	Validity

Figure 29—Application Control Objectives for the General Ledger (*cont.*)

Illustrative Control Objectives	Financial Assertions
Journal entries of exceptional amount that were posted to the general ledger during the month are flagged by the system and subsequently reviewed for accuracy and approved by the controller or CFO after month-end.	Completeness Validity Valuation Occurrence
A report of all journal entries completed as part of the closing process is reviewed by management to confirm the completeness and appropriateness of all recorded entries.	Completeness Validity
General ledger master file change reports are generated by the system and reviewed as necessary by an individual who does not input the changes.	Completeness Validity
Actual-to-actual, actual-to-budget and yield reports are produced from the general ledger system on a monthly basis prior to the final close of the general ledger. Reports are distributed to and reviewed by the controller and CFO. Unusual amounts or variances are investigated and reclassified when applicable.	Completeness Validity Valuation Occurrence
A standard chart of accounts has been approved by management and is utilized within all entities of the corporation. Adding to or deleting from general ledger is limited to authorized accounting department personnel.	Completeness Validity
A stale items report (e.g., reconciling items outstanding over 90 days) is generated by the system to monitor timely follow-up and resolution of outstanding items.	Completeness Validity
Entries booked in the close process are complete and accurate.	Completeness Validity
Automated amortization timing, periods and methods are appropriate and accurately entered.	Valuation Validity
Standard, recurring period-end journal entries submitted from subsidiary ledger systems are automated, appropriately approved and entered accurately.	Completeness Validity Valuation Occurrence
Transactions cannot be recorded outside of financial close cutoff requirements.	Completeness Validity Valuation Occurrence
Annually approved recurring accruals are accurately booked in the appropriate periods.	Completeness Validity Valuation Occurrence
The sources of all entries are readily identifiable.	Validity
Transactions are rejected, or accepted and identified, on exception reports in the event of data exceptions.	Completeness Validity
Account mappings are up to date.	Validity

Figure 30—Application Control Objectives for the Sales Cycle

Illustrative Control Objectives	Financial Assertions
Orders are processed only within approved customer credit limits.	Valuation
Orders are approved by management as to prices and terms of sale.	Validity
Orders and cancellations of orders are input accurately.	Valuation
Order entry data are transferred completely and accurately to the shipping and invoicing activities.	Valuation Completeness
All orders received from customers are input and processed.	Completeness
Only valid orders are input and processed.	Validity
Invoices are generated using authorized terms and prices.	Valuation
Invoices are accurately calculated and recorded.	Valuation
Credit notes and adjustments to accounts receivable are accurately calculated and recorded.	Valuation
All goods shipped are invoiced.	Completeness
Credit notes for all goods returned and adjustments to accounts receivable are issued in accordance with organization policy.	Validity
Invoices relate to valid shipments.	Validity
All credit notes relate to a return of goods or other valid adjustments.	Completeness
All invoices issued are recorded.	Completeness
All credit notes issued are recorded.	Validity
Invoices are recorded in the appropriate period.	Valuation Occurrence
Credit notes issued are recorded in the appropriate period.	Valuation Occurrence
Cash receipts are recorded in the period in which they are received.	Valuation Occurrence
Cash receipts data are entered for processing accurately.	Valuation
All cash receipts data are entered for processing.	Validity
Cash receipts data are valid and are entered for processing only once.	Completeness
Cash discounts are accurately calculated and recorded.	Valuation
Timely collection of accounts receivable is monitored.	Valuation
The customer master file is maintained.	Completeness Validity
Only valid changes are made to the customer master file.	Completeness Validity
All valid changes to the customer master file are input and processed.	Completeness Validity

Figure 30—Application Control Objectives for the Sales Cycle (*cont.*)

Illustrative Control Objectives	Financial Assertions
Changes to the customer master file are accurate.	Valuation
Changes to the customer master file are processed in a timely manner.	Completeness Validity
Customer master file data remain up to date.	Completeness Validity

Figure 31—Application Control Objectives for the Purchasing Cycle

Illustrative Control Objectives	Financial Assertions
Purchase orders are placed only for approved requisitions.	Validity
Purchase orders are accurately entered.	Valuation
All purchase orders issued are input and processed.	Completeness
Amounts posted to accounts payable represent goods or services received.	Validity
Accounts payable amounts are accurately calculated and recorded.	Valuation
All amounts for goods or services received are input and processed to accounts payable.	Completeness
Amounts for goods or services received are recorded in the appropriate period.	Valuation Occurrence
Accounts payable are adjusted only for valid reasons.	Completeness Validity
Credit notes and other adjustments are accurately calculated and recorded.	Valuation
All valid credit notes and other adjustments related to accounts payable are input and processed.	Completeness Validity
Credit notes and other adjustments are recorded in the appropriate period.	Valuation Occurrence
Disbursements are made only for goods and services received.	Validity
Disbursements are distributed to the appropriate suppliers.	Validity
Disbursements are accurately calculated and recorded.	Valuation
All disbursements are recorded.	Completeness
Disbursements are recorded in the period in which they are issued.	Valuation Occurrence
Only valid changes are made to the supplier master file.	Completeness Validity
All valid changes to the supplier master file are input and processed.	Completeness Validity
Changes to the supplier master file are accurate.	Valuation
Changes to the supplier master file are processed in a timely manner.	Completeness Validity
Supplier master file data remain up to date.	Completeness Validity

Figure 32—Application Control Objectives for the Inventory Cycle

Illustrative Control Objectives	Financial Assertions
Adjustments to inventory prices or quantities are recorded promptly and in the appropriate period.	Validity Completeness Valuation Occurrence
Adjustments to inventory prices or quantities are recorded accurately.	Valuation
Raw materials are received and accepted only if they have valid purchase orders.	Validity
Raw materials received are recorded accurately.	Valuation
All raw materials received are recorded.	Completeness
Receipts of raw materials are recorded promptly and in the appropriate period.	Valuation Occurrence
Defective raw materials are returned promptly to suppliers.	Validity
All transfers of raw materials to production are recorded accurately and in the appropriate period.	Valuation Occurrence Completeness
All direct and indirect expenses associated with production are recorded accurately and in the appropriate period.	Valuation Occurrence
All transfers of completed units of production to finished goods inventory are recorded completely and accurately in the appropriate period.	Valuation Completeness
Finished goods returned by customers are recorded completely and accurately in the appropriate period.	Valuation Completeness Occurrence
Finished goods received from production are recorded completely and accurately in the appropriate period.	Completeness Valuation Occurrence
All shipments are recorded.	Validity
Shipments are recorded accurately.	Valuation
Shipments are recorded promptly and in the appropriate period.	Valuation Occurrence
Inventory is reduced only when goods are shipped with approved customer orders.	Completeness Validity
Costs of shipped inventory are transferred from inventory to cost of sales.	Validity Valuation
Costs of shipped inventory are accurately recorded.	Valuation
Amounts posted to cost of sales represent those associated with shipped inventory.	Completeness Validity
Costs of shipped inventory are transferred from inventory to cost of sales promptly and in the appropriate period.	Valuation Occurrence
Only valid changes are made to the inventory management master file.	Validity Completeness

Figure 32—Application Control Objectives for the Inventory Cycle (cont.)

Illustrative Control Objectives	Financial Assertions
All valid changes to the inventory management master file are input and processed.	Validity Completeness
Changes to the inventory management master file are accurate.	Valuation
Changes to the inventory management master file are promptly processed.	Validity Completeness
Inventory management master file data remain up to date.	Completeness Validity

Figure 33—Application Control Objectives for the Fixed Asset Cycle

Illustrative Control Objectives	Financial Assertions
Fixed asset acquisitions are accurately recorded.	Valuation
Fixed asset acquisitions are recorded in the appropriate period.	Valuation Occurrence
All fixed asset acquisitions are recorded.	Completeness
Depreciation charges are accurately calculated and recorded.	Valuation
All depreciation charges are recorded in the appropriate period.	Validity Valuation Occurrence Completeness
All fixed asset disposals are recorded.	Validity
Fixed asset disposals are accurately calculated and recorded.	Valuation
Fixed asset disposals are recorded in the appropriate period.	Valuation Occurrence
Records of fixed asset maintenance activity are accurately maintained.	Completeness
Fixed asset maintenance activities records are updated in a timely manner.	Completeness
Only valid changes are made to the fixed asset register and/or master file.	Completeness Validity
All valid changes to the fixed asset register and/or master file are input and processed.	Completeness Validity
Changes to the fixed asset register and/or master file are accurate.	Valuation
Changes to the fixed asset register and/or master file are promptly processed.	Completeness Validity
Fixed asset register and/or master file data remain up to date.	Completeness Validity

Figure 34—Application Control Objectives for the Human Resources Cycle

Illustrative Control Objectives	Financial Assertions
Additions to the payroll master files represent valid employees.	Validity
All new employees are added to the payroll master files.	Completeness
Terminated employees are removed from the payroll master files.	Validity
Employees are terminated only within statutory and union requirements.	Completeness
Deletions from the payroll master files represent valid terminations.	Completeness
All time worked is input.	Completeness
Time worked is accurately input and processed.	Valuation
Payroll is recorded in the appropriate period.	Valuation Occurrence
Payroll (including compensation and withholdings) is accurately calculated and recorded.	Valuation
Payroll is disbursed to appropriate employees.	Validity
Only valid changes are made to the payroll master files.	Validity Completeness
All valid changes to the payroll master files are input and processed.	Validity Completeness
Changes to the payroll master files are accurate.	Valuation
Changes to the payroll master files are processed in a timely manner.	Validity Completeness
Payroll master file data remain up to date.	Validity Completeness
Only valid changes are made to the payroll withholding tables.	Validity Completeness
All valid changes to the payroll withholding tables are input and processed.	Validity Completeness
Changes to the payroll withholding tables are accurate.	Valuation
Changes to the payroll withholding tables are promptly processed.	Validity Completeness
Payroll withholding table data remain up to date.	Validity Completeness

Figure 35—Application Control Objectives for the Tax Cycle

Illustrative Control Objectives	Financial Assertions
Automated workflows are used for timely filing of returns.	Completeness
Tax payments are correctly calculated and recorded to the general ledger.	Completeness Valuation Validity
Tax exposures and valuation allowances are correctly calculated and recorded.	Completeness Validity Valuation
Tax expenses are recorded in the correct periods.	Completeness Validity Valuation
Permanent and temporary differences are identified and recorded accurately.	Completeness Validity Valuation
Correct book income is used in the tax accrual.	Completeness Validity
Tax assets, liabilities and expenses are complete and correctly calculated and reported.	Completeness Validity
Depreciation is calculated using appropriate bases, resulting in correct charges and tax ramifications.	Completeness Validity
Sales and use tax is calculated appropriately, correctly and in a timely manner.	Completeness Validity
Value-added tax is accounted for correctly and filed appropriately.	Completeness Validity
Transfer pricing policies are up to date and accurately represented in the systems.	Completeness Validity
All tax payments are accurately reflected in the general ledger.	Valuation
Property tax filings are timely and accurate.	Completeness Validity Valuation

Appendix D—Sample Application and Technology Layers Inventory

Application Name	Related Business Process	Application Details		Database		Operating System		Hardware Platform		Physical Location	
		Package/ In-house	Customized	Owner	Version	Owner	Version	Owner	Facility	Owner	Facility
SAP	Financials	Package	Yes	Kerry M	Oracle 9i v9.2.0	Craig T	Solaris 3.2	Ryan S	HP 9000	Doug W	Calgary
PeopleSoft	HR payroll	Package	Yes	Tom M	Oracle 9i v9.2.0	Craig T	HP-UX v11.11	Adel M	HP 9000	Doug W	Houston
ACCPAC	Subsidiary accounting	Package	No	Esther C	Oracle 9i v9.2.0	Craig T	HP-UX v11.11	Adel M	HP 9000	Doug W	Denver
TIMS	Time recording	Custom	Yes	Darryl J	DB2 400	Alan S	OS400	Reid C	AS400	Rob K	Calgary
VIBS	Billing	Custom	Yes	Paul Z	DB2 400	Alan S	OS400	Ryan R	AS400	Barb V	Calgary

Appendix E—Project Estimating Tool

		Estimated Effort for Each Project Phase by Size of Company (These are estimates only and could be higher or lower depending on the unique circumstances of each company.)					
Project Phase	Effort Estimate (Days)	Small (Single Location, <5 Applications)		Medium (<5 Locations, 5-10 Applications)		Large (>5 to 10 Locations, >10 to 15 Applications)	
		Low Estimate	High Estimate	Low Estimate	High Estimate	Low Estimate	High Estimate
1. Plan and scope.	2	5	5	5	10	10	20
2. Assess risk.	2	5	2	5	5	5	15
3. Identify and document controls	5	10	10	20	20	20	50
4. Evaluate design and operating effectiveness.	5	10	10	20	20	20	30
5. Prioritize and remediate deficiencies.	Note 1	Note 1	Note 1	Note 1	Note 1	Note 1	Note 1
6. Build sustainability.	Note 2	Note 2	Note 2	Note 2	Note 2	Note 2	Note 2

Note 1—Remediation effort depends on the severity of the deficiency. Companies may choose to go beyond remediation and address operational efficiency issues, such as implementing a new system development or change management process.

Note 2—Sustainment efforts include the evaluation of automation and rationalization opportunities but do not include the time required to implement, which is unique to every organization.

		Estimate of Effort to Document and Test (Days)			
IT Environment (Each)		IT Environment (Each)		Estimate of Effort to Document and Test (Days)	
		Low Estimate	High Estimate	Low Estimate	High Estimate
Small package application		1	2	.25	1
Large package application		2	5	.5	2
Small custom application		1	2	2	5
Large custom application		5	10	.5	2
Assess segregation of duties—small application		2	10	.5	5
Assess segregation of duties—large application		5	30	.5	1

The estimates noted above are initial planning estimates and may vary. For instance, companies that are very decentralized and have a significant number of applications may require substantially more effort. Similarly, very small companies with simple processes and few applications may require less effort. Furthermore, once the initial assessment has been performed, the estimates of effort for sustaining these controls may decrease over time.

Appendix F—Inherent Risk Assessment and Control Prioritization Grid

Risk Assessment Considerations

By performing a risk assessment of the in-scope applications and their related subsystems, companies can prioritize efforts in areas of higher risk and reduce efforts in areas of lower risk. It is important to note that the assessment of risk is a judgment decision; however, there are common risk factors that should be taken into consideration. The following illustrative tables are provided to assist in the inherent risk assessment.

Figure 36—Inherent Risk Considerations

Example Risk Factors	Considerations for Higher Risk	Considerations for Lower Risk
Nature of technology	Complex, unique, customized, developed in-house	Simple, commonly used, not customized, off-the-shelf
Nature of people	Inexperienced, lack of training, limited number of people, high turnover	Experienced, trained and specialized, sufficient resources, low turnover
Nature of processes	Decentralized, multilocation, <i>ad hoc</i>	Centralized, formalized, consistent
Past experience	History of problems including processing errors, system outages, data corruption	No history of problems
Significance to the financial reports	Direct—Used for initiating and recording amounts into the financial reports	Indirect—Used for analytical purposes but does not initiate or record amounts into the financial reports

Information Technology Risk Assessment

An assessment should be performed for each in-scope application. In some cases, the subsystems (database, operating system, network and physical environment) will be the same for many or all applications. In this case, subsystems can be assessed only once.

Figure 37—Inherent Risk Assessment for Technology Layers

Inherent Risk Factors	Technology Layers				Physical
	Application	Database	Operating System	Network	
Nature of technology	H or L	H or L	H or L	H or L	H or L
Nature of people	H or L	H or L	H or L	H or L	H or L
Nature of processes	H or L	H or L	H or L	H or L	H or L
Past experience	H or L	H or L	H or L	H or L	H or L
Significance to the financial reports	H or L	H or L	H or L	H or L	H or L
Overall conclusion (judgment)	H or L	H or L	H or L	H or L	H or L

In performing the risk assessment and establishing a risk rating, it is important to document the considerations or rationale for the risk rating. The considerations in figure 37 may be used as a starting point, but further analysis should be completed to support the risk assessment.

Recommendations on Where Control Should Be Considered

This grid provides illustrative guidance on the IT controls that should be considered for each of the technology layers. Generally speaking, the grid reflects the theory that financial applications that more directly support financial controls are of greater risk to financial reporting and therefore require the greatest consideration. Similarly, physical security controls, which support the general control environment but are very far removed from the financial statements, present less risk and deserve less consideration. As always, there is no **one-size-fits-all** approach, and each company will have to customize this grid based on its particular needs and circumstances.

Figure 38—Control Prioritization Grid

PCAOB Headings	IT Controls for Sarbanes-Oxley	Technology Layers				
		Application	Database	Operating System	Network	Physical
Program Change and Program Development and Computer Operations	Acquire and maintain application software.	R	R	D	D	D
	Acquire and maintain technology infrastructure.	D	D	D	D	D
	Develop the IT processes, organization and relationships.	R	R	R	R	R
	Install and accredit solutions and changes.	R	R	D	D	D
	Manage changes.	R	R	R	D	D
	Define and manage service levels.	D	D	D	D	D
	Manage third-party services.	R	R	R	D	D
	Ensure systems security.	R	R	R	R	D
	Manage the configuration.	R	R	R	D	D
	Manage problems and incidents.	R	R	R	R	D
Access to Programs and Data and Computer Operations	Manage data.	R	R	D	D	D
	Manage the physical environment and operations.	R	R	D	D	D

R—Recommended. IT controls should be considered for each technology layer as noted. The extent of work in each area will depend on the inherent risk assessment.

D—Discretionary. IT controls should be considered where risks have been identified.


Appendix G—Sample Control Documentation and Testing Template

Sample Documentation Template

This matrix provides guidance on the types of control attributes that should be documented and maintained as part of the compliance program. As always, there is no one-size-fits-all approach, and each company will have to customize this matrix based on its particular needs and circumstances.

Appendix H—Sample Deficiency Evaluation Decision Tree

The following decision tree can be used to assist in the evaluation of control design or operating effectiveness issues. Companies should consult with their financial compliance teams and, ultimately, with their senior executive officers before concluding whether a control deficiency is a significant deficiency or a material weakness. This sample tree is not based upon authoritative pronouncement but reflects a common approach followed by many companies.



Appendix I—Sample Approach for Spreadsheets

Many companies rely on spreadsheets as tools in their financial reporting processes. As a result, the use of spreadsheets has become an important part of the information and decision-making process for these companies.

Unfortunately, spreadsheets lack the inherent controls that many applications provide, including user access and change management controls.

As users of spreadsheets develop more and more sophisticated models to automate and accelerate financial close and reporting processes, significant risks are introduced into the financial reporting process.

One challenge facing many companies is the significant number of spreadsheets in use, in some cases totaling thousands at a single company. Of course, not all spreadsheets are of the same importance and risk. Therefore, the objective is to identify those spreadsheets that are most significant to the financial reporting process and determine if controls are in place and whether they are tested in a reasonable manner. To do so, the following three-step approach is provided as a guide. As always, professional judgment needs to be considered and customization of this approach made to suit the individual needs of each company. The three-step approach:

1. Spreadsheet inventory—Using the business process documentation as a starting point, inventory all spreadsheets that are involved in the financial reporting process and document the spreadsheet name, business process name related to the spreadsheet, financial statement line items impacted by the spreadsheet, description of what the spreadsheet does, and dollar value of transactions processed in the spreadsheet.
2. Risk assessment—For each of the spreadsheets inventoried, assess the impact and likelihood of financial statement error. The illustrative considerations outlined in **figure 39** are provided as a guideline.

Figure 39—Spreadsheet Considerations

Impact Considerations	Low (1)	Medium (2)	High (3)
Total dollar value processed by the spreadsheet	<20% of materiality	20-50% of materiality	>50% of materiality
Purpose of the spreadsheet output	Analytical review	Financial reporting disclosures	Posting to the general ledger
Likelihood Considerations	Low (1)	Medium (2)	High (3)
Complexity of the spreadsheet	Low (used for logging or data tracking)	Moderate (simple calculations or minor journal entries)	High (complex modeling, pivot tables, links to other data sources)
Number of users of the spreadsheet	1 user	<5 users	>5 users
Frequency of changes to the spreadsheet	Infrequent	Occasional	Frequent

Using the impact and likelihood assessment, calculate a composite risk score (1-9) and categorize the spreadsheets according to their relative score. Make certain the categorization is reviewed in aggregate to confirm the appropriateness of how spreadsheets have been rated. Once the risk rating is complete, establish an action plan to address the spreadsheets.

The following action plan is provided as a guideline:

- Composite risk rating 1-3—The inherent risk of the spreadsheet is low. No action will be taken.
- Composite risk rating 4-6—The inherent risk of the spreadsheet is moderate. Implement and assess spreadsheet controls described in 3a-3c below.
- Composite risk rating 7-9—The inherent risk of the spreadsheet is high. Implement and assess spreadsheet controls described in 3a-3g below.

3. Implement/assess spreadsheet controls—Based on the composite risk ratings noted previously, the following spreadsheet controls are provided as a guideline. Other controls may be considered necessary depending on the circumstances of the organization and its use of spreadsheets.
 - a) Access control—Limit access to the spreadsheets by storing them on a network server and assigning appropriate access restrictions.
 - b) Change control—Establish a process for making changes to the spreadsheet, including documenting the change in a tab within the spreadsheet.
 - c) Documentation—Ensure that the appropriate level of spreadsheet documentation is maintained and kept up to date to understand the business objective and specific functions of the spreadsheet.
 - d) Testing—Formally test the spreadsheet by having someone who is independent of the business process review it. Have that individual confirm that the spreadsheet processing and related output is functioning as intended.
 - e) Input control—Reconcile data inputs to source documents to confirm that data are input completely and accurately.
 - f) Security and integrity of data—Prevent unauthorized or inadvertent changes to the spreadsheet by “locking” or protecting sensitive cells that are important for data processing, such as formulas and master data.
 - g) Logic inspection—Have someone other than the user or developer of critical spreadsheets inspect the spreadsheets’ logic. This review should be formally documented.

Appendix J—Lessons Learned

There were many lessons learned during the first and second years of the Sarbanes-Oxley implementation, as described below.

Figure 44—Lessons Learned

Lessons Learned—Plan and Scope

- a) Organizations should form an IT control subcommittee that is integrated into and reports to the overall Sarbanes-Oxley steering committee. The IT control subcommittee should oversee the IT Sarbanes-Oxley process, facilitate communication and integration with the overall Sarbanes-Oxley project, and facilitate the role of the independent auditors in the Sarbanes-Oxley IT process.
- b) The responsibility of IT for internal control should be defined. Common areas of confusion have included who is responsible for application controls, responsibilities for spreadsheets and the responsibilities of business owners.
- c) In many cases, the initial scope of the section 404 implementation process was not well understood. Further, the initial scope was not challenged during the implementation process, applications that were not relevant to the financial reporting process were not taken out of scope, and some applications that should have been included were not included until an issue was raised by the external auditor.
- d) A top-down approach to the implementation was often not taken. Both management and auditors often began testing control activities without considering the impact on risks of other COSO controls. Considerable work was performed at the control activity level that could potentially have been reduced as other controls may have reduced the risk that key control breakdowns would not be detected.
- e) Implementation plans may not have included communication plans. Communication plans are necessary so stakeholders are kept informed of progress and their responsibilities. For example, as new policies are developed, there should be a plan to communicate these to employees and contractors.
- f) The time frames to execute work for the external auditors were not included in implementation plans. This increased the risk that external audit work would be performed too late. In some cases, significant deficiencies were not identified until late in the process and could not be corrected until after year-end.
- g) Opportunities to implement standardized or centralized controls may have been missed or the potential impact of standardized or centralized controls and processes on the testing strategy were not considered.
- h) There was often poor communication between Sarbanes-Oxley financial/operational teams and IT teams. Both teams often identified key controls that addressed the same control objectives. In addition, opportunities for relying on automated controls rather than manual controls were missed and assumptions about the adequacy of the controls in the other team's area were sometimes invalid.
- i) Other than spreadsheets and word processing software, there was little automation of the compliance process. It was often difficult to track progress or identify the root causes of control deficiencies that could be addressed with a single solution.
- j) The skill sets required to address implementation needs were often in short supply, e.g., control design, risk assessments and documentation. In the final quarter of a year, it became increasingly difficult to find and retain public accounting audit expertise as this was focused on meeting the firm's external audit obligations. Often, external expertise that was required was more costly than initially anticipated.

Figure 44—Lessons Learned

Lessons Learned—Plan and Scope
k) In many cases, internal audit provided significant assistance in the implementation effort. However, this meant that internal audit plans could not be achieved and areas of risk outside of financial reporting may not have been reviewed. There was also an independence issue as auditors who design controls should not be reviewing and testing the controls they have implemented. This may have an impact on internal audit activity in the future.
l) The potential to use the internal audit function to test the controls self-assessment process as part of its normal audit plans was not considered. The potential impact of a controls self-assessment process to reduce the testing of control activities was not considered.
Lessons Learned—Assess Risk
a) The risks associated with IT general controls were often not considered. Levels of tests were often set at a higher level than necessary for low-risk areas. Conversely, the impact of higher risks was not considered on the level of testing.
b) Risk assessments were often not performed on IT general controls.
Lessons Learned—Identify and Document Controls
a) In a number of cases, the external auditors were not consulted about the nature and extent of the documentation required. This increased the risk that a process could have been overdocumented and that documentation could become quickly out of date. Similarly, a process could be underdocumented and would have to be redone.
b) A holistic approach to the control framework was not taken. The impact of manual controls, automated application controls, IT general controls, monitoring controls (including internal audit as a periodic monitoring control) and the control environment were not considered in their entirety in the risk assessment process when such consideration could have reduced the risk of unnecessary testing.
Lessons Learned—Evaluate Design and Operating Effectiveness
a) Process documentation often became the key objective instead of serving as an aid to identifying key controls.
b) In some instances, all controls identified were considered to be key controls, resulting in unnecessary testing.
c) The documentation required for parameter-driven IT general controls and the documentation of process-driven IT general controls was not considered.
d) In some cases, a centralized gap list, including manual control gaps, IT application control gaps and IT general control gaps, was not created. This made it difficult to assess potential compensating controls and to determine if solutions to common control gaps could be remediated centrally, rather than having individual groups create different solutions for the same issue.
e) Walkthroughs of parameter-driven IT general controls were sometimes reperformed during the evaluation of operational effectiveness.
f) Service auditor reports were not mapped to the risk and control matrix (which should also include the organization's controls). This increased the risk that a gap in key controls would not be detected. Similarly, there was often confusion as to whether the controls documented in the service organization's narrative but not in the service auditor's narrative could be relied upon or whether additional management testing was required.

Figure 44—Lessons Learned**Lessons Learned—Prioritize and Remediate Deficiencies**

- a) In some cases, rather than management identifying key controls and deficiencies, the external auditor challenged management's assessment. Management accepted the external auditor's assessment and performed additional work.

Lessons Learned—Build Sustainability

- a) There were often no postimplementation reviews or assessments of how the Sarbanes-Oxley process could be improved. Once one year's section 404 process was completed, the next year's started. When postimplementation reviews were performed, they may not have included all stakeholders.
- b) Consideration may not have been given to extending the compliance framework to monitor compliance in other regulatory areas and to comply with company policy.

References

Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO), *Exposure Draft Enterprise Risk Management Framework*, USA, July 2003, www.coso.org

Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO), *Exposure Draft Guidance for Smaller Public Companies Reporting on Internal Control over Financial Reporting*, USA, November 2005, www.coso.org

Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO), American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, *Internal Control—Integrated Framework*, USA, 1992

CSE (Canada), SCSSI (France), BSII (Germany), NLNCSA (Netherlands), CESG (UK), NIST (USA) and NSA (USA), *Common Criteria and Methodology for Information Technology Security Evaluation*, 1999

Deloitte & Touche LLP, “Moving Forward—A Guide to Improving Corporate Governance Through Effective Internal Control,” 2003

Deloitte & Touche LLP, “Taking Control, A Guide to Compliance with Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002,” 2003

Deloitte & Touche LLP, illustration figures 2, 3, 4, 30-34

Dewitt, Ron, “Managing Change is Managing People,” 30 April 2004, www.cioupdate.com

Ernst & Young LLP, “The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, The Current Landscape—Rules, Updates and Business Trends,” 2003

International Organization for Standardization (ISO), ISO/IEC 17799, *Code of Practice for Information Security Management*, Switzerland, 2005

IT Governance Institute, *Board Briefing on IT Governance, 2nd Edition*, USA, 2003, www.itgi.org

IT Governance Institute, COBIT 4.0, USA, 2005, www.itgi.org

IT Governance Institute, *IT Governance Implementation Guide*, USA, 2003, www.itgi.org

KPMG, “The Defining Issues—Implications of Proposed Auditing Standard on Internal Control,” 2003

LaMarsh & Associates Inc., Managed ChangeTM Model, USA

Office of Government Commerce (OGC), Central Computer and Telecommunications Agency (CCTA), IT Infrastructure Library (ITIL), UK, 1989

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, “An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting Performed in Conjunction with an Audit of Financial Statements,” Final Auditing Standard: Release No. 2004-001, USA, 9 March 2004

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, “The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, Strategies for Meeting New Internal Control Reporting Challenges,” 2003

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, “Understanding the Independent Auditor’s Role in Building Trust,” 2003

Securities and Exchange Commission, “Final Rule: Management’s Reports on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and Certification of Disclosure in Exchange Act Periodic Reports,” Release Nos. 33-8238; 34-47986; IC-26068; File Nos. S7-40-02; S7-06-03, USA, June 2003,
www.sec.gov/rules/final/33-8238.htm