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Omnipresence of Fraud!

- Fraud is omnipresent and it is as old as human civilisation!
- **Kautilya**, ancient Indian statesman (2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C)-well known for his famous treatise on statecraft and policy, ‘Arthashastra’, described in detail
  - forty different ways in which state funds could be embezzled during his time; and
  - laid down an elaborate punishment procedure.

  “Whether one wishes or not, honey or poison kept on tongue gets tasted eventually. So it is, corruption and wealth accumulation by government officials. It is highly likely that they do accumulate more or less wealth by corruption in their tenure.”

  – **Kautilya**
Typical Public Sector Audit Jurisdiction

Federal Government
- State owned undertakings/corporations
- Public private partnerships

Provincial Government
- State owned undertakings/corporations
- Public private partnerships
- Local government
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## The Magnitude of Losses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACFE</th>
<th>PwC</th>
<th>My Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximately two-thirds of the cases reported targeted privately held or publicly owned companies and these for-profit organizations suffered the largest median losses among the types of organizations analysed, at $180,000 and $178,000, respectively.</td>
<td>41 percent of the respondents from government/state owned enterprises reported that their organisations had suffered economic crime in the last 12 months. The same survey shows that: (a) procurement fraud has more than doubled in the public sector since 2012; and (b) 24 percent of the government organisations surveyed worldwide suffered losses in the past 24 months that were in excess of $1 million. (2014 PwC Global Economic Crime Survey)</td>
<td>Based on secondary data; Losses of over $40 million in five years; Almost every department of the government had suffered frauds; The perpetrators were insiders in 80 percent of the cases reported; Cash-on-hand misappropriation was the most frequently followed scheme; and 80 percent of the revenue was lost before crediting (skimming); and the primary (61 percent) reason for the control weaknesses was ‘not following the prescribed checks’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the cases involving a government victim, those that occurred at the federal level reported the highest median loss ($194,000), compared to state or provincial ($100,000) and local entities ($80,000).</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://rtinagpur.cag.gov.in/research-paper.php">http://rtinagpur.cag.gov.in/research-paper.php</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ACFE 2016 Report to the Nations on Fraud and Abuse)
Results of My Study...
A Summary of Fraud Schemes Followed
Results of My Study contd., Revenue Loss

![Bar Chart: Revenue Loss]

- Skimming: 80%
- Cash Larceny: 20%
Results of My Study *contd.*, Control Weaknesses

Where is the weakness?

- Prescribed checks not exercised: 61.32%
- Management failure to review: 33.96%
- Absence of Internal Controls: 4.72%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perspectives of Fraud in the Public Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Magnitude of Losses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Institutional Arrangements in Place for Fighting Frauds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Traditional/Statutory Audit Versus Forensic Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Role of Forensic Auditors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Audit Mandate of the Supreme Audit Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Digital Forensics and Data Mining - A Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Challenges and the Way Forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTOSAI

Regional working Group

Regional working Group

Regional working Group

Legislature

Internal Oversight

SAI

Investigating authorities
INTOSAI Regional Working Groups

- **OLACEFS** - Organization of Latin American and Caribbean Supreme Audit Institutions
- **CAROSAI** - Caribbean Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutes
- **EUROSAI** - European Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions
- **CREFIAF** - Supreme Audit Institutions of French-speaking sub-Saharan African countries
- **ARABOSAI** - Arab Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions
- **AFROSAI** - African Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions
- **ASOSAI** - Asian Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions
- **PASAI** - Pacific Association of Supreme Audit Institutions
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Statutory Audit Versus Forensic Audit - How Do They Differ?

- Evidence gathering techniques
- Types of evidence required
- Scope and Purpose (Who, What, When, Where)
- Periodicity
- Skills required
- Type of assurance - absolute
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Proactive role

> Raising risk awareness.
> Facilitating Control & Assessment.
> Advisory services to advocate integrating forensic principles in the business activities.
> Review of the systems under development for incorporating forensic principles.
> Review of the adequacy of controls in IT systems used with a focus on interfaces among different systems.
> Capacity building.

Reactive role

> Collecting appropriate evidence and maintaining the chain of custody.
> Adequate coordination with investigating and law enforcement agencies.
> Findings reported through normal audit process, when applicable, are handed over to the investigating authorities.
Characteristics of a Forensic Auditor

- Law enforcement
- Accounting
- Auditing (Information Technology, Regularity, Financial, Compliance and Performance)
- Investigation skills and applied psychology
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Mandates of the Supreme Audit Institutions - A Comparison Between 2010 and 2014

Some Commonly Followed Practices Among SAIs

- Investigation with the help of forensic teams
- Part of the investigating agencies’ teams
- Keep off after handing over the evidence to the investigating agencies
- ??
Barring few SAIs, in most of the cases, there are other agencies responsible for investigating fraud and corruption. Government Accountability Office, USA, and National Audit Office, UK, Office of the Auditor General, South Africa have specialized forensic investigation teams.

The 2014 Global Survey conducted by INTOSAI advised SAIs to undertake specialised audits that included investigative or forensic audits. The member countries of the Asian Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions (ASOSAI) had the following statuses: Forensic Auditing by SAIs.
• Indonesia, Iraq, Korea, and Philippines: Ranked forensic audit as the foremost instrumental audit service in prevention of fraud and corruption while Russia ranked it second.

• Philippines: Established a Fraud Audit Office, which conducts audits of government agencies with probable fraudulent transactions to safeguard government assets against abuse and fraud and to respond to the increasing public demand for fidelity in the use of government funds and property.

• Malaysia: Investigative audit is a part of regular auditing. In the course of an audit, indications of fraud are investigated by the team that conducts the audit.

Source: 10th ASOSAI Research Project, 2015.
• Indonesia: Developed an investigative audit task force (ad hoc).
• Thailand: Conducts investigative audits and established a Forensic Audit Unit.
• China, India, Iran, and Turkey: Did not have forensic audit units.
• Iran: The General Inspection Organization of Iran performed the task of investigative auditing; and
• Turkey: Did not have a separate forensic audit unit and did not have a plan to establish one in the future.

Source: 10th ASOSAI Research Project, 2015.
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Digital Forensics

**Seizure**: To understand whether the auditor has the authority to seize the digital equipment as well as knowledge of the proper methodology to use so that evidence is not destroyed or tainted.

**Image Acquisition**: Use of decision-making processes to determine the best method for acquiring an image of the suspect system and the proper use of software and hardware tools to facilitate the image capture maintaining ‘chain of custody.’

**Analysis**: Use of specialized tools designed to give the examiner the means to locate and extract artefacts that will be used as evidence in the investigation.

**Reporting and Testifying**: A qualified computer forensic expert may be asked to render an opinion about the use or misuse of the system.
Some Commonly Used Detection Techniques

• *Data Mining:* To discover previously hidden patterns and attributes in data, pointing not only to fraudulent transactions, but also to new markets and products, is the new challenge for Information Systems auditors.

• Other techniques: Case-based reasoning tools and neural networks, data matching etc.,
### Indicators of Fraudulent Practices, Red Flags, a Good Starting Point - An Example of Public Works

| Estimates of requirements prepared in piecemeal to avoid procurement procedures set for high value purchases. |
| Specifications prepared to exclude all but certain favoured suppliers. |
| Estimates prepared using costs higher than the market price. |
| Single work divided into several small components so that it can be approved within the initiator’s authority. |
| Material purchased directly at the manufacturer’s price that falsely claim to meet the required specifications. |
| Unusually low time given for bidding to avoid competition. |
| Tailored conditions of payment allow unconditional secured advance, mobilisation advance etc., |

**Source:** Speaker’s publication, ‘Red flags and anti-fraud measures in Public Works’ at [http://rtinagpur.cag.gov.in/research-paper.php](http://rtinagpur.cag.gov.in/research-paper.php)
AUDIT OF TAXATION SYSTEM USING FORENSIC PRINCIPLES- A CASE STUDY

- Income tax collections (2013-14) in the province-$3448 million
- Sustained interface between Tax Administration offices and Statutory Audit offices
- Taxation offices/tax payers identified by unique identification numbers
- Taxation systems: Income tax, VAT, excise duty on manufacturing, and customs duty
- Lack of interface between different taxation systems in the audit office

Stages involved

Taxation sub-systems (Data sources) → Data aggregation → Staging → Analysis → Investigation
Taxation data

Fraud analytics through data mining

Investigation/risk analysis

OBJECTIVE

Challenges:
- Large volumes of data
- Data acquisition
- Integration errors
- Soft skills and controls
- Resources

INTEGRATION PLAYED A KEY ROLE!

Components

PROCESS DESIGN

IT SYSTEMS

PEOPLE

INTEGRATION PLAYED A KEY ROLE!
Taxation sub-systems (Data sources)

Data aggregation

Staging

Analysis

Investigation

VAT

Income Tax

Manufacturing

Real Estate

Import/Export

Data warehouse

Patterns

Data mining

Rules identification
(some examples)

- Sudden rise/fall in the tax paid,
- Abnormal spike in tax holidays enjoyed,
- Taxable income not commensurate with the known activities.
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The Way Forward

Institutional arrangements
- Securing appropriate audit mandate
- Well-defined relationships with investigating agencies
- Infrastructure for evidence preservation and analysis

Professional practices
- Entities’ profiling integrating forensic principles
- Developing red flags/fraud patterns/rules
- Proactive role through facilitating control self assessment-sensitising clients
- Advocate for integration of forensic principles in the business systems

Capacity building
- SAIs staff-recruitment, specialists cadre
- Entities’ staff
- Joint seminars/workshops for knowledge and experience sharing
“Corruption, embezzlement, fraud, these are all characteristics which exist everywhere. It is regrettably the way human nature functions, whether we like it or not. What successful economies do is keep it to a minimum. No one has ever eliminated any of that stuff.”

Allan Greenspan
American Economist
Thank You
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