her views or his or her personal situation. These circumstances might include:

1. Relationships of an official, professional, and/or personal nature that might cause the auditor to limit the extent or character of the inquiry, to limit disclosure, or to weaken his or her findings in any way.

2. Preconceived ideas about the objectives or quality of a particular operation or personal likes or dislikes of individuals, groups, or objectives of a particular program.

3. Previous involvement in a decision-making or management capacity in the operations of the governmental entity or program being audited.

4. Biases and prejudices, including those induced by political or social convictions, which result from employment in or loyalty to a particular group, entity, or level of government.

5. Actual or potential restrictive influence when the auditor performs preaudit work and subsequently performs a post audit.

6. Financial interest, direct or indirect, in an organization or facility which is benefiting from the audited programs.

External Impairments

External factors can restrict the audit or impinge on the auditor’s ability to form independent and objective opinions and conclusions. For example, under the following conditions either the audit itself could be adversely affected or the auditor would not have complete freedom to make an independent judgment.\(^2\)

1. Interference or other influence that improperly or imprudently eliminates, restricts, or modifies the scope or character of the audit.

2. Interference with the selection or application of audit procedures of the selection of activities to be examined.

3. Denial of access to such sources of information as books, records, and supporting documents or denial or opportunity to obtain explanations by officials and employees of the governmental organization, program, or activity under audit.

4. Interference in the assignment of personnel to the audit task.

5. Retaliatory restrictions placed on funds or other resources dedicated to the audit operation.

6. Activity to overrule or significantly influence the auditors judgment as to the appropriate content of the audit report.

7. Influences that place the auditor’s continued employment in jeopardy for reasons other than competency or the need for audit services.

\(^2\)Some of these situations may constitute justifiable limitations on the scope of the work. In such cases the limitation should be identified in the auditor’s report.

8. Unreasonable restriction on the time allowed to competently complete an audit assignment.

Organizational Impairments

(a) The auditor’s independence can be affected by his or her place within the organizational structure of governments. Auditors employed by Federal, State, or local government units may be subject to policy direction from superiors who are involved either directly or indirectly in the government management process. To achieve maximum independence such auditors and the audit organization itself not only should report to the highest practicable echelon within their government but should be organizationally located outside the line-management function of the entity under audit.

(b) These auditors should also be sufficiently removed from political pressures to ensure that they can conduct their auditing objectively and can report their conclusions completely without fear of censure. Whenever feasible they should be under a system which will place decisions on compensation, training, job tenure, and advancement on a merit basis.

(c) When independent public accountants or other independent professionals are engaged to perform work that includes inquiries into compliance with applicable laws and regulations, efficiency and economy of operations, or achievement of program results, they should be engaged by someone other than the officials responsible for the direction of the effort being audited. This practice removes the pressure that may result if the auditor must criticize the performance of those by whom he or she was engaged. To remove this obstacle to independence, governments should arrange to have auditors engaged by officials not directly involved in operations to be audited.


APPENDIX B TO SUBPART B OF PART 668—APPENDIX I, STANDARDS FOR AUDIT OF GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS, PROGRAMS, ACTIVITIES, AND FUNCTIONS (GAO)

Qualifications of Independent Auditors Engaged by Governmental Organizations

(a) When outside auditors are engaged for assignments requiring the expression of an opinion on financial reports of governmental organizations, only fully qualified public accountants should be employed. The type of qualifications, as stated by the Comptroller General, deemed necessary for financial audits of governmental organizations and programs is quoted below:
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“Such audits shall be conducted * * * by independent certified public accountants or by independent licensed public accountants, licensed on or before December 31, 1970, who are certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States: Except that independent public accountants licensed to practice by such regulatory authority after December 31, 1970, and persons who although not so certified or licensed, meet, in the opinion of the Secretary, standards of education and experience representative of the highest prescribed by the licensing authorities of the several States which provide for the continuing licensing of public accountants and which are prescribed by the Secretary in appropriate regulations may perform such audits until December 31, 1975; Provided, That if the Secretary deems it necessary in the public interest, he may prescribe by regulations higher standard than those required for the practice of public accounting by the regulatory authorities of the States.”¹

(b) The standards for examination and evaluation require consideration of applicable laws and regulations in the auditor’s examination. The standards for reporting require a statement in the auditor’s report regarding any significant instances of noncompliance disclosed by his or her examination and evaluation work. What is to be included in this statement requires judgment. Significant instances of noncompliance, even those not resulting in legal liability to the audited entity, should be included. Minor procedural noncompliance need not be disclosed.

(c) Although the reporting standard is generally on an exception basis—that only noncompliance need be reported—it should be recognized that governmental entities often want positive statements regarding whether or not the auditor’s tests disclosed instances of noncompliance. This is particularly true in grant programs where authorizing agencies frequently want assurance in the auditor’s report that this matter has been considered. For such audits, auditors should obtain an understanding with the authorizing agency as to the extent to which such positive comments on compliance are desired. When coordinated audits are involved, the audit program should specify the extent of comments that the auditor is to make regarding compliance.

(d) When noncompliance is reported, the auditor should place the findings in proper perspective. The extent of instances of noncompliance should be related to the number of cases examined to provide the reader with a basis for judging the prevalence of noncompliance.

¹Letter (B–138144, September 15, 1970) from the Comptroller General to the heads of Federal departments and agencies. The reference to “Secretary” means the head of the department or agency.