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Upcoming Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Fraud Conference</td>
<td>February 16, 2018</td>
<td>Melville Marriott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual IT Conference</td>
<td>March 23, 2018</td>
<td>Melville Marriott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Conference</td>
<td>April 27, 2018</td>
<td>Melville Marriott</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See page 15 for further details.

For more information, go to:  
https://chapters.theiia.org/long-island/Pages/default.aspx
The calendar reads December, which means the start of the holiday season. For most of us, this means spending quality time with family and friends, enjoying the festivities of the season, and maybe even singing Christmas carols at home, in a show, or at a place of worship.

The holiday season is also a time when many of us purchase presents from online stores. In doing so, we need to be cautious that some online stores are actually fake sites created up by cyber criminals. The SANS Institute, a cybersecurity research and education organization, has created the following list of ways to protect yourself:

• When possible, purchase from websites that you already know, trust, and have done business with previously.
• Verify the website has a legitimate mailing address and a phone number for sales or support-related questions. If the site looks suspicious, call and speak to a human. If you can’t get a hold of someone to talk to, then that is the first big sign you are dealing with a fake website.
• Look for obvious warning signs, like deals that are obviously too good to be true or poor grammar and spelling.
• Be very suspicious if a website appears to be an exact replica of a well-known website you have used in the past, but its domain name or the name of the store is slightly different. For example, you may be used to shopping online at Amazon, whose website is https://www.amazon.com. But be very suspicious if you find yourself at websites pretending to be Amazon, such as http://store-amazoncom.com.
• Type the store’s name or URL into a search engine and see what other people have said about the website in the past. Look for terms like “fraud,” “scam,” “never again,” or “fake.” A lack of reviews can also be a sign indicating that the website is very new and might not be trustworthy.
• Before purchasing any items, make sure your connection to the website is encrypted. Most browsers show a connection is encrypted by having a lock and/or the letters HTTPS in green right before the website’s name.

Enjoy the season, however you plan to spend it, and remember to stay safe while doing so.

We are off to a great start to the 2017/2018 Chapter year. The turnout has been wonderful so far and we have had excellent speakers to present on interesting and relevant topics.

As a reminder, we will not be having any conferences during December and January, as these months have shown lower attendance in the past, primarily due to holidays, year-end financial closings, and winter weather. We will reconvene on February 16th with our Annual Fraud Conference. This conference, which is dedicated towards sharpening our fraud awareness and detection skills, has always proven to be a highlight of the Chapter’s conferences offered annually, and also one of the most well attended.

Our IT and Annual Conferences will close out the Chapter year in March and April 2018, respectively. Stay tuned for more information on these programs in upcoming newsletters.

Please reach out to myself or a Board member should you need any assistance. I can be reached at 1-516-349-2050 or rocky.shankar@pseg.com.

Happy Holidays!

Kind regards,

Rocky Shankar, CIA, CCSA, CRMA
November Conference Recap
Risk Management in an Audit Environment

Event Summary

Our November Conference ‘Risk Management in an Audit Environment’ featured topics on risk appetite, documenting risk assessments, the new COSO ERM and internal audit implications, a Compliance Officer’s view on managing risk, and leveraging data analytics in risk assessment, audit fieldwork and reporting. These presentations enabled CRMA attendees to earn the necessary CPE credits they need as part of their CRMA certification ongoing requirement. A special thanks to three of our Board members, Maria Michaelson, Alice Seoylemezian and Larry Karp, for helping to put together the conference. We also had a very nice turnout of 142 attendees.

Photos from the November ‘Risk Management in an Audit Environment’ Program

Photos from November ‘Risk Management in an Audit Environment’ Program show featured speakers and attendees

Left: Rocky Shankar and Biju Beegum, with newly certified CIA Megan Muccio.

Center: Chris Wright, Protiviti, speaking on ‘Risk Appetite’

Right: Dr. Paul Walker speaking on 'New COSO ERM and Internal Audit Implications'.

Top: At far left is Chris Wardak, PwC, and far right Lorenz Schmid, PwC, (these two individuals are speaking on 'Leveraging Data Analytics in Risk Assessment, Audit Fieldwork and Reporting)

Bottom Left: At far left is Antonio Fernandez, PSEG (Antonio is speaking on 'A Compliance Officer’s View on Managing Risk)

Bottom Right: Dave Erickson, IBM Watson Financial Services Group (Dave is speaking on 'Documenting Risk Assessments')

Wendy LaBarbera, Internal Audit Manager at Catholic Health Services of Long Island, was the Survey Winner, via a random drawing, for responding to the survey for the Risk Management in an Audit Environment Conference. A gift card from the IIA Long Island Chapter is on its way to Wendy. Please note that a random drawing is held after every seminar. Respond to the survey and you can also be a winner.
I am happy to report that we have filled our needs for a non-Board member to be on the Finance Committee and also for an individual to take pictures at our conferences for publication in our newsletter, website and other Chapter materials.

We still have other Board position opportunities, so if you would like to volunteer within the Long Island Chapter please do not hesitate to contact me - (Rocky Shankar at rocky.shankar@pseg.com).

Below is the program schedule for the remainder of the 2017/2018 Chapter year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Location</th>
<th>Format CPE/CPDs</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Prices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 16, 2018 Friday Melville Marriott</td>
<td>Full Day (Breakfast and Lunch) 8 CPE/CPDs</td>
<td><strong>Annual Fraud Conference</strong></td>
<td>Member - $150 Non-member - $200 Student - $30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23, 2018 Friday Melville Marriott</td>
<td>Full Day (Breakfast and Lunch) 8 CPE/CPDs</td>
<td><strong>Annual IT Conference</strong></td>
<td>Member - $150 Non-member - $200 Student - $30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27, 2018 Friday Melville Marriott</td>
<td>Full Day (Breakfast and Lunch) 8 CPE/CPDs</td>
<td><strong>Annual Conference</strong></td>
<td>Member - $150 Non-member - $200 Student - $30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continental Breakfast* is served at 8:00 a.m. Registration for individual events generally opens 20 days before each event. For more information go to: https://chapters.theiia.org/long-island/Pages/default.aspx
Five Personality Faces of Procurement Fraud Risk

By Tom Caulfield, CFE, CIG, CIGI; and Sheryl Steckler, CIG, CIGI
www.Procurement-Integrity.net

Here are five employee faces to look for when trying to prevent procurement fraud, abuse and noncompliance. Their aberrant behavior can lead to manipulated purchasing systems plus major financial and reputational losses, potential litigation and/or contract termination.

Let's travel back to the early 1990s. Darian, a midlevel federal government employee, has an extensive background in contracting. He’s leading a two-phase advanced computerization research and development (R&D) project of specialized software tools for a U.S. federal agency.

The project’s milestone dates for the first phase (R&D) are planned from January 1991 through June 1994. The second phase, a nationwide implementation of the software tools that the agency had developed during the first phase, is planned for July 1994. The agency plans to implement the tools under a government contract with a base value of $4.5 million.

In July 1993, Darian (not his real name) receives an unexpected telephone call from his boss’s boss. The big boss wants to let Darian know the division appeared to be ending the year with just over $4.5 million in unexpended funds and asks if the computerization project could transition from R&D to integration a year early. Darian is a good mid-level employee and he hopes to eventually move up the government management chain, so he answers with a confident “absolutely!”

The big boss thanks Darian for his dedication to the mission’s success but wants to ensure that Darian is aware that he must commit the funds to a contracted vendor before the end of November 1993.

Darian realizes that he has only five months (July 1993 to November 1993) to complete all the required paperwork and convince a Contracting Officer (CO) to have a contract awarded, which is extremely difficult. In a best-case scenario, the average full and open federal government competitive contract competition takes six to eight months.

Darian quickly visits the division’s CO and requests his assistance in getting a vendor on contract to implement the newly developed software tools at multiple locations across the U.S.

The CO asks how many companies can satisfy the requirements. Darian, who knows that any answer other than “one” will result in a requirement for a “full and open completion,” decides to tell the CO only one company is qualified to satisfy the implementation requirements. The CO says that if there is only one qualified company, then the procurement regulations would require a sole-source justification to be drafted and approved by management, which Darian acknowledges (a sole-source procurement is a contract entered into without a competitive process, based on a written justification that only one known source exists or that only one single supplier can fulfill the requirements).
Darian then asks the CO for a copy of the instructions to complete a sole-source justification, a blank sole-source justification form and an example of a previous sole-source justification that the CO has approved.

Darian contacts the computerization company he believes is best qualified to complete the integration portion of the project. He meets with a representative of the company at a local restaurant to provide them with the government documents. He requests the company to complete the narrative portions of the contracting forms and to highlight its technical capabilities. Darian is well aware that soliciting the company to complete the government documents is a direct violation of the federal procurement rules, but he believed he had no choice if he wants the contract awarded on time.

The company completes the sole-source justification forms and Darian signs them confirming all the information in the documents are accurate and truthful.

Darian gives the completed contracting documents to the CO and waits for a confirmation that the sole-source justification was sufficient, which would allow Darian’s preferred contractor to be awarded the $4.5 million contract. The CO reviews the justifications and tells Darian the justification isn’t adequate and needs additional details.

Quick-thinking Darian decides to add a new technical requirement that the selected contractor has to be geographically located within 100 miles of the government headquarters. This requirement is completely unnecessary but is compelling enough to convince the CO to accept the sole-source justification.

Darian has spent two years on this R&D project. He’s confident no one knows more about this specialized effort than he does, and therefore he believes that he alone should decide the company that’s best suited for the final integration of the software tools. For that reason alone, Darian deliberately and knowingly violates the federal procurement rules and solicits the company’s help in completing government documents he was solely responsible to complete.

What’s the harm?
Darian didn’t receive anything of value from the company that won the sole-source contract, so he wasn’t involved in receiving a bribe. The company didn’t provide Darian with any gift after the award, so he didn’t receive any illegal gratuity. Darian didn’t have any financial interest in the company, so he didn’t violate the federal conflict of interest laws. Also, Darian wasn’t interested in leaving the government and working for the company that won the contract, so he didn’t violate any legal restrictions regarding post-government employment. And no one in his family worked for the company, so no conflict-of-interest violation was apparent.

No federal prosecutor would’ve attempted to charge Darian with a violation of the Procurement Integrity Act. He hadn’t violated any federal criminal or civil violations. Yes, he did violate the agency’s procurement rules, and he violated the federal employee ethics rules, but was that so bad? Wasn’t he totally motivated by his desire to accomplish the government’s mission? Wouldn’t many describe Darian’s actions as “great initiative, but poor judgment?”
**Best product at best price thwarted**

What if someone had noticed Darian sitting in a restaurant providing the contractor with government documents, and then that person had notified the government? Wouldn’t the government have initiated an investigation? And if investigators had searched the contracting records and discovered that Darian was leading a multimillion-dollar, sole-source contracting effort, wouldn’t that have justified the investigation to continue?

Wouldn’t investigators have conducted an exhaustive search of Darian’s finances to attempt to find a motivation for some type of fraudulent scheme? Investigators would’ve had to eventually interview Darian. If they understood his personality type and why he was motivated to deliberately violate internal procurement policies, they’d probably be more effective in collecting vital evidence, and if substantiated, ensure some appropriate punitive and corrective actions.

Although Darian didn’t violate the law, he clearly violated federal government ethics rules. A disciplinary board surely would’ve formally reprimanded him and possibly removed him from government service. The CO who was quick to accept the written justification even with last-minute additions and didn’t question the validity of the requirements might have been reprimanded and retrained on his professional responsibilities.

Darian’s statement to the CO that “only one company could satisfy the requirements” wasn’t accurate. In 1993, three companies advertised capabilities that were consistent with the scope of work required for this government contract. One of these companies learned of the sole-source decision and informally raised concerns to Darian’s management. However, that company’s concerns ended there.

Because the agency didn’t use a competitive procurement process the government will never know if it had received the best product at the best price. If the company with the legitimate concern had formalized its complaint, the contract probably would’ve been delayed, the computerization efforts would’ve stalled, and the government could’ve been required to formally complete the contract thereby spending more time and wasting funds.

The U.S. government never pursued Darian’s ethical violations because it didn’t know about his actions until years after he left government service. He’d told a government employee about what he’d accomplished by circumventing the rules, and the employee told his supervisors. A government examination confirmed Darian’s accounts. However, the government didn’t begin a formal examination because of the lapse in time, Darian no longer worked for the government, the contract period of performance was completed and everyone was satisfied with the contract deliverables.
Five personality risk profiles

Darian’s case illustrates one of five personality risk profiles (“well-intentioned noncompliance employee”) of those who deliberately manipulate portions of their organizations’ procurement processes.

Some employees who violate their procurement processes are performing their misdeeds so they can commit fraud.

However, others, as in this case illustration, will deliberately violate their procurement processes not for fraud but to enhance the efficiency of operations or so they rationalize. We call this procurement abuse. (Abuse is a contracting action, like Darian’s inappropriate sole source, that falls short of a criminal or civil violation. However, a prudent procurement professional wouldn’t consider it, given the same facts and circumstances, a reasonable or a necessary business practice.)

These procurement process abusers might not have any malicious intent, but they’re placing victimized entities at significant risk of contract termination, reputational damage, financial loss and potential litigation. Abuse also gives potential fraudsters the incentive to commit crimes.

We’ve identified these five personality risk profiles after decades of practical experience and hundreds of fraud investigations and examinations and/or assessments of procurement integrity controls.

When we understand the underlying motivations and self-justification for these personalities, we’ll be more effective in promoting procurement integrity and can help prevent and deter fraud.

Procurement fraud, abuse and acts of noncompliance to procurement policy are, by their nature, products of human behavior that employees perform with willful intent.

Individuals who fall into these personality risk profiles create different risks or vulnerabilities. As a professional working in the prevention and detection of procurement fraud and abuse you’ll eventually interact with these profiles, so you must understand their individual motivations for their actions:

• Situational fraudster.
• Deviant fraudster.
• Multi-interest abuser.
• Well-intentioned noncompliance employee (Darian’s face).
• Disengaged noncompliance employee.
Situational fraudster

This employee, who many consider the typical fraudster, appears to be frustrated at work, has rationalized their perceived entitlement to an illegal enrichment and perpetrates the fraud when the right occasion occurs, usually because of weak procurement integrity controls. When the situational fraudster is caught, other employees aren’t surprised that the individual was involved in the fraud because of the person’s poor work attitude.

Situational fraudsters have no intention of committing any type of fraud when they join their organizations, and often have no criminal records. They usually become upset with events at work that have a direct financial impact on them such as being passed over for a promotion or transferred to a lower position. They perceive these events as unjust, rationalize that they aren’t deserving of their financial losses and observe a weakness in organizations’ procurement integrity controls that they decide to exploit.

As a hypothetical example of a situational fraudster, let’s examine a government agency (GA) employee (we’ll call him Sam) who’s overseeing a contractor’s performance. This employee then becomes upset because he’s losing one day of pay each week for 10 weeks due to sequestration. (Sequestration is the employment of automatic, across-the-board spending cuts in the face of annual budget deficits.)

Sam rationalizes that the failure of elected officials to approve a budget was the only reason he lost a portion of his pay. While his frustration grows, the contractor he’s been overseeing for several years offers to “lend” him a small amount of money just to help, which Sam perceives as his only solution for paying down his expected debt. What started out as a “loan” with Sam’s potential intent to repay becomes an offer of a “gift” from the contractor. Sam feels gratitude and returns the “favor” by providing sensitive information of a future procurement opportunity.

Sam realizes how easy it was to supply the sensitive information, so he accepts additional payments from the contractor for more sensitive information. Sam doesn’t intend to become a situational fraudster. But he has a perceived pressure to regain his lost income from sequestration. And he saw the opportunity of providing the sensitive information as a solution, which he rationalized that he deserved.

The “gifts” are legally defined as bribes. The contractor’s payments will continue if Sam rationalizes them and believes he has a low probability of being caught.

You might structure your interview plan of Sam, the situational fraudster, around the theme of the elected officials’ failure as the catalyst for Sam’s actions.
Deviant fraudsters

Often described as “wheeler dealers,” deviant fraudsters are the most serious threat to organizations because they can cause the most damage. Organizations perceive them as some of the hardest workers or best contractors even though they’re always searching for opportunities to commit fraud.

They live behind “veils of trust” from others within the organization. A deviant fraudster has a strong group of advocates who’ll deny assertions that the fraudster is involved with any wrongdoing. Internal deviant fraudsters will take only a few days of leave each year. They seem to have their hands in every process within their business units.

An example of an external deviant fraudster would be a corrupt contractor who offered our previous GA, Sam, the situational fraudster, the “loan” that turned into a “gift” that rolled over into a bribe.

Multi-interest abuser

Most procurement fraud authors and trainers talk almost exclusively about situational and deviant fraudsters, but we should consider the vulnerabilities of other types.

Multi-interest abusers aren’t by definition fraudsters, they aren’t seeking any financial advantages but they still manipulate procurement processes to advance their interests and/or the interests of others. They help friends or family members obtain contracts or ensure awards go to their preferred contractors.

In some countries or cultures, family members of a new government employee expect that person to supply them with jobs or contracts.

Multi-interest abusers of the procurement process inappropriately draft specifications to particular contractors, push the need for sole-source justifications to avoid fully competitive processes or slant technical evaluations to specific bidders. They might support the continued use of incumbent contractors mostly because they enjoy good working relationships with them, but the contractors might not be supplying the best deals.

An abuser who drafts an unwarranted sole-source procurement to their family members or friends can rationalize that the organization is getting the contract service it needed, so their actions aren’t harming the organization.

These abusers raise significant risks to procurement processes because of the increased risks of contract protests from other contractors or forcing organizations to pay higher costs because of noncompetitive processes. Of course, if personal financial gain motivated employees to inappropriately act then we’d categorize them as procurement fraudsters and not abusers.
Well-intentioned noncompliance employee

Organizations rarely consider this personality type (or the next one, disengaged noncompliance employee), but they present significant risks to procurements and are harder to identify than fraudsters or abusers.

Fraudsters and abusers create direct financial losses or damages to reputations or create media embarrassments, but noncompliance employees create indirect and unnecessary exposures to fraud and potential contract disputes. They can waste organizations’ resources and funds and create countless opportunities for fraudsters. You must address the vulnerabilities these employees create.

Well-intentioned noncompliance employees believe their willful deviations from procurement processes cause no harm but actually help their organizations become more efficient and obtain better services. They’re totally focused on helping their organizations.

These employees normally have been with their organizations for several years and have good working knowledge of procurement processes or requirements and therefore know exactly how to advance their outcomes. They consciously decide not to identify to the procurement staff the true scope of requirements, which ensures contracts remain under a particular dollar threshold and expedites awards. These employees also know the key descriptions in purchasing documents to use (or not use) to avoid any additional procurement steps. (Think about Darian’s actions in our opening case.)

Another example: A well-intentioned noncompliance employee works on developing a product over the course of several years, which an external contractor is ready to manufacture. The employee is familiar with this contractor that historically provides good service and has an outstanding record of customer service.

The procurement staff asks the employee to develop technical evaluation criteria for a fully competitive procurement. The employee disregards the policy that forbids the technical evaluation criteria to be tailored to any specific contractor and intentionally develops technical requirements that best matches the contractor that he prefers. The employee easily rationalizes the resulting benefit in efficiency and potential services versus complying with the procurement policy.
Disengaged noncompliance employees

They are usually disgruntled or dissatisfied with their organizations, and knowingly decide to expend little or minimal effort on specific procurement steps. These employees will disregard their responsibilities to verify contractors’ bonds, to examine contractors’ performance records or to confirm contractors’ deliverables prior to approving payment.

If deviant fraudsters observe disengaged noncompliance employees’ disregard for oversight, they could theoretically submit false or inflated cost data. Deviant fraudsters, who observe disengaged product inspectors not performing required testing, could substitute low-cost parts during manufacturing.

Gallup workforce polls clearly demonstrate the statistical probability of these disgruntled disengaged employees working anywhere within an organization.

Recognize the faces

Procurement fraud, abuse and non-compliance to procurement policy is no accident. They’re byproducts of the unusual and sometimes deviant human behavior with different motivations and justifications for their actions than you and me. Because every global organization, public or private, faces the risk from each of the five personality risk profiles, you must discover and differentiate the faces to develop mitigation steps and assist management in detecting, deterring and preventing bad behavior.

Tom Caulfield, CFE, CIG, CIGI, is chief operating officer and co-owner of Procurement Integrity Consulting Services, LLC. He’s an instructor for the ACFE’s Contract and Procurement Fraud seminar. His email address is: Tom@procurement-integrity.net

Sheryl Steckler, CIG, CICI, is president and co-owner of Procurement Integrity Consulting Services, LLC. Her email address is: Sheryl@procurement-integrity.net

The Long Island Chapter would like to thank Tom Caulfield and Sheryl Steckler for allowing us to reprint this fraud article in our Newsletter.
End-of-Year CPE Reporting

CPE/CPD credits are required for end-of-year reporting to keep your IIA designation(s) active, report now. The deadline is Dec. 31, 2017. North America members report CPE for free.

If you do not report, your certification/qualification goes inactive, and as a result, you are no longer approved to represent yourself as a certified individual.

Depending on your IIA designation, you will need to report 20 to 40 CPE/CPD credits each year to maintain your certified status.

NEW! Ethics CPE Requirement

In 2018, two of your CPE/CPD credits must be earned in Ethics. While this is not a requirement for 2017, we recommend you begin planning now. The IIA currently provides Ethics for Internal Auditors, an OnDemand course that can help you obtain these CPE. The IIA will be adding additional ethics training options throughout 2018 and beyond.
December Chapter Book of the Month

This new edition aligns with the 2017 IPPF, providing tools to streamline your QAIP process — from collection and analysis through final report prep. It captures required changes in professional guidance and features insights of internal audit professionals.


New Tools to Help Assess Fraud

This practice guide describes fraud characteristics, and how to identify and assess risks when planning individual audit engagements. It discusses how to brainstorm fraud scenarios and evaluate fraud risks to determine which ones should be evaluated further.


New! QIAL Case Studies Sample Guide

Coming December 2017, QIAL candidates can purchase the new QIAL Case Studies Sample Guide through CCMS. The case studies included in the guide are representative examples of the type and length of content candidates might expect to find on a current case study.

To learn more, contact Joelle.McFaddin@theiia.org
2018 General Audit Management (GAM) Conference
March 12–14, 2018
Aria Resort & Casino / Las Vegas, NV

For 38 years, GAM has been the essential experience for empowering audit industry leaders to be influential, indispensable and informative! The goal of the GAM conference is to provide an opportunity for attendees to engage with their peers and the industries best and brightest thought leaders who will share their perspectives on how to best position audit leaders to evolve their knowledge and skills to better serve their companies.

Attendees can earn up to 16.5 CPE credits during 40 general and concurrent session led by renowned presenters who will help you be innovative and impactful, as you face the uncomfortable or unfamiliar.

Upcoming Training Opportunities

December 8, 2017
Root Cause Analysis for Auditors Conference
Baruch College, 55 Lexington Avenue 24th St., NY, NY

December 11, 2017
Orlando Seminar
Disney’s Contemporary Resort and Hotel, Orlando, FL

December 12, 2017
Austin Seminar
Austin, TX

February 13, 2018
Phoenix Seminar
Phoenix, AZ
The global business environment and the internal audit profession have undergone great change. To ensure that the Certified Internal Auditor® (CIA®) exam remains current and valid, The IIA conducted a global job analysis study. The study results confirmed the need to update the current three-part CIA exam and drove the content, design, and structure (CIA syllabi) of the next version of the exam. The updated CIA exam, based on the revised syllabi, will be released in January 2019 in English only. Translated exam parts are expected to be released beginning April 2019, and a translation timeline will be posted online soon. In the meantime, CIA and CRMA* candidates may sit for the current exams until the revised exams become available in respective languages. Please visit the CIA Exam Syllabi Revisions webpage to prepare for the upcoming changes, which includes a CIA Exam Syllabi Revisions Handbook, answers to Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), and information on:

• How and why the CIA exam is changing.

• What is changing and when changes might impact you.

• A comparison of the existing exam syllabi to the updated version, including noteworthy elements and a reference list to aid you in your exam preparation.

If you still have questions after reviewing this information, please contact Customer.Relations@theiia.org or call +1-407-937-1111.

* NOTE: This exam update affects candidates pursuing the Certification in Risk Management Assurance because one of the requirements for earning that certification is passing Part I of the CIA exam.
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