



NZ AUDITING  
AND ASSURANCE  
STANDARDS BOARD

## **PROFESSIONAL AND ETHICAL STANDARD 3 (Amended)**

### **Quality Control for Firms that Perform Audits and Reviews of Financial Statements, and Other Assurance Engagements (PES 3 (Amended))**

**Systems of quality control in compliance with this Professional and Ethical Standard are required for application from 1 January 2014.**

This Standard was issued by the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board of the External Reporting Board pursuant to section 24(1)(b) of the Financial Reporting Act 1993. This Standard is a Regulation for the purpose of the Regulations (Disallowance) Act 1989.

**This compilation was prepared in June 2020 and incorporates amendments up to and including June 2020.**

COPYRIGHT

© External Reporting Board (“XRB”) 2013

This XRB standard contains copyright material and reproduces, with the permission of the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC), parts of the corresponding international standard issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”), and published by IFAC. Reproduction within New Zealand in unaltered form (retaining this notice) is permitted for personal and non-commercial use subject to the inclusion of an acknowledgement of the source.

Requests and enquiries concerning reproduction and rights for commercial purposes within New Zealand should be addressed to the Chief Executive, External Reporting Board at the following email address: [enquiries@xrb.govt.nz](mailto:enquiries@xrb.govt.nz)

All existing rights (including copyrights) in this material outside of New Zealand are reserved by IFAC, with the exception of the right to reproduce for the purposes of personal use or other fair dealing. Further information can be obtained from IFAC at [www.ifac.org](http://www.ifac.org) or by writing to [permissions@ifac.org](mailto:permissions@ifac.org)

ISBN 978-1-927174-39-5

## PROFESSIONAL AND ETHICAL STANDARD 3 (Amended)

**QUALITY CONTROL FOR FIRMS THAT PERFORM AUDITS AND REVIEWS OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, AND OTHER ASSURANCE ENGAGEMENTS***Issued by the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board***CONTENTS**

	Paragraph
<b>History of Amendments</b>	
<b>Introduction</b>	
Scope of this Professional and Ethical Standard.....	1-NZ3.1
Authority of this Professional and Ethical Standard .....	4-9
Effective Date .....	10-NZ10.2
<b>Objective</b> .....	11
<b>Definitions</b> .....	12- NZ12.9
<b>Requirements</b>	
Applying, and Complying with, Relevant Requirements .....	13-15
Elements of a System of Quality Control .....	16-17
Leadership Responsibilities for Quality within the Firm .....	18-19
Relevant Ethical Requirements .....	20-25
Acceptance and Continuance of Client Relationships and Specific Engagements .....	26-28
Human Resources .....	29-31
Engagement Performance .....	32-47
Monitoring .....	48-56
Documentation of the System of Quality Control .....	57-59
<b>Application and Other Explanatory Material</b>	
Applying, and Complying with, Relevant Requirements .....	A1
Establishment of a System of Quality Control .....	A2-A3
Leadership Responsibilities for Quality within the Firm .....	A4-A6
Relevant Ethical Requirements .....	A7-A17
Acceptance and Continuance of Client Relationships and Specific Engagements .....	A18-A23
Human Resources .....	A24-A31
Engagement Performance .....	A32-A63
Monitoring .....	A64-A72

Documentation of the System of Quality Control .....	A73-A75
Accompanying Attachment: Similarity to International and Australian Standards on Quality Control .....	35-36
Appendix: Amendments to Other Pronouncements .....	37-38

---

Professional and Ethical Standard 3 (Amended), “Quality Control for Firms that Perform Audits and Reviews of Financial Statements, and Other Assurance Engagements” should be read in conjunction with ISA (NZ) 200, “Overall Objectives of the Independent Auditor and the Conduct of an Audit in Accordance with International Standards on Auditing (New Zealand)”.

## History of Amendments

### Table of pronouncements – PES 3 (Amended) *Quality Control for Firms that Perform Audits and Reviews of Financial Statements, and Other Assurance Engagements*

This table lists the pronouncements establishing and amending PES 3 (Amended).

<b>Pronouncements</b>	<b>Date approved</b>	<b>Effective date</b>
PES 3 (Amended) <i>Quality Control for Firms that Perform Audits and Reviews of Financial Statements, and Other Assurance Engagements</i>	December 2012	Systems of quality control in compliance with this standard are required to be established for application from 1 January 2014.
Amendments to the Auditing and Assurance Standards: Omnibus Amendments (Legislative Update)	February 2014	Effective for assurance engagements relating to financial statements for periods beginning on or after 1 April 2014.
Conforming amendments to ISAs (NZ) and other pronouncements (Auditor Reporting)	September 2015	Effective for audits of financial statements for periods ending on or after 15 December 2016.
Amendments to Standards Issued by the NZAuASB: Annual Improvements 2016	October 2016	Effective on 15 December 2016
Conforming Amendments to ISAs (NZ) and Other Pronouncements (NOCLAR)	October 2016	Effective for audits of financial statements for periods ending on or after 15 December 2107
Amendments to Professional and Ethical Standard 1 (Revised) Provisions Addressing the Long Association of Personnel with an Assurance Client and Amendments to the Definition of a Public Interest Entity	February 2018	Effective for audits and reviews of financial statements for periods beginning on or after 15 December 2018
Conforming Amendments to Auditing and Assurance Standards as a Result of the Revised Professional and Ethical Standard 1	June 2020	Effective on 15 July 2020

<b>Table of Amended Paragraphs in PES 3 (Amended)</b>		
<b>Paragraph affected</b>	<b>How affected</b>	<b>By ... [date]</b>
NZ12.4, NZ12.5, 35, 38, A41, A44-A47	Amended	Amendments to the Auditing and Assurance Standards: Omnibus Amendments (Legislative Update) [Feb 2014]
NZ12.4, NZ12.5, NZ35.1, NZ38.1, NZA41.1, NZA44.1-NZA47.1	Amended	Conforming amendments to ISAs (NZ) and other pronouncements (Auditor Reporting) [September 2015]
NZ12.1, NZ12.7	Amended	Amendments to Standards Issued by the NZAuASB: Annual Improvements 2016 [October 2016]

A56	Amended	Conforming Amendments to ISAs (NZ) and Other Pronouncements (NOCLAR) [October 2016]
NZ12.7	Amended	Amendments to Professional and Ethical Standard 1 (Revised) Provisions Addressing the Long Association of Personnel with an Assurance Client and Amendments to the Definition of a Public Interest Entity [February 2018]
NZ12.9, 21, 22, 25, A7-A13, NZA14.1	Amended	Conforming Amendments to Auditing and Assurance Standards as a Result of the Revised Professional and Ethical Standard 1 [June 2020]

## Introduction

### Scope of this Professional and Ethical Standard

1. [Amended by the NZAuASB].
- NZ1.1 This Professional and Ethical Standard deals with a firm's responsibilities for its system of quality control for audits and reviews of financial statements, and other assurance engagements. This Professional and Ethical Standard is to be read in conjunction with relevant ethical requirements.
2. Other pronouncements of the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (NZAuASB) set out additional standards and guidance on the responsibilities of firm personnel regarding quality control procedures for specific types of engagements. ISA (NZ) 220<sup>1</sup>, for example, deals with quality control procedures for audits of financial statements.
3. A system of quality control consists of policies designed to achieve the objective set out in paragraph 11 and the procedures necessary to implement and monitor compliance with those policies.
- NZ3.1 This standard is not intended to detract from responsibilities which may be imposed by law or regulation.

### Authority of this Professional and Ethical Standard

4. [Amended by the NZAuASB].
- NZ4.1 This Professional and Ethical Standard applies to all firms of assurance practitioners in respect of audits and reviews of financial statements, and other assurance engagements. The nature and extent of the policies and procedures developed by an individual firm to comply with this Professional and Ethical Standard will depend on various factors such as the size and operating characteristics of the firm, and whether it is part of a network.
5. This Professional and Ethical Standard contains the objective of the firm in following this Professional and Ethical Standard, and requirements designed to enable the firm to meet that stated objective. In addition, it contains related guidance in the form of application and other explanatory material, as discussed further in paragraph 8, and introductory material that provides context relevant to a proper understanding of this Professional and Ethical Standard, and definitions.
6. The objective provides the context in which the requirements of this Professional and Ethical Standard are set, and is intended to assist the firm in:
  - Understanding what needs to be accomplished; and
  - Deciding whether more needs to be done to achieve the objective.
7. The requirements of this Professional and Ethical Standard are expressed using "shall."
8. Where necessary, the application and other explanatory material provides further explanation of the requirements and guidance for carrying them out. In particular, it may:
  - Explain more precisely what a requirement means or is intended to cover.
  - Include examples of policies and procedures that may be appropriate in the circumstances.

---

<sup>1</sup> ISA (NZ) 220, *Quality Control for an Audit of Financial Statements*

While such guidance does not in itself impose a requirement, it is relevant to the proper application of the requirements. The application and other explanatory material may also provide background information on matters addressed in this Professional and Ethical Standard. Where appropriate, additional considerations specific to the public sector or smaller firms are included within the application and other explanatory material. These additional considerations assist in the application of the requirements in this Professional and Ethical Standard. They do not, however, limit or reduce the responsibility of the firm to apply and comply with the requirements in this Professional and Ethical Standard.

9. This Professional and Ethical Standard includes, under the heading “Definitions,” a description of the meanings attributed to certain terms for purposes of this Professional and Ethical Standard. These are provided to assist in the consistent application and interpretation of this Professional and Ethical Standard, and are not intended to override definitions that may be established for other purposes, whether in law, regulation or otherwise. Explanatory Guide Au4<sup>2</sup> issued by the NZAuASB includes the terms defined in this Professional and Ethical Standard. It also includes descriptions of other terms found in this Professional and Ethical Standard to assist in common and consistent interpretation.

### Effective Date

10. [Amended by the NZAuASB].

NZ10.1 Systems of quality control in compliance with this Professional and Ethical Standard are required to be established for application from 1 January 2014. [*Note: For the effective dates of paragraphs changed or added by an Amending Standard see the History of Amendments*].

NZ10.2 This Standard supersedes PES 3 *Quality Control* issued in 2011.

### Objective

11. The objective of the firm is to establish and maintain a system of quality control to provide it with reasonable assurance that:
  - (a) The firm and its personnel comply with standards issued by the External Reporting Board or the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and applicable legal and regulatory requirements; and
  - (b) Reports issued by the firm or engagement partners are appropriate in the circumstances.

### Definitions

12. In this Professional and Ethical Standard, the following terms have the meanings attributed below:

[NZ12.1] Assurance engagement - An engagement in which an assurance practitioner aims to obtain sufficient appropriate evidence in order to express a conclusion designed to enhance the degree of confidence of the intended users other than the responsible party about the subject matter information (that is, the outcome of the measurement or evaluation of an underlying subject matter against criteria).

[NZ12.2] Assurance practitioner – A person or an organisation, whether in public practice, industry, commerce or the public sector, appointed or engaged to undertake assurance engagements.

---

<sup>2</sup> EG Au4, *Glossary of Terms*.



- (a) Date of report – The date selected by the assurance practitioner to date the report.
- [NZ12.3] Engagement – In the context of this Professional and Ethical Standard, an assurance engagement.
- (b) Engagement documentation – The record of work performed, results obtained, and conclusions the assurance practitioner reached (terms such as “working papers” or “workpapers” are sometimes used).
- (c) Engagement partner<sup>3</sup> – The partner or other person in the firm who is responsible for the assurance engagement and its performance, and for the report that is issued on behalf of the firm, and who, where required, has the appropriate authority from a professional, legal or regulatory body.

[NZ] Considerations Specific to the Public Sector

Where a statutory officer (such as the Auditor-General) appoints an employee or other suitably qualified person (appointed auditor) to perform audits or other assurance services on that officer’s behalf, for the purposes of this Professional and Ethical Standard it is the appointed auditor who effectively discharges the obligations of the engagement partner. Any reference to the engagement partner should be interpreted accordingly.

- (d) [Amended by the NZAuASB. Refer to NZ 12.4].
- [NZ12.4] Engagement quality control review – A process designed to provide an objective evaluation, on or before the date of the report, of the significant judgements the engagement team made and the conclusions it reached in formulating the report. The engagement quality control review process is for audits of financial statements of FMC reporting entities considered to have a higher level of public accountability, and those other assurance engagements, if any, for which the firm has determined an engagement quality control review is required.
- (e) Engagement quality control reviewer – A partner, other person in the firm, suitably qualified external person, or a team made up of such individuals, none of whom is part of the engagement team, with sufficient and appropriate experience and authority to objectively evaluate the significant judgements the engagement team made and the conclusions it reached in formulating the report.
- (f) Engagement team – All partners and staff performing the engagement, and any individuals engaged by the firm or a network firm who perform procedures on the engagement. This excludes external experts engaged by the firm or by a network firm.
- (g) Firm – A sole practitioner, partnership or corporation or other entity undertaking assurance engagements.

[NZ] Considerations Specific to the Public Sector

Where a statutory officer (such as the Auditor-General) appoints an employee or other suitably qualified person (appointed auditor) to perform audits or other assurance services on that officer’s behalf, for the purposes of this Professional and Ethical Standard the term “firm” refers to the combination of the statutory officer, the

---

<sup>3</sup> “Engagement partner,” “partner,” and “firm” should be read as referring to their public sector equivalents where relevant.

appointed auditor, and, if applicable, the firm of which the appointed auditor is a partner, member or employee.

- [NZ12.5] FMC reporting entity considered to have a higher level of public accountability – A FMC Reporting Entity or a class of FMC reporting entity that is considered to have a higher level of public accountability than other FMC reporting entities:
- Under section 461K of the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013; or
  - By notice issued by the Financial Markets Authority (FMA) under section 461L(1)(1) of the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013.
- (h) Inspection – In relation to completed engagements, procedures designed to provide evidence of compliance by engagement teams with the firm’s quality control policies and procedures.
- (i) Listed entity – [Deleted by the NZAuASB].
- (j) Monitoring – A process comprising an ongoing consideration and evaluation of the firm’s system of quality control, including a periodic inspection of a selection of completed engagements, designed to provide the firm with reasonable assurance that its system of quality control is operating effectively.
- (k) Network firm – A firm or entity that belongs to a network.
- (l) Network – A larger structure:
- (i) That is aimed at cooperation, and
  - (ii) That is clearly aimed at profit or cost-sharing or shares common ownership, control or management, common quality control policies and procedures, common business strategy, the use of a common brand name, or a significant part of professional resources.
- (m) Partner – Any individual with authority to bind the firm with respect to the performance of an assurance engagement.
- (n) Personnel – Partners and staff.
- [NZ12.6] Public entity – Has the meaning as defined in section 5 (1) of the Public Audit Act 2001.
- [NZ12.7] Public interest entity – An entity that meets the Tier 1 criteria in accordance with XRB A1<sup>4</sup> and is not eligible to report in accordance with the accounting requirements of another tier.
- [NZ12.8] Public sector auditor – The Auditor-General or an auditor appointed by the Auditor-General to perform audits or other assurance services for public entities.
- (o) Professional standards – [Deleted by the NZAuASB].
  - (p) Reasonable assurance – In the context of this Professional and Ethical Standard, a high, but not absolute, level of assurance.
  - (q) [Amended by the NZAuASB. Refer to NZ12.9].
- [NZ12.9] Relevant ethical requirements – Ethical requirements to which the engagement team and engagement quality control reviewer are subject when undertaking audits or reviews of financial statements, or other assurance engagements, which ordinarily

---

<sup>4</sup> XRB A1 *Application of the Accounting Standards Framework*.

comprise the provisions of Professional and Ethical Standard 1 *International Code of Ethics for Assurance Practitioners (including International Independence Standards) (New Zealand)*, and other applicable law or regulation.

- (r) Staff – Professionals, other than partners, including any experts the firm employs.
- (s) Suitably qualified external person – An individual outside the firm with the competence and capabilities to act as an assurance engagement partner, for example a partner of another firm, or an employee (with appropriate experience) of either a professional body whose members may perform audits and reviews of historical financial information, or other assurance engagements, or of an organisation that provides relevant quality control services.

## Requirements

### Applying, and Complying with, Relevant Requirements

13. Personnel within the firm responsible for establishing and maintaining the firm’s system of quality control shall have an understanding of the entire text of this Professional and Ethical Standard, including its application and other explanatory material, to understand its objective and to apply its requirements properly.
14. The firm shall comply with each requirement of this Professional and Ethical Standard unless, in the circumstances of the firm, the requirement is not relevant to the services provided in respect of audits and reviews of financial statements, and other assurance engagements. (Ref: Para. A1)
15. The requirements are designed to enable the firm to achieve the objective stated in this Professional and Ethical Standard. The proper application of the requirements is therefore expected to provide a sufficient basis for the achievement of the objective. However, because circumstances vary widely and all such circumstances cannot be anticipated, the firm shall consider whether there are particular matters or circumstances that require the firm to establish policies and procedures in addition to those required by this Professional and Ethical Standard to meet the stated objective.

### Elements of a System of Quality Control

16. The firm shall establish and maintain a system of quality control that includes policies and procedures that address each of the following elements:
  - (a) Leadership responsibilities for quality within the firm.
  - (b) Relevant ethical requirements.
  - (c) Acceptance and continuance of client relationships and specific engagements.
  - (d) Human resources.
  - (e) Engagement performance.
  - (f) Monitoring.
17. The firm shall document its policies and procedures and communicate them to the firm’s personnel. (Ref: Para. A2-A3)

### Leadership Responsibilities for Quality within the Firm

18. The firm shall establish policies and procedures designed to promote an internal culture recognising that quality is essential in performing engagements. Such policies and

procedures shall require the firm's chief executive officer (or equivalent) or, if appropriate, the firm's managing board of partners (or equivalent) to assume ultimate responsibility for the firm's system of quality control. (Ref: Para. A4-A5)

19. The firm shall establish policies and procedures such that any person or persons assigned operational responsibility for the firm's system of quality control by the firm's chief executive officer or managing board of partners has sufficient and appropriate experience and ability, and the necessary authority, to assume that responsibility. (Ref: Para. A6)

### **Relevant Ethical Requirements**

20. The firm shall establish policies and procedures designed to provide it with reasonable assurance that the firm and its personnel comply with relevant ethical requirements. (Ref: Para. A7-A10)

### *Independence*

21. The firm shall establish policies and procedures designed to provide it with reasonable assurance that the firm, its personnel and, where applicable, others subject to independence requirements (including network firm personnel) maintain independence where required by relevant ethical requirements. Such policies and procedures shall enable the firm to: (Ref: Para. A10)

- (a) Communicate its independence requirements to its personnel and, where applicable, others subject to them; and
- (b) Identify threats to independence, evaluate whether the identified threats are at an acceptable level, and if not address them by eliminating the circumstances that create the threats, applying safeguards to reduce threats to an acceptable level, or withdrawing from the engagement, where withdrawal is possible under applicable law or regulation.

22. Such policies and procedures shall require: (Ref: Para. A10)

- (a) Engagement partners to provide the firm with relevant information about client engagements, including the scope of services, to enable the firm to evaluate the overall impact, if any, on independence requirements;
- (b) Personnel to promptly notify the firm of circumstances and relationships that create a threats to independence so that appropriate action can be taken; and
- (c) The accumulation and communication of relevant information to appropriate personnel so that:
  - (i) The firm and its personnel can readily determine whether they satisfy independence requirements;
  - (ii) The firm can maintain and update its records relating to independence; and
  - (iii) The firm can take appropriate action regarding identified threats to independence that are not at an acceptable level.

23. The firm shall establish policies and procedures designed to provide it with reasonable assurance that it is notified of breaches of independence requirements, and to enable it to take appropriate actions to resolve such situations. The policies and procedures shall include requirements for: (Ref: Para. A10)

- (a) Personnel to promptly notify the firm of independence breaches of which they become aware;
  - (b) The firm to promptly communicate identified breaches of these policies and procedures to:
    - (i) The engagement partner who, with the firm, needs to address the breach; and
    - (ii) Other relevant personnel in the firm and, where appropriate, the network, and those subject to the independence requirements who need to take appropriate action; and (Ref: Para. A14)
  - (c) Prompt communication to the firm, if necessary, by the engagement partner and the other individuals referred to in subparagraph 23(b)(ii) of the actions taken to resolve the matter, so that the firm can determine whether it should take further action.
24. At least annually, the firm shall obtain written confirmation of compliance with its policies and procedures on independence from all firm personnel required to be independent by relevant ethical requirements. (Ref: Para. A10-A11)
25. The firm shall establish policies and procedures: (Ref: Para A10)
- (a) Setting out criteria for determining the need to eliminate the circumstances that create a threat of long association with an entity to an acceptable level, when using the same senior personnel on an assurance engagement over a long period of time or criteria for applying safeguards to reduce the threat; and (Ref: Para. A14)
  - (b) Requiring, for audits of financial statements of public interest entities, the rotation of the key assurance partner, and where applicable, others subject to rotation requirements, after a specified period in compliance with relevant ethical requirements. (Ref: Para. A12-A17)

### **Acceptance and Continuance of Client Relationships and Specific Engagements**

26. The firm shall establish policies and procedures for the acceptance and continuance of client relationships and specific engagements, designed to provide the firm with reasonable assurance that it will only undertake or continue relationships and engagements where the firm:
- (a) Is competent to perform the engagement and has the capabilities, including time and resources, to do so; (Ref: Para. A18, A23)
  - (b) Can comply with relevant ethical requirements; and
  - (c) Has considered the integrity of the client, and does not have information that would lead it to conclude that the client lacks integrity. (Ref: Para. A19-A20, A23)
27. Such policies and procedures shall require:
- (a) The firm to obtain such information as it considers necessary in the circumstances before accepting an engagement with a new client, when deciding whether to continue an existing engagement, and when considering acceptance of a new engagement with an existing client. (Ref: Para. A21, A23)
  - (b) If a potential conflict of interest is identified in accepting an engagement from a new or an existing client, the firm to determine whether it is appropriate to accept the engagement.

- (c) If issues have been identified, and the firm decides to accept or continue the client relationship or a specific engagement, the firm to document how the issues were resolved.
28. The firm shall establish policies and procedures on continuing an engagement and the client relationship, addressing the circumstances where the firm obtains information that would have caused it to decline the engagement had that information been available earlier. Such policies and procedures shall include consideration of:
- (a) The professional and legal responsibilities that apply to the circumstances, including whether there is a requirement for the firm to report to the person or persons who made the appointment or, in some cases, to regulatory authorities; and
  - (b) The possibility of withdrawing from the engagement or from both the engagement and the client relationship. (Ref: Para. A22-A23)

### **Human Resources**

29. The firm shall establish policies and procedures designed to provide it with reasonable assurance that it has sufficient personnel with the competence, capabilities, and commitment to ethical principles necessary to:
- (a) Perform engagements in accordance with standards issued by the External Reporting Board or the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and applicable legal and regulatory requirements; and
  - (b) Enable the firm or engagement partners to issue reports that are appropriate in the circumstances. (Ref: Para. A24-A29)

### *Assignment of Engagement Teams*

30. The firm shall assign responsibility for each engagement to an engagement partner and shall establish policies and procedures requiring that:
- (a) The identity and role of the engagement partner are communicated to key members of client management and those charged with governance;
  - (b) The engagement partner has the appropriate competence, capabilities, and authority to perform the role; and
  - (c) The responsibilities of the engagement partner are clearly defined and communicated to that partner. (Ref: Para. A30)
31. [Amended by the NZAuASB. Refer to NZ31.1].
- [NZ31.1] The firm shall also establish policies and procedures to assign appropriate personnel with the necessary competence, capabilities, and time to:
- (a) Perform engagements in accordance with standards issued by the External Reporting Board or the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and applicable legal and regulatory requirements; and
  - (b) Enable the firm or engagement partners to issue reports that are appropriate in the circumstances. (Ref: Para. A31)

### **Engagement Performance**

32. The firm shall establish policies and procedures designed to provide it with reasonable assurance that engagements are performed in accordance with standards issued by the

External Reporting Board or the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and applicable legal and regulatory requirements, and that the firm or the engagement partner issue reports that are appropriate in the circumstances. Such policies and procedures shall include:

- (a) Matters relevant to promoting consistency in the quality of engagement performance; (Ref: Para. A32-A33)
  - (b) Supervision responsibilities; and (Ref: Para. A34)
  - (c) Review responsibilities. (Ref: Para. A35)
33. The firm's review responsibility policies and procedures shall be determined on the basis that work of less experienced team members is reviewed by more experienced engagement team members.

#### *Consultation*

34. The firm shall establish policies and procedures designed to provide it with reasonable assurance that:
- (a) Appropriate consultation takes place on difficult or contentious matters;
  - (b) Sufficient resources are available to enable appropriate consultation to take place;
  - (c) The nature and scope of, and conclusions resulting from, such consultations are documented and are agreed by both the individual seeking consultation and the individual consulted; and
  - (d) Conclusions resulting from consultations are implemented; or

[NZ34.1] The reasons alternative courses of action from consultations were undertaken are documented. (Ref: Para. A36-A40)

#### *Engagement Quality Control Review*

35. [Amended by the NZAuASB].
- NZ35.1 The firm shall establish policies and procedures requiring, for appropriate engagements, an engagement quality control review that provides an objective evaluation of the significant judgements made by the engagement team and the conclusions reached in formulating the report. Such policies and procedures shall:
- (a) Require an engagement quality control review for all audits of financial statements of FMC reporting entities considered to have a higher level of public accountability;
  - (b) Set out criteria against which all other audits and reviews of historical financial information and other assurance engagements shall be evaluated to determine whether an engagement quality control review should be performed; and (Ref: Para. A41)
  - (c) Require an engagement quality control review for all engagements, if any, meeting the criteria established in compliance with subparagraph 35(b).
36. The firm shall establish policies and procedures setting out the nature, timing and extent of an engagement quality control review. Such policies and procedures shall require that the engagement report not be dated until the completion of the engagement quality control review. (Ref: Para. A42-A43)
37. The firm shall establish policies and procedures to require the engagement quality control review to include:

- (a) Discussion of significant matters with the engagement partner;
- (b) Review of the financial statements or other subject matter information and the proposed report;
- (c) Review of selected engagement documentation relating to significant judgements the engagement team made and the conclusions it reached; and
- (d) Evaluation of the conclusions reached in formulating the report and consideration of whether the proposed report is appropriate. (Ref: Para. A44)

38. [Amended by the NZAuASB].

NZ38.1 For audits of financial statements of FMC reporting entities considered to have a higher level of public accountability, the firm shall establish policies and procedures to require the engagement quality control review to also include consideration of the following:

- (a) The engagement team's evaluation of the firm's independence in relation to the specific engagement;
- (b) Whether appropriate consultation has taken place on matters involving differences of opinion or other difficult or contentious matters, and the conclusions arising from those consultations; and
- (c) Whether documentation selected for review reflects the work performed in relation to the significant judgements and supports the conclusions reached. (Ref: Para. A45-A46)

#### Criteria for the Eligibility of Engagement Quality Control Reviewers

- 39. The firm shall establish policies and procedures to address the appointment of engagement quality control reviewers and establish their eligibility through:
  - (a) The technical qualifications required to perform the role, including the necessary experience and authority; and (Ref: Para. A47)
  - (b) The degree to which an engagement quality control reviewer can be consulted on the engagement without compromising the reviewer's objectivity. (Ref: Para. A48)
- 40. The firm shall establish policies and procedures designed to maintain the objectivity of the engagement quality control reviewer. (Ref: Para. A49-A51)
- 41. The firm's policies and procedures shall provide for the replacement of the engagement quality control reviewer where the reviewer's ability to perform an objective review may be impaired.

#### Documentation of the Engagement Quality Control Review

- 42. The firm shall establish policies and procedures on documentation of the engagement quality control review which require documentation that:
  - (a) The procedures required by the firm's policies on engagement quality control review have been performed;
  - (b) The engagement quality control review has been completed on or before the date of the report; and
  - (c) The reviewer is not aware of any unresolved matters that would cause the reviewer to believe that the significant judgements the engagement team made and the conclusions it reached were not appropriate.



*Differences of Opinion*

43. The firm shall establish policies and procedures for dealing with and resolving differences of opinion within the engagement team, with those consulted and, where applicable, between the engagement partner and the engagement quality control reviewer. (Ref: Para. A52-A53)
44. Such policies and procedures shall require that:
  - (a) Conclusions reached be documented and implemented; and
  - (b) The report not be dated until the matter is resolved.

*Engagement Documentation*

Completion of the Assembly of Final Engagement Files

45. The firm shall establish policies and procedures for engagement teams to complete the assembly of final engagement files on a timely basis after the engagement reports have been finalised. (Ref: Para. A54-A55)

Confidentiality, Safe Custody, Integrity, Accessibility and Retrievability of Engagement Documentation

46. The firm shall establish policies and procedures designed to maintain the confidentiality, safe custody, integrity, accessibility and retrievability of engagement documentation. (Ref: Para. A56-A59)

Retention of Engagement Documentation

47. The firm shall establish policies and procedures for the retention of engagement documentation for a period sufficient to meet the needs of the firm or as required by law or regulation. (Ref: Para. A60-A63)

**Monitoring**

*Monitoring the Firm's Quality Control Policies and Procedures*

48. The firm shall establish a monitoring process designed to provide it with reasonable assurance that the policies and procedures relating to the system of quality control are relevant, adequate, and operating effectively. This process shall:
  - (a) Include an ongoing consideration and evaluation of the firm's system of quality control including, on a cyclical basis, inspection of at least one completed engagement for each engagement partner;
  - (b) Require responsibility for the monitoring process to be assigned to a partner or partners or other persons with sufficient and appropriate experience and authority in the firm to assume that responsibility; and
  - (c) Require that those performing the engagement or the engagement quality control review are not involved in inspecting the engagement. (Ref: Para. A64-A68)

*Evaluating, Communicating and Remediating Identified Deficiencies*

49. The firm shall evaluate the effect of deficiencies noted as a result of the monitoring process and determine whether they are either:
  - (a) Instances that do not necessarily indicate that the firm's system of quality control is insufficient to provide it with reasonable assurance that it complies with standards

- issued by the External Reporting Board or the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and applicable legal and regulatory requirements, and that the reports issued by the firm or engagement partners are appropriate in the circumstances; or
- (b) Systemic, repetitive or other significant deficiencies that require prompt corrective action.
50. The firm shall communicate to relevant engagement partners and other appropriate personnel, including any engagement quality control reviewers, deficiencies noted as a result of the monitoring process and recommendations for appropriate remedial action. (Ref: Para. A69)
51. Recommendations for appropriate remedial actions for deficiencies noted shall include one or more of the following:
- (a) Taking appropriate remedial action in relation to an individual engagement or member of personnel;
  - (b) The communication of the findings to those responsible for training and professional development;
  - (c) Changes to the quality control policies and procedures; and
  - (d) Disciplinary action against those who fail to comply with the policies and procedures of the firm, especially those who do so repeatedly.
52. The firm shall establish policies and procedures to address cases where the results of the monitoring procedures indicate that a report may be inappropriate or that procedures were omitted during the performance of the engagement. Such policies and procedures shall require the firm to determine what further action is appropriate to comply with relevant standards issued by the External Reporting Board or the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and legal and regulatory requirements and to consider whether to obtain legal advice.
53. The firm shall communicate at least annually the results of the monitoring of its system of quality control to engagement partners and other appropriate individuals within the firm, including the firm's chief executive officer or, if appropriate, its managing board of partners. This communication shall be sufficient to enable the firm and these individuals to take prompt and appropriate action where necessary in accordance with their defined roles and responsibilities. Information communicated shall include the following:
- (a) A description of the monitoring procedures performed.
  - (b) The conclusions drawn from the monitoring procedures.
  - (c) Where relevant, a description of systemic, repetitive or other significant deficiencies and of the actions taken to resolve or amend those deficiencies.
54. Some firms operate as part of a network and, for consistency, may implement some of their monitoring procedures on a network basis. Where firms within a network operate under common monitoring policies and procedures designed to comply with this Professional and Ethical Standard, and these firms place reliance on such a monitoring system, the firm's policies and procedures shall require that:
- (a) At least annually, the network communicate the overall scope, extent and results of the monitoring process to appropriate individuals within the network firms; and

- (b) The network communicate promptly any identified deficiencies in the system of quality control to appropriate individuals within the relevant network firm or firms so that the necessary action can be taken,

in order that engagement partners in the network firms can rely on the results of the monitoring process implemented within the network, unless the firms or the network advise otherwise.

### *Complaints and Allegations*

55. The firm shall establish policies and procedures designed to provide it with reasonable assurance that it deals appropriately with:

- (a) Complaints and allegations that the work performed by the firm fails to comply with standards issued by the External Reporting Board or the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and applicable legal and regulatory requirements; and
- (b) Allegations of non-compliance with the firm's system of quality control.

As part of this process, the firm shall establish clearly defined channels for firm personnel to raise any concerns in a manner that enables them to come forward without fear of reprisals.

(Ref: Para. A70)

56. If during the investigations into complaints and allegations, deficiencies in the design or operation of the firm's quality control policies and procedures or non-compliance with the firm's system of quality control by an individual or individuals are identified, the firm shall take appropriate actions as set out in paragraph 51. (Ref: Para. A71-A72)

### **Documentation of the System of Quality Control**

57. The firm shall establish policies and procedures requiring appropriate documentation to provide evidence of the operation of each element of its system of quality control. (Ref: Para. A73-A75)
58. The firm shall establish policies and procedures that require retention of documentation for a period of time sufficient to permit those performing monitoring procedures to evaluate the firm's compliance with its system of quality control, or for a longer period if required by law or regulation.
59. The firm shall establish policies and procedures requiring documentation of complaints and allegations and the responses to them.

\*\*\*

## **Application and Other Explanatory Material**

### **Applying, and Complying with, Relevant Requirements**

#### *Considerations Specific to Smaller Firms* (Ref: Para. 14)

- A1. This Professional and Ethical Standard does not call for compliance with requirements that are not relevant, for example, in the circumstances of a sole practitioner with no staff. Requirements in this Professional and Ethical Standard such as those for policies and procedures for the assignment of appropriate personnel to the engagement team (see paragraph 31), for review responsibilities (see paragraph 33), and for the annual communication of the results of monitoring to engagement partners within the firm (see paragraph 53) are not relevant in the absence of staff.

**Elements of a System of Quality Control** (Ref: Para. 17)

A2. In general, communication of quality control policies and procedures to firm personnel includes a description of the quality control policies and procedures and the objectives they are designed to achieve, and the message that each individual has a personal responsibility for quality and is expected to comply with these policies and procedures. Encouraging firm personnel to communicate their views or concerns on quality control matters recognises the importance of obtaining feedback on the firm's system of quality control.

[NZA2.1] The form and content of communication should be explicit to provide firm personnel with a ready source of information concerning those policies and procedures applicable to them.

*Considerations Specific to Smaller Firms*

A3. Documentation and communication of policies and procedures for smaller firms may be less formal and extensive than for larger firms.

**Leadership Responsibilities for Quality within the Firm***Promoting an Internal Culture of Quality* (Ref: Para. 18)

A4. The firm's leadership and the examples it sets significantly influence the internal culture of the firm. The promotion of a quality-oriented internal culture depends on clear, consistent and frequent actions and messages from all levels of the firm's management that emphasise the firm's quality control policies and procedures, and the requirement to:

- (a) Perform work that complies with standards issued by the External Reporting Board or the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and applicable legal and regulatory requirements; and
- (b) Issue reports that are appropriate in the circumstances.

Such actions and messages encourage a culture that recognises and rewards high quality work. These actions and messages may be communicated by, but are not limited to, training seminars, meetings, formal or informal dialogue, mission statements, newsletters, or briefing memoranda. They may be incorporated in the firm's internal documentation and training materials, and in partner and staff appraisal procedures such that they will support and reinforce the firm's view on the importance of quality and how, practically, it is to be achieved.

A5. Of particular importance in promoting an internal culture based on quality is the need for the firm's leadership to recognise that the firm's business strategy is subject to the overriding requirement for the firm to achieve quality in all the engagements that the firm performs. Promoting such an internal culture includes:

- (a) Establishment of policies and procedures that address performance evaluation, compensation, and promotion (including incentive systems) with regard to its personnel, in order to demonstrate the firm's overriding commitment to quality;
- (b) Assignment of management responsibilities so that commercial considerations do not override the quality of work performed; and
- (c) Provision of sufficient resources for the development, documentation and support of its quality control policies and procedures.

*Assigning Operational Responsibility for the Firm's System of Quality Control* (Ref: Para. 19)

- A6. Sufficient and appropriate experience and ability enables the person or persons responsible for the firm's system of quality control to identify and understand quality control issues and to develop appropriate policies and procedures. Necessary authority enables the person or persons to implement those policies and procedures.

### **Relevant Ethical Requirements**

*Compliance with Relevant Ethical Requirements* (Ref: Para. 20)

- A7. Professional and Ethical Standard 1 establishes the fundamental principles of ethics, which are:
- (a) Integrity;
  - (b) Objectivity;
  - (c) Professional competence and due care;
  - (d) Confidentiality; and
  - (e) Professional behaviour.

The fundamental principles of ethics establish the standard of behaviour expected of an assurance practitioner.

- A8. Professional and Ethical Standard 1 provides a conceptual framework that established the approach which an assurance practitioner is required to apply when identifying, evaluating and addressing threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. In the case of audits, reviews and other assurance engagements, Professional and Ethical Standard 1 sets out *International Independence Standards (New Zealand)* established by the application of the conceptual framework to threats to independence in relation to those engagements.
- A9. The fundamental principles are reinforced in particular by:
- The leadership of the firm;
  - Education and training;
  - Monitoring; and
  - A process for dealing with breaches.

Definition of "Firm," "Network" and "Network Firm" (Ref: Para. 20-25)

- A10. The definitions of "firm," "network" or "network firm" in relevant ethical requirements may differ from those set out in this Professional and Ethical Standard. For example, Professional and Ethical Standard 1 defines the "firm" as:
- (i) A sole practitioner, partnership or corporation undertaking assurance engagements ;
  - (ii) An entity that controls such parties, through ownership, management or other means; and
  - (iii) An entity controlled by such parties, through ownership, management or other means.

Professional and Ethical Standard 1 also provides guidance in relation to the terms "network" and "network firm."

In complying with the requirements in paragraphs 20-25, the definitions used in the relevant ethical requirements apply in so far as is necessary to interpret those ethical requirements.

Considerations Specific to the Public Sector (Ref: Para. 23, 25)

[NZA10.1] In the case of a statutory officer (such as the Auditor-General) who is bound by this Professional and Ethical Standard in their professional capacity as an assurance practitioner, if the officer does not have the ability to withdraw from, or to decline to accept, an engagement to eliminate a threat to independence of a professional nature, it will be sufficient compliance with this Professional and Ethical Standard for the statutory officer to:

- (a) Introduce safeguards to reduce the threat to independence to the extent that is reasonably possible in the circumstances; and
- (b) Disclose the threat to independence to those responsible for governance of the entity and publicly disclose the matter where a report is required.

Written Confirmation (Ref: Para. 24)

A11. Written confirmation may be in paper or electronic form. By obtaining confirmation and taking appropriate action on information indicating a breach, the firm demonstrates the importance that it attaches to independence and makes the issue current for, and visible to, its personnel.

Long Association with an Entity (Ref: Para. 25)

A12. Professional and Ethical Standard 1 discusses the threat that may be created as a result of an individual's long association with:

- The entity and its operations;
- The entity's senior management; or
- The underlying subject matter and subject matter information of the assurance engagement.

A13. Professional and Ethical Standard 1 includes examples of factors that are relevant to evaluating the level of a threat that may arise when an individual is involved in an assurance engagement over a long period of time. Professional and Ethical Standard 1 also provides examples of actions including:

- Eliminating the threat, by rotating the individual off the engagement team; or

Applying safeguards to reduce the threat to an acceptable level, for example by performing regular independent internal or external quality reviews of the engagement.

A14. [Amended by the NZAuASB. Refer to NZA14.1].

[NZA14.1] Professional and Ethical Standard 1 recognises that the familiarity threat is particularly relevant in the context of financial statement audits of public interest entities. For these audits, Professional and Ethical Standard 1 requires the rotation of the key audit partner<sup>5</sup> after a pre-defined period, normally no more than seven years, and provides related standards and guidance<sup>6</sup>.

[NZA14.2] Shorter rotation requirements may be established for particular audit engagements or classes of audit engagement, for example for audits of entities whose securities are quoted or listed on a recognised stock exchange.

<sup>5</sup> Professional and Ethical Standard 1, Definitions.

<sup>6</sup> Professional and Ethical Standard 1, section 540, *Long Association of Personnel (including Partner Rotation) with an Audit or Review Client*.

### Considerations Specific to the Public Sector

A15. Statutory measures may provide safeguards for the independence of a statutory officer (for example, the Auditor-General). However, threats to independence may still exist regardless of any statutory measures designed to protect it. Therefore, in establishing the policies and procedures required by paragraphs 20-25, the public sector auditor may have regard to the public sector mandate and address any threats to independence in that context.

A16. [Amended by the NZAuASB. Refer to NZA16.1].

[NZA16.1] There may be other public entities that are not defined as a public interest entity, that are significant due to size, complexity, commercial risk, parliamentary or media interest or public interest aspects, and which consequently have a wide range of stakeholders. There are no fixed objective criteria on which this determination of significance should be based. Such a determination should encompass an evaluation of all factors relevant to the public entity. Therefore, there may be instances when a firm determines, based on its quality control policies and procedures, that a public entity is significant for the purposes of expanded quality control procedures.

A17. [Amended by the NZAuASB. Refer to NZA17.1].

[NZA17.1] In the public sector, legislation may establish the appointments and terms of office of the auditor with engagement partner responsibility. Nonetheless, for public entities considered significant, as noted in paragraph A16, it may be in the public interest for public sector auditors to establish policies and procedures to promote compliance with the spirit of rotation of engagement partner responsibility.

### Acceptance and Continuance of Client Relationships and Specific Engagements

#### *Competence, Capabilities, and Resources* (Ref: Para. 26(a))

A18. Consideration of whether the firm has the competence, capabilities, and resources to undertake a new engagement from a new or an existing client involves reviewing the specific requirements of the engagement and the existing partner and staff profiles at all relevant levels, and including whether:

- Firm personnel have knowledge of relevant industries or subject matters;
- Firm personnel have experience with relevant regulatory or reporting requirements, or the ability to gain the necessary skills and knowledge effectively;
- The firm has sufficient personnel with the necessary capabilities and competence;
- Experts are available, if needed;
- Individuals meeting the criteria and eligibility requirements to perform engagement quality control review are available, where applicable; and
- The firm is able to complete the engagement within the reporting deadline.

#### *Integrity of Client* (Ref: Para. 26(c))

A19. With regard to the integrity of a client, matters to consider include, for example:

- The identity and business reputation of the client's principal owners, key management, and those charged with its governance.
- The nature of the client's operations, including its business practices.
- Information concerning the attitude of the client's principal owners, key management

and those charged with its governance towards such matters as aggressive interpretation of accounting standards and the internal control environment.

- Whether the client is aggressively concerned with maintaining the firm's fees as low as possible.
- Indications of an inappropriate limitation in the scope of work.
- Indications that the client might be involved in money laundering or other criminal activities.
- The reasons for the proposed appointment of the firm and non-reappointment of the previous firm.
- The identity and business reputation of related parties.

The extent of knowledge a firm will have regarding the integrity of a client will generally grow within the context of an ongoing relationship with that client.

A20. Sources of information on such matters obtained by the firm may include the following:

- Communications with existing or previous providers of professional accountancy services to the client in accordance with relevant ethical requirements, and discussions with other third parties.
- Enquiry of other firm personnel or third parties such as bankers, legal counsel and industry peers.
- Background searches of relevant databases.

*Continuance of Client Relationship* (Ref: Para. 27(a))

A21. Deciding whether to continue a client relationship includes consideration of significant matters that have arisen during the current or previous engagements, and their implications for continuing the relationship. For example, a client may have started to expand its business operations into an area where the firm does not possess the necessary expertise.

*Withdrawal* (Ref: Para. 28)

A22. Policies and procedures on withdrawal from an engagement or from both the engagement and the client relationship address issues that include the following:

- Discussing with the appropriate level of the client's management and those charged with its governance the appropriate action that the firm might take based on the relevant facts and circumstances.
- If the firm determines that it is appropriate to withdraw, discussing with the appropriate level of the client's management and those charged with its governance withdrawal from the engagement or from both the engagement and the client relationship, and the reasons for the withdrawal.
- Considering whether there is a professional, legal or regulatory requirement for the firm to remain in place, or for the firm to report the withdrawal from the engagement, or from both the engagement and the client relationship, together with the reasons for the withdrawal, to regulatory authorities.
- Documenting significant matters, consultations, conclusions and the basis for the conclusions.



Considerations Specific to the Public Sector (Ref: Para. 26-28)

A23. In the public sector, auditors may be appointed in accordance with statutory procedures. Accordingly, certain of the requirements and considerations regarding the acceptance and continuance of client relationships and specific engagements as set out paragraphs 26-28 and A18-A22 may not be relevant. Nonetheless, establishing policies and procedures as described may provide valuable information to public sector auditors in performing risk assessments and in carrying out reporting responsibilities.

**Human Resources** (Ref: Para. 29)

A24. Personnel issues relevant to the firm's policies and procedures related to human resources include, for example:

- Recruitment.
- Performance evaluation.
- Capabilities, including time to perform assignments.
- Competence.
- Career development.
- Promotion.
- Compensation.
- The estimation of personnel needs.

Effective recruitment processes and procedures help the firm select individuals of integrity who have the capacity to develop the competence and capabilities necessary to perform the firm's work and possess the appropriate characteristics to enable them to perform competently.

A25. Competence can be developed through a variety of methods, including the following:

- Professional education.
- Continuing professional development, including training.
- Work experience.
- Coaching by more experienced staff, for example, other members of the engagement team.
- Independence education for personnel who are required to be independent.

A26. The continuing competence of the firm's personnel depends to a significant extent on an appropriate level of continuing professional development so that personnel maintain their knowledge and capabilities. Effective policies and procedures emphasise the need for continuing training for all levels of firm personnel, and provide the necessary training resources and assistance to enable personnel to develop and maintain the required competence and capabilities.

A27. The firm may use a suitably qualified external person, for example, when internal technical and training resources are unavailable.

A28. Performance evaluation, compensation and promotion procedures give due recognition and reward to the development and maintenance of competence and commitment to ethical

principles. Steps a firm may take in developing and maintaining competence and commitment to ethical principles include:

- Making personnel aware of the firm's expectations regarding performance and ethical principles;
- Providing personnel with evaluation of, and counseling on, performance, progress and career development; and
- Helping personnel understand that advancement to positions of greater responsibility depends, among other things, upon performance quality and adherence to ethical principles, and that failure to comply with the firm's policies and procedures may result in disciplinary action.

#### *Considerations Specific to Smaller Firms*

A29. The size and circumstances of the firm will influence the structure of the firm's performance evaluation process. Smaller firms, in particular, may employ less formal methods of evaluating the performance of their personnel.

#### *Assignment of Engagement Teams*

Engagement Partners (Ref: Para. 30)

A30. Policies and procedures may include systems to monitor the workload and availability of engagement partners so as to enable these individuals to have sufficient time to adequately discharge their responsibilities.

Engagement Teams (Ref: Para. 31)

A31. The firm's assignment of engagement teams and the determination of the level of supervision required, include for example, consideration of the engagement team's:

- Understanding of, and practical experience with, engagements of a similar nature and complexity through appropriate training and participation;
- Understanding of the standards issued by the External Reporting Board or the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and legal and regulatory requirements;
- Technical knowledge and expertise, including knowledge of relevant information technology;
- Knowledge of relevant industries in which the clients operate;
- Ability to apply professional judgement; and
- Understanding of the firm's quality control policies and procedures.

### **Engagement Performance**

*Consistency in the Quality of Engagement Performance* (Ref: Para. 32(a))

A32. The firm promotes consistency in the quality of engagement performance through its policies and procedures. This is often accomplished through written or electronic manuals, software tools or other forms of standardised documentation, and industry or subject matter-specific guidance materials. Matters addressed may include:

- How engagement teams are briefed on the engagement to obtain an understanding of

the objectives of their work.

- Processes for complying with applicable engagement standards.
- Processes of engagement supervision, staff training and coaching.
- Methods of reviewing the work performed, the significant judgements made and the form of report being issued.
- Appropriate documentation of the work performed and of the timing and extent of the review.
- Processes to keep all policies and procedures current.

A33. Appropriate teamwork and training assist less experienced members of the engagement team to clearly understand the objectives of the assigned work.

*Supervision* (Ref: Para. 32(b))

A34. Engagement supervision includes the following:

- Tracking the progress of the engagement;
- Considering the competence and capabilities of individual members of the engagement team, whether they have sufficient time to carry out their work, whether they understand their instructions and whether the work is being carried out in accordance with the planned approach to the engagement;
- Addressing significant matters arising during the engagement, considering their significance and modifying the planned approach appropriately; and
- Identifying matters for consultation or consideration by more experienced engagement team members during the engagement.

*Review* (Ref: Para. 32(c))

A35. A review consists of consideration of whether:

- The work has been performed in accordance with the standards issued by the External Reporting Board or the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and applicable legal and regulatory requirements;
- Significant matters have been raised for further consideration;
- Appropriate consultations have taken place and the resulting conclusions have been documented and implemented;
- There is a need to revise the nature, timing and extent of work performed;
- The work performed supports the conclusions reached and is appropriately documented;
- The evidence obtained is sufficient and appropriate to support the report; and
- The objectives of the engagement procedures have been achieved.

*Consultation* (Ref: Para. 34)

A36. Consultation includes discussion at the appropriate professional level, with individuals within or outside the firm who have specialised expertise.

A37. Consultation uses appropriate research resources as well as the collective experience and technical expertise of the firm. Consultation helps to promote quality and improves the application of professional judgement. Appropriate recognition of consultation in the firm's policies and procedures helps to promote a culture in which consultation is recognised as a strength and encourages personnel to consult on difficult or contentious matters.

A38. Effective consultation on significant technical, ethical and other matters within the firm, or where applicable, outside the firm can be achieved when those consulted:

- Are given all the relevant facts that will enable them to provide informed advice; and
- Have appropriate knowledge, seniority and experience,

and when conclusions resulting from consultations are appropriately documented and implemented.

A39. Documentation of consultations with other professionals that involve difficult or contentious matters that is sufficiently complete and detailed contributes to an understanding of:

- The issue on which consultation was sought; and
- The results of the consultation, including any decisions taken, the basis for those decisions and how they were implemented.

#### Considerations Specific to Smaller Firms

A40. A firm needing to consult externally, for example, a firm without appropriate internal resources, may take advantage of advisory services provided by:

- Other firms;
- Professional and regulatory bodies; or
- Commercial organisations that provide relevant quality control services.

Before contracting for such services, consideration of the competence and capabilities of the external provider helps the firm to determine whether the external provider is suitably qualified for that purpose.

#### *Engagement Quality Control Review*

Criteria for an Engagement Quality Control Review (Ref: Para. 35(b))

A41. [Amended by the NZAuASB].

NZA41.1 Criteria for determining which engagements other than audits of financial statements of FMC reporting entities considered to have a higher level of public accountability are to be subject to an engagement quality control review may include, for example:

- The nature of the engagement, including the extent to which it involves a matter of public interest.
- The identification of unusual circumstances or risks in an engagement or class of engagements.
- Whether laws or regulations require an engagement quality control review.

## Nature, Timing and Extent of the Engagement Quality Control Review (Ref: Para. 36-37)

A42. The engagement report is not dated until the completion of the engagement quality control review. However, documentation of the engagement quality control review may be completed after the date of the report.

A43. Conducting the engagement quality control review in a timely manner at appropriate stages during the engagement allows significant matters to be promptly resolved to the engagement quality control reviewer's satisfaction on or before the date of the report.

A44. [Amended by the NZAuASB].

NZA44.1 The extent of the engagement quality control review may depend, among other things, on the complexity of the engagement, whether the entity is a FMC reporting entity considered to have a higher level of public accountability, and the risk that the report might not be appropriate in the circumstances. The performance of an engagement quality control review does not reduce the responsibilities of the engagement partner.

## Engagement Quality Control Review of a FMC reporting Entity Considered to have a Higher Level of Public Accountability (Ref: Para. 38)

A45. [Amended by the NZAuASB].

NZA45.1 Other matters relevant to evaluating the significant judgements made by the engagement team that may be considered in an engagement quality control review of an audit of financial statements of a FMC reporting entity considered to have a higher level of public accountability include:

- Significant risks identified during the engagement and the responses to those risks.
- Judgements made, particularly with respect to materiality and significant risks.
- The significance and disposition of corrected and uncorrected misstatements identified during the engagement.
- The matters to be communicated to management and those charged with governance and, where applicable, other parties such as regulatory bodies.

These other matters, depending on the circumstances, may also be applicable for engagement quality control reviews for audits of the financial statements of other entities as well as reviews of financial statements and other assurance engagements.

## Considerations Specific to the Public Sector

A46. [Amended by the NZAuASB].

NZA46.1 Although not referred to as FMC reporting entities considered to have a higher level of public accountability, as described in paragraph A16, certain public entities may be of sufficient significance to warrant performance of an engagement quality control review.

NZA46.2 There are no fixed objective criteria on which this determination of significance should be based. However, such a determination should encompass an evaluation of all factors relevant to the public entity. Such factors include size, complexity, commercial risk, parliamentary or media interest and the number and range of stakeholders affected.

*Criteria for the Eligibility of Engagement Quality Control Reviewers*

## Sufficient and Appropriate Technical Expertise, Experience and Authority (Ref: Para. 39(a))

A47. [Amended by the NZAuASB].

NZA47.1 What constitutes sufficient and appropriate technical expertise, experience and authority depends on the circumstances of the engagement. For example, the engagement quality control reviewer for an audit of the financial statements of a FMC reporting entity considered to have a higher level of public accountability is likely to be an individual with sufficient and appropriate experience and authority to act as an audit engagement partner on audits of financial statements of FMC reporting entities considered to have a higher level of public accountability.

#### Consultation with the Engagement Quality Control Reviewer (Ref: Para. 39(b))

A48. The engagement partner may consult the engagement quality control reviewer during the engagement, for example, to establish that a judgement made by the engagement partner will be acceptable to the engagement quality control reviewer. Such consultation avoids identification of differences of opinion at a late stage of the engagement and need not compromise the engagement quality control reviewer's eligibility to perform the role. Where the nature and extent of the consultations become significant the reviewer's objectivity may be compromised unless care is taken by both the engagement team and the reviewer to maintain the reviewer's objectivity. Where this is not possible, another individual within the firm or a suitably qualified external person may be appointed to take on the role of either the engagement quality control reviewer or the person to be consulted on the engagement.

#### Objectivity of the Engagement Quality Control Reviewer (Ref: Para. 40)

A49. The firm is required to establish policies and procedures designed to maintain objectivity of the engagement quality control reviewer. Accordingly, such policies and procedures provide that the engagement quality control reviewer:

- Where practicable, is not selected by the engagement partner;
- Does not otherwise participate in the engagement during the period of review;
- Does not make decisions for the engagement team; and
- Is not subject to other considerations that would threaten the reviewer's objectivity.

#### Considerations Specific to Smaller Firms

A50. It may not be practicable, in the case of firms with few partners, for the engagement partner not to be involved in selecting the engagement quality control reviewer. Suitably qualified external persons may be contracted where sole practitioners or small firms identify engagements requiring engagement quality control reviews. Alternatively, some sole practitioners or small firms may wish to use other firms to facilitate engagement quality control reviews. Where the firm contracts suitably qualified external persons, the requirements in paragraphs 39-41 and guidance in paragraphs A47-A48 apply.

#### Considerations Specific to the Public Sector

A51. In the public sector, a statutory auditor (for example, an Auditor-General, or other suitably qualified person appointed on behalf of the Auditor-General) may act in a role equivalent to that of engagement partner with overall responsibility for public sector audits. In such circumstances, where applicable, the selection of the engagement quality control reviewer includes consideration of the need for independence from the audited entity and the ability of the engagement quality control reviewer to provide an objective evaluation.

*Differences of Opinion* (Ref: Para. 43)

- A52. Effective procedures encourage identification of differences of opinion at an early stage, provide clear guidelines as to the successive steps to be taken thereafter, and require documentation regarding the resolution of the differences and the implementation of the conclusions reached.
- A53. Procedures to resolve such differences may include consulting with another assurance practitioner or firm, or a professional or regulatory body.

*Engagement Documentation*

## Completion of the Assembly of Final Engagement Files (Ref: Para. 45)

- A54. Law or regulation may prescribe the time limits by which the assembly of final engagement files for specific types of engagement is to be completed. Where no such time limits are prescribed in law or regulation, paragraph 45 requires the firm to establish time limits that reflect the need to complete the assembly of final engagement files on a timely basis. In the case of an audit, for example, such a time limit would ordinarily not be more than 60 days after the date of the auditor's report<sup>7</sup>.
- A55. Where two or more different reports are issued in respect of the same subject matter information of an entity, the firm's policies and procedures relating to time limits for the assembly of final engagement files address each report as if it were for a separate engagement. This may, for example, be the case when the firm issues an auditor's report on a component's financial information for group consolidation purposes and, at a subsequent date, an auditor's report on the same financial information for statutory purposes.

## Confidentiality, Safe Custody, Integrity, Accessibility and Retrievability of Engagement Documentation (Ref: Para. 46)

- A56. Relevant ethical requirements establish an obligation for the firm's personnel to observe at all times the confidentiality of information contained in engagement documentation, unless specific client authority has been given to disclose information, or there are responsibilities under law, regulation or relevant ethical requirements to do so.<sup>8</sup> Specific laws or regulations may impose additional obligations on the firm's personnel to maintain client confidentiality, particularly where data of a personal nature are concerned.
- A57. Whether engagement documentation is in paper, electronic or other media, the integrity, accessibility or retrievability of the underlying data may be compromised if the documentation could be altered, added to or deleted without the firm's knowledge, or if it could be permanently lost or damaged. Accordingly, controls that the firm designs and implements to avoid unauthorised alteration or loss of engagement documentation may include those that:
- Enable the determination of when and by whom engagement documentation was created, changed or reviewed;
  - Protect the integrity of the information at all stages of the engagement, especially when the information is shared within the engagement team or transmitted to other parties via the Internet;
  - Prevent unauthorised changes to the engagement documentation; and

<sup>7</sup> ISA (NZ) 230, *Audit Documentation*, paragraph A21

<sup>8</sup> See, for example, paragraphs R114.1, 114.1 A1 and R360.26 of Professional and Ethical Standard 1

- Allow access to the engagement documentation by the engagement team and other authorised parties as necessary to properly discharge their responsibilities.

A58. Controls that the firm designs and implements to maintain the confidentiality, safe custody, integrity, accessibility and retrievability of engagement documentation may include the following:

- The use of a password among engagement team members to restrict access to electronic engagement documentation to authorised users.
- Appropriate back-up routines for electronic engagement documentation at appropriate stages during the engagement.
- Procedures for properly distributing engagement documentation to the team members at the start of the engagement, processing it during engagement, and collating it at the end of engagement.
- Procedures for restricting access to, and enabling proper distribution and confidential storage of, hardcopy engagement documentation.

A59. For practical reasons, original paper documentation may be electronically scanned for inclusion in engagement files. In such cases, the firm's procedures designed to maintain the integrity, accessibility, and retrievability of the documentation may include requiring the engagement teams to:

- Generate scanned copies that reflect the entire content of the original paper documentation, including manual signatures, cross-references and annotations;
- Integrate the scanned copies into the engagement files, including indexing and signing off on the scanned copies as necessary; and
- Enable the scanned copies to be retrieved and printed as necessary.

There may be legal, regulatory or other reasons for a firm to retain original paper documentation that has been scanned.

#### Retention of Engagement Documentation (Ref: Para. 47)

A60. The needs of the firm for retention of engagement documentation, and the period of such retention, will vary with the nature of the engagement and the firm's circumstances, for example, whether the engagement documentation is needed to provide a record of matters of continuing significance to future engagements. The retention period may also depend on other factors, such as whether local law or regulation prescribes specific retention periods for certain types of engagements, or whether there are generally accepted retention periods in the jurisdiction in the absence of specific legal or regulatory requirements.

A61. In the specific case of audit engagements, the retention period would ordinarily be no shorter than five years from the date of the auditor's report, or, if later, the date of the group auditor's report.

A62. Procedures that the firm adopts for retention of engagement documentation include those that enable the requirements of paragraph 47 to be met during the retention period, for example to:

- Enable the retrieval of, and access to, the engagement documentation during the retention period, particularly in the case of electronic documentation since the underlying technology may be upgraded or changed over time;



- Provide, where necessary, a record of changes made to engagement documentation after the engagement files have been completed; and
- Enable authorised external parties to access and review specific engagement documentation for quality control or other purposes.

#### Ownership of engagement documentation

A63. Unless otherwise specified by law or regulation, engagement documentation is the property of the firm. The firm may, at its discretion, make portions of, or extracts from, engagement documentation available to clients, provided such disclosure does not undermine the validity of the work performed, or the independence of the firm or its personnel.

#### Monitoring

##### *Monitoring the Firm's Quality Control Policies and Procedures* (Ref: Para. 48)

A64. The purpose of monitoring compliance with quality control policies and procedures is to provide an evaluation of:

- Adherence to the standards issued by the External Reporting Board or the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and legal and regulatory requirements;
- Whether the system of quality control has been appropriately designed and effectively implemented; and
- Whether the firm's quality control policies and procedures have been appropriately applied, so that reports that are issued by the firm or engagement partners are appropriate in the circumstances.

A65. Ongoing consideration and evaluation of the system of quality control include matters such as the following:

- Analysis of:
  - New developments in the standards issued by the External Reporting Board or the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and applicable legal and regulatory requirements, and how they are reflected in the firm's policies and procedures where appropriate;
  - Written confirmation of compliance with policies and procedures on independence;
  - Continuing professional development, including training; and
  - Decisions related to acceptance and continuance of client relationships and specific engagements.
- Determination of corrective actions to be taken and improvements to be made in the system, including the provision of feedback into the firm's policies and procedures relating to education and training.
- Communication to appropriate firm personnel of weaknesses identified in the system, in the level of understanding of the system, or compliance with it.
- Follow-up by appropriate firm personnel so that necessary modifications are promptly made to the quality control policies and procedures.

A66. Inspection cycle policies and procedures may, for example, specify a cycle that spans three years. The manner in which the inspection cycle is organised, including the timing of selection of individual engagements, depends on many factors, such as the following:

- The size of the firm.
- The number and geographical location of offices.
- The results of previous monitoring procedures.
- The degree of authority both personnel and offices have (for example, whether individual offices are authorised to conduct their own inspections or whether only the head office may conduct them).
- The nature and complexity of the firm's practice and organisation.
- The risks associated with the firm's clients and specific engagements.

A67. The inspection process includes the selection of individual engagements, some of which may be selected without prior notification to the engagement team. In determining the scope of the inspections, the firm may take into account the scope or conclusions of an independent external inspection programme. However, an independent external inspection programme does not act as a substitute for the firm's own internal monitoring programme.

[NZA67.1] In the public sector, the Office of the Auditor-General performs quality reviews on appointed auditors on a cyclical basis. A quality review by the Office of the Auditor-General would contribute towards the firm's compliance with the monitoring requirements of this standard.

#### Considerations Specific to Smaller Firms

A68. In the case of small firms, monitoring procedures may need to be performed by individuals who are responsible for design and implementation of the firm's quality control policies and procedures, or who may be involved in performing the engagement quality control review. A firm with a limited number of persons may choose to use a suitably qualified external person or another firm to carry out engagement inspections and other monitoring procedures. Alternatively, the firm may establish arrangements to share resources with other appropriate organisations to facilitate monitoring activities.

#### *Communicating Deficiencies* (Ref: Para. 50)

A69. The reporting of identified deficiencies to individuals other than the relevant engagement partners need not include an identification of the specific engagements concerned, although there may be cases where such identification may be necessary for the proper discharge of the responsibilities of the individuals other than the engagement partners.

#### *Complaints and Allegations*

##### Source of Complaints and Allegations (Ref: Para. 55)

A70. Complaints and allegations (which do not include those that are clearly frivolous) may originate from within or outside the firm. They may be made by firm personnel, clients or other third parties. They may be received by engagement team members or other firm personnel.

[NZA70.1] Complaints and allegations may also be received from relevant professional bodies.

#### Investigation Policies and Procedures (Ref: Para. 56)

A71. Policies and procedures established for the investigation of complaints and allegations may include for example, that the partner supervising the investigation:

- Has sufficient and appropriate experience;
- Has authority within the firm; and
- Is otherwise not involved in the engagement.

The partner supervising the investigation may involve legal counsel as necessary.

#### Considerations Specific to Smaller Firms

A72. It may not be practicable, in the case of firms with few partners, for the partner supervising the investigation not to be involved in the engagement. These small firms and sole practitioners may use the services of a suitably qualified external person or another firm to carry out the investigation into complaints and allegations.

#### Documentation of the System of Quality Control (Ref: Para. 57)

A73. The form and content of documentation evidencing the operation of each of the elements of the system of quality control is a matter of judgement and depends on a number of factors, including the following:

- The size of the firm and the number of offices.
- The nature and complexity of the firm's practice and organisation.

For example, large firms may use electronic databases to document matters such as independence confirmations, performance evaluations and the results of monitoring inspections.

A74. Appropriate documentation relating to monitoring includes, for example:

- Monitoring procedures, including the procedure for selecting completed engagements to be inspected.
- A record of the evaluation of:
  - Adherence to the standards issued by the External Reporting Board or the New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and applicable legal and regulatory requirements;
  - Whether the system of quality control has been appropriately designed and effectively implemented; and
  - Whether the firm's quality control policies and procedures have been appropriately applied, so that reports that are issued by the firm or engagement partners are appropriate in the circumstances.
- Identification of the deficiencies noted, an evaluation of their effect, and the basis for determining whether and what further action is necessary.

#### Considerations Specific to Smaller Firms

A75. Smaller firms may use more informal methods in the documentation of their systems of quality control such as manual notes, checklists and forms.

[NZA75.1] The policies are often simply embedded in the firm's engagements templates in the form of standard communications, questionnaires, checklists, memoranda, and forms.

## **Accompanying Attachment: Similarity to International and Australian Standards on Quality Control**

This conformity statement accompanies but is not part of PES 3 (Amended).

### **Conformity with International Standards on Quality Control**

This Professional and Ethical Standard conforms with International Standard on Quality Control (ISQC) 1 *Quality Control for Firms that Perform Audits and Reviews of Financial Statements, and Other Assurance and Related Services Engagements*, issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB), and independent standard-setting board of the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC) in respect of audits and reviews of financial statements, and other assurance engagements.

Requirements and application material that has been added to this Professional and Ethical Standard (and do not appear in the text of the equivalent ISQC 1) are identified with the prefix “NZ”.

The following requirements are additional to ISQC 1:

- Emphasising that having appropriate time available is a consideration in assigning the engagement team; (Ref: Para NZ31.1)
- A requirement to document the reasons alternative courses of action from consultations were undertaken (NZ34.1)

This Professional and Ethical standard differs in scope from ISQC 1 as it does not apply to related service engagements.

This Professional and Ethical Standard incorporates terminology and definitions used in New Zealand. Requirements that apply to listed entities have been broadened to apply to FMC reporting entities considered to have a higher level of public accountability in New Zealand. This applies to the engagement quality control review requirements. (Ref: Para NZ35.1 and NZ38.1)

Compliance with this Professional and Ethical Standard enables compliance with ISQC 1, to the extent that ISQC 1 applies to audits and reviews of financial statements, and other assurance engagements.

### **Comparison with Australian Standards on Quality Control**

In Australia, the Australian Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (AUASB) has issued Auditing Standard ASQC 1 *Quality Control for Firms that perform Audits and Reviews of Financial Reports and Other Financial Information, and Other Assurance Engagements*.

ASQC 1 also conforms with ISQC 1. ASQC 1 also differs, like PES 3(Amended), in scope from ISQC 1 as it does not apply to related services engagements. ASQC 1 also includes the additional requirement described above to document the reasons alternative courses of action from consultations were undertaken.

The following requirement in ASQC 1 is additional to ISQC 1 and PES 3(Amended):

- At least annually, the firm shall obtain written confirmation of compliance with its policies and procedures on independence from all firm personnel required to be independent by applicable legal and regulatory requirements (Ref: Para. Aus 24.1)

The equivalent requirements and related application and other explanatory material included in ISQC 1 and PES 3 (Amended) in respect of relevant ethical requirements, are included in another Auditing Standard, ASA 102 *Compliance with Ethical Requirements when Performing Audits*,

*Reviews and Other Assurance Engagements*, rather than ASAE 3410. There is no international or New Zealand equivalent to ASA 102.

## Appendix

**Amendments to Other Pronouncements**

*This appendix sets out amendments to other ISAs (NZ), ISAEs (NZ) and other pronouncements issued by the XRB or the NZAuASB that are a consequence of the issuance of this PES 3 (Amended). Amended paragraphs are shown with new text underlined and deleted text struck through.*

A generic change is required throughout the relevant ISAs (NZ), ISAEs (NZ) and other pronouncements issued by the XRB Board or the NZAuASB to amend the title of Professional and Ethical Standard 3, “Quality Control”, to Professional and Ethical Standard 3 (Amended), “Quality Control for Firms that Perform Audits and Reviews of Financial Statements, and Other Assurance Engagements”.

Paragraph references to Professional and Ethical Standard 3 will be amended as follows:

<b>Pronouncement</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Change</b>
ISA (NZ) 200	Paragraph A17 footnote 13	Amend “paragraph 26-27” to “paragraphs 20-25”
ISA (NZ) 220	Paragraph 2 footnote 2	Amend “paragraph 14” to “paragraph 11”.
	Paragraph A8 footnote 8	Amend “paragraph 32” to paragraph 27(a)”
	Paragraph A16 footnote 10	Amend “paragraph 39” to “paragraph 33”.
	Paragraph A32 footnote 17	Amend “paragraph 54” to paragraph 48”
ISA (NZ) 230	Paragraph 3 footnote 3	Amend “paragraph 41-44 and 54” to “paragraph 32-33, 35-38, and 48”.
	Paragraph A21 footnote 12	Amend “paragraph 51” to “paragraph 45”.
	Paragraph A21 footnote 13	Amend “paragraph A62” to “paragraph A54”.
	Paragraph A23 footnote 14	Amend “paragraph 53” to “paragraph 47”.
	Paragraph A23 footnote 15	Amend “paragraph A68” to “paragraph A61”.
ISA (NZ) 260	Appendix 1 first bullet point	Amend “paragraph 36(a)” to “paragraph 30(a)”
ISA (NZ) 600	Paragraph A35 footnote 20	Amend “paragraph 60” to “paragraph 54”
ISA (NZ) 620	Paragraph A11 footnote 9	Amend “paragraph 15(g)” to “paragraph 12 (f)”
	Paragraph A12 footnote 10	Amend “paragraph 15(g)” to “paragraph 12 (f)”
ISAE (NZ) 3402	Paragraph 50 footnote 11	Amend “paragraphs A62-A63” to “paragraphs A54-A55”.

	Paragraph A46 footnote 17	Amend “paragraph 51” to “paragraph 45”
	Paragraph A46 footnote 18	Amend “paragraph A62” to “paragraph A54”.