

Accountancy Profession Act 1979

Cap 281

Directive Number 2 issued in terms of the Accountancy Profession Act (Cap 281) and of the Accountancy Profession Regulations 1986 (as amended)

In exercise of the powers conferred by article 8(2) of the Accountancy Profession Act (hereinafter referred to as "**the Act**"), the Accountancy Board with the approval of the Minister for Finance is hereby issuing the Directive set out in this document to warrant holders under the Act.

This Directive may be cited as the Accountancy Profession (Code of Ethics for Warrant Holders) Directive, and shall, in accordance with article 8 of the Act come into force one week from its publication in the Government Gazette.

This Directive shall replace Directive Number 2 previously issued by the Board which was effective from 13 March 2015 (the "**Replaced Code**"), which itself had replaced the previous Directive 2 originally issued on 20 March 2009.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY MEMORANDUM.....	3
CONTENTS	6
DEFINITIONS	8
EFFECTIVE DATE.....	15
PART A: GENERAL APPLICATION OF THE CODE	16
PART B: WARRANT HOLDERS IN PUBLIC PRACTICE	26
PART C: WARRANT HOLDERS IN BUSINESS.....	125

INTRODUCTORY MEMORANDUM

Introduction

This memorandum provides background to, and explanation of, the Code of Ethics for Accountants (the Code), being issued by the Accountancy Board as a Directive in terms of the Accountancy Profession Act (Cap 281).

The Code establishes the fundamental principles of professional ethics for warrant holders and provides a conceptual framework for applying those principles. Unless a limitation is specifically stated, the fundamental principles are equally valid for all warrant holders. Compliance with the Code is mandatory for all warrant holders with effect from the Effective Date.

Background

This Code is largely based on a model code developed under the auspices of the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC). IFAC's mission is to serve the public interest, continue to strengthen the accountancy profession worldwide, promote adherence to high-quality professional standards and furthering the international convergence of such standards.

In pursuing its mission, IFAC has established the International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants (IESBA) to function as an independent standard-setting body. The IESBA's objective is to serve the public interest by setting high-quality ethical standards for warrant holders and by facilitating the convergence of international and national ethical standards. In fulfilling the above objective, the IESBA develops and issues the international Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants (IESBA Code). The IESBA Code establishes ethical requirements for warrant holders and is updated from time to time to reflect new developments together with heightened expectations from the accountancy profession. As a Member body of IFAC, the Maltese recognised accountancy body must comply with the principles included in the IESBA Code.

In November 2001, IFAC issued a revision to Section 8 of the IFAC Code of Ethics, addressing independence requirements for assurance engagements. This section represented the start of a process of change for the IFAC Code. It established an international standard, and determined that no IFAC member body or firm is allowed to apply less stringent standards than those stated in that section unless prohibited by law or regulation.

In 2002 IESBA embarked upon a project to extend the principles based (or 'Framework') approach to the entire IFAC Code, addressing accountants in public practice and in business. In December 2004, the IESBA launched a comprehensive project to revisit the independence requirements for warrant holders in public practice that perform assurance engagements. The IESBA approved the proposed changes to the independence requirements contained in the Code of Ethics in 2008.

Subsequent to this, in July 2009, the IESBA issued a revised IESBA Code clarifying the requirements for all warrant holders and significantly strengthening the independence requirements of all warrant holders in public practice.

This process has been accompanied by the development of similar guidance, with particular emphasis on auditor independence, which has been issued by various regulatory and other authorities, including the European Commission.

In May 2002 the European Commission issued as a recommendation, a set of fundamental principles on Statutory Auditors' Independence in the European Union. The EU recommendation is also based on a set of fundamental principles that seek to provide investors and other stakeholders in EU companies with a uniformly high level of assurance that statutory auditors perform their audit work independently throughout the EU. This recommendation provides a framework within which all of the general issues of statutory auditors' independence are considered. This Code takes into account the European Commission's recommendation.

Directive 2006/43/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2006 on statutory audits of annual accounts and consolidated accounts requires Member States to ensure auditor independence. It requires all warrant holders to be subject to principles of professional ethics, integrity, objectivity, professional competence and due care. These provisions have been transposed in this Code.

Directive 2014/56/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 amending Directive 2006/43/EC further reinforced the concept of independence.

The Accountancy Board believes that rather than merely comply with a set of specific rules, which may be arbitrary, the establishment of a conceptual framework that requires warrant holders to identify, evaluate and address threats to compliance with the fundamental principles, is in the public interest.

The Accountancy Board has considered the need to update the Code of Ethics applicable to warrant holders in Malta to reflect these developments, and this revised code is being issued today to address this need.

The Code issued by the Accountancy Board is based on the IESBA Code amended in certain areas to reflect additional requirements contained in the EU recommendation, Directive and Regulation. It sets standards of conduct and states the fundamental principles that should be observed by warrant holders. It is being issued not as a recommendation to warrant holders but as a mandatory standard.

Structure of the Code

This Code is divided into three parts:

- (a) Part A applies to all warrant holders.
- (b) Part B applies to warrant holders in public practice.
- (c) Part C applies to warrant holders in business.

The Code also includes a definitions section.

This format means that warrant holders in public practice will need to be familiar with Parts A and B, and warrant holders in business will need to be familiar with Parts A and C. There is a certain amount of repetition of material from Part A in both Parts B and C, intended to aid in the readability and understandability of those two Parts. However, this does not remove the need for all warrant holders to be familiar with all of Part A.

The Framework Approach

The framework approach assists warrant holders in complying with the ethical requirements of this Code and meeting their responsibility to act in the public interest. The Code establishes the fundamental principles of ethics for warrant holders and provides a conceptual framework that requires warrant holders to identify, evaluate and address threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. When a warrant holder identifies threats to compliance with the fundamental principles the warrant holder is required to determine whether appropriate safeguards are available and can be applied to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. A warrant holder is also required to use his professional judgment in applying this conceptual framework.

The Accountancy Board believes that such a framework approach is preferable to a rules based approach to ethics which cannot provide for all circumstances and may lead to unquestioning obedience to the letter of a rule while setting definitive lines in legislation that some will try to circumnavigate.

Areas of Guidance

Part A establishes the fundamental principles of professional ethics for warrant holders and provides a conceptual framework that warrant holders shall apply to:

- (a) Identify threats to compliance with the fundamental principles;
- (b) Evaluate the significance of the threats identified; and
- (c) Apply safeguards, when necessary, to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level.

This Part also includes guidance regarding the resolution of ethical conflicts.

Parts B and C of the Code include examples that are intended to illustrate the application of the principles. They identify various circumstances posing potential threats to compliance with the fundamental principles that may be experienced by warrant holders in public practice and warrant holders in business. Examples of safeguards against such threats are also provided, including potential safeguards created in the work environment or by the client.

These examples are not intended to be, nor should they be interpreted as, an exhaustive list of all circumstances experienced by warrant holders that may create threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. Consequently, it is not sufficient for warrant holders merely to comply with the examples presented; rather, they should apply the principles to the particular circumstances they encounter.

**CODE OF ETHICS
FOR WARRANT HOLDERS**

CONTENTS

DEFINITIONS	8
EFFECTIVE DATE	15
PART A: GENERAL APPLICATION OF THE CODE	16
SECTION 100: Introduction and Fundamental Principles	17
SECTION 110: Integrity	22
SECTION 120: Objectivity	22
SECTION 130: Professional Competence and Due Care	23
SECTION 140: Confidentiality	23
SECTION 150: Professional Behaviour	25
PART B: WARRANT HOLDERS IN PUBLIC PRACTICE	26
SECTION 200: Introduction	29
SECTION 210: Professional Appointment	33
SECTION 220: Conflicts of Interest	36
SECTION 230: Second Opinions	40
SECTION 240: Fees and Other Types of Remuneration	40
SECTION 250: Marketing Professional Services	42
SECTION 260: Gifts and Hospitality	42
SECTION 270: Custody of Client Assets	43
SECTION 280: Objectivity – All Services	43
SECTION 290: Independence – Audit and Review Engagements	45
SECTION 291: Independence – Other Assurance Engagements	96
SECTION 292: Internal organisation of auditors	122
SECTION 293: Organisation of the work	123
PART C: WARRANT HOLDERS IN BUSINESS	125
SECTION 300: Introduction	126
SECTION 310: Conflicts of Interest	128
SECTION 320: Preparation and Reporting of Information	130
SECTION 330: Acting with Sufficient Expertise	131
SECTION 340: Financial Interests, Compensation and Incentives Linked to Financial Reporting and Decision Making	132

DEFINITIONS

In this Code of Ethics for Warrant Holders the following expressions have the following meanings assigned to them:

- Acceptable level** A level at which a reasonable and informed third party would be likely to conclude, weighing all the specific facts and circumstances available to the warrant holder at that time, that compliance with the fundamental principles is not compromised.
- Act** The Accountancy Profession Act XXVIII of 1979 as amended.
- Advertising** The communication to the public of information as to the services or skills provided by warrant holders in public practice with a view to procuring professional business.
- Assurance client** The responsible party that is the person (or persons) who:
 (a) In a direct reporting engagement, is responsible for the subject matter; or
 (b) In an assertion-based engagement, is responsible for the subject matter information and may be responsible for the subject matter.
- Assurance engagement** An engagement in which a warrant holder in public practice expresses a conclusion designed to enhance the degree of confidence of the intended users other than the responsible party about the outcome of the evaluation or measurement of a subject matter against criteria.
 (For guidance on assurance engagements see the International Framework for Assurance Engagements issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board which describes the elements and objectives of an assurance engagement and identifies engagements to which International Standards on Auditing (ISAs), International Standards on Review Engagements (ISREs) and International Standards on Assurance Engagements (ISAEs) apply.)
- Assurance team** (a) All members of the engagement team for the assurance engagement;
 (b) All others within a firm who can directly influence the outcome of the assurance engagement, including:
 (i) those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the assurance engagement principal in connection with the performance of the assurance engagement;
 (ii) those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry specific issues, transactions or events for the assurance engagement; and
 (iii) those who provide quality control for the assurance engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the assurance engagement.

DEFINITIONS

Audit client	An entity in respect of which a firm conducts an audit engagement. When the client is a listed entity, audit client will always include its related entities. When the audit client is not a listed entity, audit client includes those related entities over which the client has direct or indirect control.
Audit engagement	A reasonable assurance engagement in which a warrant holder in public practice expresses an opinion whether financial statements are prepared, in all material respects (or give a true and fair view or are presented fairly, in all material respects,), in accordance with an applicable financial reporting framework, such as an engagement conducted in accordance with International Standards on Auditing. This includes a Statutory Audit, which is an audit required by legislation or other regulation.
Audit Regulation	Regulation (EU) No. 537/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 on specific requirements regarding statutory audit of public-interest entities and repealing Commission Decision 2005/909/EC.
Audit team	<ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) All members of the engagement team for the audit engagement;(b) All others within a firm who can directly influence the outcome of the audit engagement, including:<ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) Those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the engagement principal in connection with the performance of the audit engagement including those at all successively senior levels above the engagement principal through to the individual who is the firm's Senior or Managing Principal (Chief Executive or equivalent);(ii) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry-specific issues, transactions or events for the engagement; and(iii) Those who provide quality control for the engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the engagement; and(c) All those within a network firm who can directly influence the outcome of the audit engagement.
Board	The Accountancy Board established under Article 6 of the Accountancy Profession Act XXVIII of 1979 as amended.
Close family	A parent, child or sibling who is not an immediate family member.
Contingent fee	A fee calculated on a predetermined basis relating to the outcome of a transaction or the result of the services performed by the firm. A fee that is established by a court or other public authority is not a contingent fee.
Direct financial interest	A financial interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Owned directly by and under the control of an individual or entity (including those managed on a discretionary basis by others); or▪ Beneficially owned through a collective investment vehicle, estate,

DEFINITIONS

trust or other intermediary over which the individual or entity has control, or the ability to influence investment decisions.

Director or officer	Those charged with the governance of an entity, or acting in an equivalent capacity, regardless of their title.
Engagement principal	The principal or other person in the firm who is responsible for the engagement and its performance, and for the report that is issued on behalf of the firm.
Engagement quality control review	A process designed to provide an objective evaluation, on or before the report is issued, of the significant judgments the engagement team made and the conclusions it reached in formulating the report.
Engagement team	All principals and staff performing the engagement, and any individuals engaged by the firm or a network firm who perform assurance procedures on the engagement. This excludes external experts engaged by the firm or by a network firm. The term “engagement team” also excludes individuals within the client’s internal audit function who provide direct assistance on an audit engagement when the external auditor complies with the requirements of ISA 610 (Revised 2013), Using the Work of Internal Auditors.
EU Listed entity	An entity governed by the law of a Member State whose transferable securities are admitted to trading on a regulated market of any Member State within the meaning of point 14 of article 4(1) of Directive 2004/39/EC.
Existing warrant holder	A warrant holder in public practice currently holding an audit appointment or carrying out accounting, taxation, consulting or similar professional services for a client.
Expert	If the context so requires, the term ‘expert’ refers to accountants possessing appropriate skills and qualifications, not limited to warrant holders, who would be suitably placed to assist a warrant holder in the discharge of his responsibilities according to the particular circumstances; it would include, for instance, an auditor from an overseas network firm who may be consulted due to his specialist knowledge in a particular field; or a member of staff of appropriate seniority who may be requested to conduct a second review of the work of a more junior colleague who is taking up employment with an audit client.
External expert	An individual (who is not a principal or a member of the professional staff, including temporary staff, of the firm or a network firm) or organisation possessing skills, knowledge and experience, whose work is used to assist the warrant holder in obtaining sufficient appropriate evidence.
Financial interest	An interest in an equity or other security, debenture, loan or other debt instrument of an entity, including rights and obligations to acquire such

DEFINITIONS

an interest and derivatives directly related to such interest.

Financial statements

A structured representation of historical financial information, including related notes, intended to communicate an entity's economic resources or obligations at a point in time or the changes therein for a period of time in accordance with a financial reporting framework. The related notes ordinarily comprise a summary of significant accounting policies and other explanatory information. The term can relate to a complete set of financial statements, but it can also refer to a single financial statement, for example, a balance sheet, or a statement of revenues and expenses, and related explanatory notes.

Financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion

In the case of a single entity, the financial statements of that entity. In the case of consolidated financial statements, also referred to as group financial statements, the consolidated financial statements.

Firm

(a) An audit firm;
(b) An accountancy firm;
(c) A third-country auditor or a third-country audit entity registered in accordance with article 7(6) of the Act;
(d) A sole practice through which a warrant holder engages in public practice;
and where applicable shall include an entity that controls such parties and an entity that is controlled by such parties.

Historical financial information

Information expressed in financial terms in relation to a particular entity, derived primarily from that entity's accounting system, about economic events occurring in past time periods or about economic conditions or circumstances at points in time in the past.

Immediate family

A spouse (or equivalent) or dependent.

Independence

Independence is:

- (a) Independence of mind – the state of mind that permits the expression of a conclusion without being affected by influences that compromise professional judgement, thereby allowing an individual to act with integrity, and exercise objectivity and professional scepticism.
- (b) Independence in appearance – the avoidance of facts and circumstances that are so significant that a reasonable and informed third party would be likely to conclude, weighing all the specific facts and circumstances, that a firm's, or a member of the audit or assurance team's, integrity, objectivity or professional scepticism has been compromised.

Indirect financial interest

A financial interest beneficially owned through a collective investment vehicle, estate, trust or other intermediary over which the individual or entity has no control or ability to influence investment decisions.

Key audit principal

(a) the statutory auditor designated by an audit firm for a particular

DEFINITIONS

	audit engagement as being primarily responsible for carrying out the statutory audit on behalf of the audit firm; or
	(b) in the case of a group audit, at least the statutory auditor designated by an audit firm as being primarily responsible for carrying out the statutory audit at the level of the group and the statutory auditor designated as being primarily responsible at the level of the material subsidiaries;
	(c) the statutory auditor who signs the audit report; or
	(d) the individual responsible for the engagement quality control review.
Listed entity	An EU listed entity and any other entity whose shares, stock or debt are quoted or listed on a recognised stock exchange, or are marketed under the regulations of a recognised stock exchange or other equivalent body.
Network	A larger structure: (a) That is aimed at co-operation; and (b) 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.
Network firm	A firm or entity that belongs to a network.
Non EU Listed entity	Any listed entity which is not an EU listed entity
Office	A distinct sub-group, whether organised on geographical or practice lines.
Professional Activity	An activity requiring accountancy or related skills undertaken by a warrant holder, including accounting, auditing, taxation, management consulting, and financial management.
Professional scepticism	An attitude that includes a questioning mind, being alert to conditions which may indicate possible misstatement due to error or fraud, and a critical assessment of audit evidence.
Professional services	Professional activities performed for clients.
Public-interest entity	(a) An entity governed by the law of a Member State whose transferable securities are admitted to trading on a regulated market of any Member State within the meaning of point 14 of Article 4(1) of Directive 2004/39/EC; (b) a credit institution as defined in point 1 of Article 3 (1) of Directive 2013/36/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on access to the activity of credit institutions and the prudential supervision of credit institutions and investment firms, other than those referred to in Article 2 of that Directive; (c) an insurance undertaking within the meaning of Article 2(1) of

DEFINITIONS

- Directive 91/674/EEC; and
- (d) such other entities as may be prescribed by the Minister.

Related entity	<p>An entity that has any of the following relationships with the client:</p> <p>(a) An entity that has direct or indirect control over the client if the client is material to such entity;</p> <p>(b) An entity with a direct financial interest in the client if that entity has significant influence over the client and the interest in the client is material to such entity;</p> <p>(c) An entity over which the client has direct or indirect control;</p> <p>(d) An entity in which the client, or an entity related to the client under (c) above, has a direct financial interest that gives it significant influence over such entity and the interest is material to the client and its related entity in (c); and</p> <p>(e) An entity which is under common control with the client (a “sister entity”) if the sister entity and the client are both material to the entity that controls both the client and sister entity.</p>
Review client	<p>An entity in respect of which a firm conducts a review engagement.</p>
Review engagement	<p>An assurance engagement, conducted in accordance with International Standards on Review Engagements or equivalent, in which a warrant holder in public practice expresses a conclusion on whether, on the basis of the procedures which do not provide all the evidence that would be required in an audit, anything has come to the warrant holder’s attention that causes the warrant holder to believe that the financial statements are not prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with an applicable financial reporting framework.</p>
Review team	<p>(a) All members of the engagement team for the review engagement; and</p> <p>(b) All others within a firm who can directly influence the outcome of the review engagement, including:</p> <p>(i) Those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the engagement principal in connection with the performance of the review engagement including those at all successively senior levels above the engagement principal through to the individual who is the firm’s Senior or Managing Principal (Chief Executive or equivalent);</p> <p>(ii) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry specific issues, transactions or events for the engagement; and</p> <p>(iii) Those who provide quality control for the engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the engagement; and</p> <p>(c) All those within a network firm who can directly influence the outcome of the review engagement.</p>
Special purpose financial statements	<p>Financial statements prepared in accordance with a financial reporting framework designed to meet the financial needs of specified users.</p>

DEFINITIONS

Statutory Audit Directive	Directive 2006/43EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2006 on statutory audits of annual accounts and consolidated accounts as amended by Directive 2014/56/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014.
Those charged with governance	The person(s) or organisation(s) (for example, a corporate trustee) with responsibility for overseeing the strategic direction of the entity and obligations related to the accountability of the entity. This includes overseeing the financial reporting process. For some entities in some jurisdictions, those charged with governance may include management personnel, for example, executive members of a governance board of a private or public sector entity, or an owner-manager.
Warrant	A warrant issued in terms of Article 4 of the Act and where applicable includes a practicing certificate;
Warrant holder	A person, holding a warrant as defined above and unless the context otherwise requires includes a firm.
Warrant holder in business	A warrant holder employed or engaged in an executive or non-executive capacity in such areas as commerce, industry, service, the public sector, education, the not for profit sector, regulatory bodies or professional bodies, or a warrant holder contracted by such entities.
Warrant holder in public practice	A warrant holder, irrespective of functional classification (e.g., audit, tax or consulting) in a firm that provides professional services. This term is also used to refer to a firm of warrant holders in public practice.

Terms used in the Code of Ethics and not defined shall, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning assigned to them in the Act and/or the Regulations made thereunder.

Reference to the male gender in this Code denotes both the male and female genders.

EFFECTIVE DATE

This Code is effective on 17 June 2016 (the “Effective Date”); early adoption is permitted. The Code is subject to the following transitional provisions:

Fees—Relative Size

1. Paragraph 290.221 provides that, in respect of an audit or review client that is a public interest entity, when the total fees from that client and its related entities (subject to the considerations in paragraph 290.27) for two consecutive years represent more than 15% of the total fees of the firm expressing the opinion on the financial statements, a pre- or post-issuance review (as described in paragraph 290.221) of the second year’s audit shall be performed. In the case of non EU listed entity this requirement is effective for audits or reviews of financial statements covering years that begin on or after December 15, 2014. For example, in the case of an audit client with a calendar year end, if the total fees from the client exceeded the 15% threshold for 2015 and 2016, the pre-or post-issuance review would be applied with respect to the audit of the 2016 financial statements.

Compensation and Evaluation Policies

2. Paragraph 290.229 provides that a key audit principal shall not be evaluated or compensated based on that principal’s success in selling non-assurance services to the principal’s audit client. This requirement is effective on January 1, 2016. A key audit principal may, however, receive compensation after January 1, 2016 based on an evaluation made prior to January 1, 2016 of that principal’s success in selling non-assurance services to the audit client.

Definition of the term “engagement team”

3. The definition of the term “engagement team” in the Definitions section of the Code is effective for audits of financial statements for periods ending on or after December 15, 2015.

**PART A: GENERAL APPLICATION OF THE CODE
CONTENTS**

SECTION 100: Introduction and Fundamental Principles	17
SECTION 110: Integrity	22
SECTION 120: Objectivity	22
SECTION 130: Professional Competence and Due Care	23
SECTION 140: Confidentiality	23
SECTION 150: Professional Behaviour	25

SECTION 100: Introduction and Fundamental Principles

General

- 100.1 This Part of the Code applies to all warrant holders.
- 100.2 The identity of the accountancy profession is characterised worldwide by its endeavour to achieve a number of common objectives and by its observance of certain fundamental principles for that purpose.
- 100.3 This Code of Ethics is based on the recommendations and guidelines made by the International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants (IESBA) which is an independent standard setting board with the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC) and is consistent with the European Commission Recommendation on Statutory Auditors' Independence in the EU and the applicable provisions of the Statutory Audit Directive and the Audit Regulation.
- 100.4 A profession is distinguished by certain characteristics including:
- Mastery of a particular intellectual skill, acquired by training and education;
 - Adherence by its members to a common code of values and conduct established by its administering body, including maintaining an outlook which is essentially objective; and
 - Acceptance of a duty to society as a whole (usually in return for restrictions in use of a title or in the granting of a qualification).
- 100.5 Warrant holders' duty to their profession and to society may at times seem to conflict with their immediate self-interest or their duty of loyalty to their employer.
- 100.6 A distinguishing mark of the accountancy profession is its acceptance of the responsibility to act in the public interest. The public interest is considered to be the collective well-being of the community of people and institutions the warrant holder serves, including clients, lenders, governments, employers, employees, investors, the business and financial community and others who rely on the work of warrant holders. Therefore, a warrant holder's responsibility is not exclusively to satisfy the needs of an individual client or employer. In acting in the public interest, a warrant holder shall observe and comply with this Code. If a warrant holder is prohibited from complying with certain parts of this Code by law or regulation, the warrant holder shall comply with all other parts of this Code.
- 100.7 This Code contains three parts. Part A establishes the fundamental principles of professional ethics for warrant holders and provides a conceptual framework that warrant holders shall apply to:
- (a) Identify threats to compliance with the fundamental principles;
 - (b) Evaluate the significance of the threats identified; and
 - (c) Apply safeguards, when necessary, to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. Safeguards are necessary when the warrant holder determines that the threats are not at a level at which a reasonable and informed third party would be likely to conclude, weighing all the specific facts and circumstances available to the warrant holder at that time, that compliance with the fundamental principles is not compromised.

A warrant holder shall use professional judgement in applying this conceptual framework.

- 100.8 Parts B and C describe how the conceptual framework applies in certain situations. They provide examples of safeguards that may be appropriate to address threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. They also describe situations where safeguards are not available to address the threats, and consequently, the circumstance or relationship creating the threats shall be avoided. Part B applies to warrant holders in public practice. Part C applies to warrant holders in business. Warrant holders in public practice may also find Part C relevant to their particular circumstances.
- 100.9 The use of the word “shall” in this Code imposes a requirement on the warrant holder or firm to comply with the specific provision in which “shall” has been used. Compliance is required unless an exception is permitted by this Code.

Fundamental Principles

- 100.10 A warrant holder shall comply with the following fundamental principles:
- (a) Integrity – to be straightforward and honest in all professional and business relationships.
 - (b) Objectivity – to not allow bias, conflict of interest or undue influence of others to override professional or business judgements.
 - (c) Professional Competence and Due Care – to maintain professional knowledge and skill at the level required to ensure that a client or employer receives competent professional services based on current developments in practice, legislation and techniques and act diligently and in accordance with applicable technical and professional standards.
 - (d) Confidentiality – to respect the confidentiality of information acquired as a result of professional and business relationships and, therefore, not disclose any such information to third parties without proper and specific authority, unless there is a legal or professional right or duty to disclose, nor use the information for the personal advantage of the warrant holder or third parties.
 - (e) Professional Behaviour – to comply with relevant laws and regulations and avoid any action that discredits the profession.

Each of these fundamental principles is discussed in more detail in Sections 110–150.

Conceptual Framework Approach

- 100.11 The circumstances in which warrant holders operate may create specific threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. It is impossible to define every situation that creates threats to compliance with the fundamental principles and specify the appropriate action. In addition, the nature of engagements and work assignments may differ and, consequently, different threats may be created, requiring the application of different safeguards. Therefore, this Code establishes a conceptual framework that requires a warrant holder to identify, evaluate, and address threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. The conceptual framework approach assists warrant holders in complying with the ethical requirements of this Code and meeting their responsibility to act in the public interest. It accommodates many

variations in circumstances that create threats to compliance with the fundamental principles and can deter a warrant holder from concluding that a situation is permitted if it is not specifically prohibited.

- 100.12 When a warrant holder identifies threats to compliance with the fundamental principles and, based on an evaluation of those threats, determines that they are not at an acceptable level, the warrant holder shall determine whether appropriate safeguards are available and can be applied to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. In making that determination, the warrant holder shall exercise professional judgement and take into account whether a reasonable and informed third party, weighing all the specific facts and circumstances available to the warrant holder at the time, would be likely to conclude that the threats would be eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level by the application of the safeguards, such that compliance with the fundamental principles is not compromised.
- 100.13 A warrant holder shall evaluate any threats to compliance with the fundamental principles when the warrant holder knows, or could reasonably be expected to know, of circumstances or relationships that may compromise compliance with the fundamental principles.
- 100.14 A warrant holder shall take qualitative as well as quantitative factors into account when evaluating the significance of a threat. When applying the conceptual framework, a warrant holder may encounter situations in which threats cannot be eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level, either because the threat is too significant or because appropriate safeguards are not available or cannot be applied. In such situations, the warrant holder shall decline or discontinue the specific professional service involved or, when necessary, resign from the engagement (in the case of a warrant holder in public practice) or the employing organisation (in the case of a warrant holder in business).
- 100.15 Sections 290 and 291 contain provisions with which a warrant holder shall comply if the warrant holder identifies a breach of an independence provision of the Code. If a warrant holder identifies a breach of any other provision of this Code, the warrant holder shall evaluate the significance of the breach and its impact on the warrant holder's ability to comply with the fundamental principles. The warrant holder shall take whatever actions that may be available, as soon as possible, to satisfactorily address the consequences of the breach. The warrant holder shall determine whether to report the breach, for example, to those who may have been affected by the breach, a member body, relevant regulator or oversight authority.
- 100.16 When a warrant holder encounters unusual circumstances in which the application of a specific requirement of the Code would result in a disproportionate outcome or an outcome that may not be in the public interest, it is recommended that the warrant holder consult with an accountancy body recognised under the Act or the Accountancy Board.

Threats and Safeguards

- 100.17 Threats may be created by a broad range of relationships and circumstances. When a relationship or circumstance creates a threat, such a threat could compromise, or could be perceived to compromise, a warrant holder's compliance with the fundamental principles. A circumstance or relationship may create more than one

threat, and a threat may affect compliance with more than one fundamental principle. Threats fall into one or more of the following categories:

- (a) Self-interest threat – the threat that a financial or other interest will inappropriately influence the warrant holder’s judgement or behaviour;
- (b) Self-review threat – the threat that a warrant holder will not appropriately evaluate the results of a previous judgement made or service performed by the warrant holder, or by another individual within the warrant holder’s firm or employing organisation, on which the warrant holder will rely when forming a judgement as part of providing a current service;
- (c) Advocacy threat – the threat that a warrant holder will promote a client’s or employer’s position to the point that the warrant holder’s objectivity is compromised;
- (d) Familiarity threat – the threat that due to a long or close relationship with a client or employer, a warrant holder will be too sympathetic to their interests or too accepting of their work; and
- (e) Intimidation threat – the threat that a warrant holder will be deterred from acting objectively because of actual or perceived pressures, including attempts to exercise undue influence over the warrant holder.

Parts B and C of this Code explain how these categories of threats may be created for warrant holders in public practice and warrant holders in business, respectively. Warrant holders in public practice may also find Part C relevant to their particular circumstances.

- 100.18 Safeguards are actions or other measures that may eliminate threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. They fall into two broad categories:
- (a) Safeguards created by the profession, legislation or regulation; and
 - (b) Safeguards in the work environment.
- 100.19 Safeguards created by the profession, legislation or regulation include:
- Educational, training and experience requirements for entry into the profession.
 - Continuing professional development requirements.
 - Corporate governance regulations.
 - Professional standards.
 - Professional or regulatory monitoring and disciplinary procedures.
 - External review by a legally empowered third party of the reports, returns, communications or information produced by a warrant holder.
- 100.20 Parts B and C of this Code discuss safeguards in the work environment for warrant holders in public practice and warrant holders in business, respectively.
- 100.21 Certain safeguards may increase the likelihood of identifying or deterring unethical behaviour. Such safeguards, which may be created by the accounting profession, legislation, regulation, or an employing organisation, include:
- Effective, well-publicised complaint systems operated by the employing organisation, the profession or a regulator, which enable colleagues, employers and members of the public to draw attention to unprofessional or unethical behaviour.
 - An explicitly stated duty to report breaches of ethical requirements.

Conflicts of Interest

- 100.22 A warrant holder may be faced with a conflict of interest when undertaking a professional activity. A conflict of interest creates a threat to objectivity and may create threats to the other fundamental principles. Such threats may be created when:
- The warrant holder undertakes a professional activity related to a particular matter for two or more parties whose interests with respect to that matter are in conflict; or
 - The interests of the warrant holder with respect to a particular matter and the interests of a party for whom the warrant holder undertakes a professional activity related to that matter are in conflict.
- 100.23 Parts B and C of this Code discuss conflicts of interest for warrant holders in public practice and warrant holders in business, respectively.

Ethical Conflict Resolution

- 100.24 A warrant holder may be required to resolve a conflict in complying with the fundamental principles.
- 100.25 When initiating either a formal or informal conflict resolution process, the following factors, either individually or together with other factors, may be relevant to the resolution process:
- (a) Relevant facts;
 - (b) Ethical issues involved;
 - (c) Fundamental principles related to the matter in question;
 - (d) Established internal procedures; and
 - (e) Alternative courses of action.
- Having considered the relevant factors, a warrant holder shall determine the appropriate course of action, weighing the consequences of each possible course of action. If the matter remains unresolved, the warrant holder may wish to consult with other appropriate persons within the firm or employing organisation for help in obtaining resolution.
- 100.26 Where a matter involves a conflict with, or within, an organisation, a warrant holder shall determine whether to consult with those charged with governance of the organisation, such as the board of directors or the audit committee.
- 100.27 It may be in the best interests of the warrant holder to document the substance of the issue, the details of any discussions held, and the decisions made concerning that issue.
- 100.28 If a significant conflict cannot be resolved, a warrant holder may consider obtaining professional advice from the Accountancy Board, an accountancy body recognised under the Act or from legal advisors. The warrant holder generally can obtain guidance on ethical issues without breaching the fundamental principle of confidentiality if the matter is discussed with the Accountancy Board or an accountancy body recognised under the Act on an anonymous basis or with a legal advisor under the protection of legal privilege. Instances in which the warrant holder

may consider obtaining legal advice vary. For example, a warrant holder may have encountered a fraud, the reporting of which could breach the warrant holder's responsibility to respect confidentiality. The warrant holder may consider obtaining legal advice in that instance to determine whether there is a requirement to report.

- 100.29 If, after exhausting all relevant possibilities, the ethical conflict remains unresolved, a warrant holder shall, where possible, refuse to remain associated with the matter creating the conflict. The warrant holder shall determine whether, in the circumstances, it is appropriate to withdraw from the engagement team or specific assignment, or to resign altogether from the engagement, the firm or the employing organisation.

Communicating with Those Charged with Governance

- 100.30 When communicating with those charged with governance in accordance with the provisions of this Code, the warrant holder or firm shall determine, having regard to the nature and importance of the particular circumstances and matter to be communicated, the appropriate person(s) within the entity's governance structure with whom to communicate. If the warrant holder or firm communicates with a subgroup of those charged with governance, for example, an audit committee or an individual, the warrant holder or firm shall determine whether communication with all of those charged with governance is also necessary so that they are adequately informed.

SECTION 110: Integrity

- 110.1 The principle of integrity imposes an obligation on all warrant holders to be straightforward and honest in all professional and business relationships. Integrity also implies fair dealing and truthfulness.
- 110.2 A warrant holder shall not knowingly be associated with reports, returns, communications or other information where the warrant holder believes that the information:
- (a) Contains a materially false or misleading statement;
 - (b) Contains statements or information furnished recklessly; or
 - (c) Omits or obscures information required to be included where such omission or obscurity would be misleading.

When a warrant holder becomes aware that he has been associated with such information, the warrant holder shall take steps to be disassociated from that information.

- 110.3 A warrant holder will be deemed not to be in breach of paragraph 110.2 if the warrant holder provides a modified report in respect of a matter contained in paragraph 110.2.

SECTION 120: Objectivity

- 120.1 The principle of objectivity imposes an obligation on all warrant holders not to compromise their professional or business judgement because of bias, conflict of interest or the undue influence of others.

- 120.2 A warrant holder may be exposed to situations that may impair objectivity. It is impracticable to define and prescribe all such situations. A warrant holder shall not perform a professional service if a circumstance or relationship biases or unduly influences the warrant holder's professional judgement with respect to that service.

SECTION 130: Professional Competence and Due Care

- 130.1 The principle of professional competence and due care imposes the following obligations on all warrant holders:
- (a) To maintain professional knowledge and skill at the level required to ensure that clients or employers receive competent professional service; and
 - (b) To act diligently in accordance with applicable technical and professional standards when providing professional services.
- 130.2 Competent professional service requires the exercise of sound judgement in applying professional knowledge and skill in the performance of such service. Professional competence may be divided into two separate phases:
- (a) Attainment of professional competence; and
 - (b) Maintenance of professional competence.
- 130.3 The maintenance of professional competence requires a continuing awareness and an understanding of relevant technical, professional and business developments. Continuing professional development enables a warrant holder to develop and maintain the capabilities to perform competently within the professional environment.
- 130.4 Diligence encompasses the responsibility to act in accordance with the requirements of an assignment, carefully, thoroughly and on a timely basis.
- 130.5 A warrant holder shall take reasonable steps to ensure that those working under his authority in a professional capacity have appropriate training and supervision.
- 130.6 Where appropriate, a warrant holder shall make clients, employers or other users of his professional services aware of the limitations inherent in the services.

SECTION 140: Confidentiality

- 140.1 The principle of confidentiality imposes an obligation on all warrant holders to refrain from:
- (a) Disclosing outside the firm or employing organisation confidential information acquired as a result of professional and business relationships without proper and specific authority or unless there is a legal or professional right or duty to disclose; and
 - (b) Using confidential information acquired as a result of professional and business relationships to their personal advantage or the advantage of third parties.
- 140.2 A warrant holder shall maintain confidentiality, including in a social environment, being alert to the possibility of inadvertent disclosure, particularly to a close business associate or a close or immediate family member.

- 140.3 A warrant holder shall maintain confidentiality of information disclosed by a prospective client or employer.
- 140.4 A warrant holder shall maintain confidentiality of information within the firm or employing organisation.
- 140.5 A warrant holder shall take reasonable steps to ensure that staff under his control and persons from whom advice and assistance is obtained respect the warrant holder's duty of confidentiality.
- 140.6 The need to comply with the principle of confidentiality continues even after the end of relationships between a warrant holder and a client or employer. When a warrant holder changes employment or acquires a new client, the warrant holder is entitled to use prior experience. The warrant holder shall not, however, use or disclose any confidential information either acquired or received as a result of a professional or business relationship.
- 140.7 The following are circumstances where warrant holders are or may be required to disclose confidential information or when such disclosure may be appropriate:
- (a) Disclosure is permitted by law and is authorised by the client or the employer;
 - (b) Disclosure is required by law, for example:
 - (i) Production of documents or other provision of evidence in the course of legal proceedings; or
 - (ii) Disclosure to the appropriate public authorities of infringements of the law that come to light;
 - (c) There is a professional duty or right to disclose, when not prohibited by law:
 - (i) To comply with any quality assurance procedures initiated by the Accountancy Board;
 - (ii) To respond to an inquiry or investigation by an accountancy body recognised under the Act or the Accountancy Board in terms of the procedures set out in the Accountancy Profession Act of 1979, as amended;
 - (iii) To protect the professional interests of a warrant holder in legal proceedings; or
 - (iv) To comply with technical standards and ethics requirements.
- 140.8 Confidentiality and professional secrecy rules relating to warrant holders or firms shall not impede enforcement of the provisions of the Statutory Audit Directive or of the Audit Regulation.
- 140.9 Where a warrant holder or a firm carries out a statutory audit of an undertaking which is part of a group whose parent undertaking is situated in a third country, the confidentiality and professional secrecy rules referred to in Section 140.7 of this Code shall not impede the transfer by the warrant holder or the firm of relevant documentation concerning the audit work performed to the group auditor situated in a third country if such documentation is necessary for the performance of the audit of consolidated financial statements of the parent undertaking.
- 140.10 A warrant holder or a firm that carries out the statutory audit of an undertaking which has issued securities in a third country, or which forms part of a group issuing

statutory consolidated financial statements in a third country, may only transfer the audit working papers or other documents relating to the audit of that entity that he, she or it holds to the competent authorities in the relevant third countries under the conditions set out in regulation 9 of the Accountancy Profession Regulations (S.L. 281.01).

The transfer of information to the group auditor situated in a third country shall comply with Chapter IV of Directive 95/46/EC and the Data Protection Act (Cap. 440) and regulations made under it.

- 140.11 In deciding whether to disclose confidential information, relevant factors to consider include:
- (a) Whether the interests of all parties, including third parties whose interests may be affected, could be harmed if the client or employer consents to the disclosure of information by the warrant holder;
 - (b) Whether all the relevant information is known and substantiated, to the extent it is practicable; when the situation involves unsubstantiated facts, incomplete information or unsubstantiated conclusions, professional judgement shall be used in determining the type of disclosure to be made, if any;
 - (c) The type of communication that is expected and to whom it is addressed; and
 - (d) Whether the parties to whom the communication is addressed are appropriate recipients.

SECTION 150: Professional Behaviour

- 150.1 The principle of professional behaviour imposes an obligation on all warrant holders to comply with relevant laws and regulations and avoid any action that the warrant holder knows or should know may discredit the profession. This includes actions that a reasonable and informed third party, weighing all the specific facts and circumstances available to the warrant holder at that time, would be likely to conclude adversely affects the good reputation of the profession.
- 150.2 In marketing and promoting themselves and their work, warrant holders shall not bring the profession into disrepute. Warrant holders shall be honest and truthful and not:
- (a) Make exaggerated claims for the services they are able to offer, the qualifications they possess, or experience they have gained; or
 - (b) Make disparaging references or unsubstantiated comparisons to the work of others.

**PART B: WARRANT HOLDERS IN PUBLIC PRACTICE
CONTENTS**

SECTION 200: INTRODUCTION	29
SECTION 210: Professional Appointment	33
SECTION 220: Conflicts of Interest	36
SECTION 230: Second Opinions	40
SECTION 240: Fees and Other Types of Remuneration	40
SECTION 250: Marketing Professional Services	42
SECTION 260: Gifts and Hospitality	42
SECTION 270: Custody of Client Assets	43
SECTION 280: Objectivity – All Services	43
SECTION 290: Independence – Audit and Review Engagements	45
Structure of Section	47
A Conceptual Framework Approach to Independence	47
Networks and Network Firms	49
Public Interest Entities	50
Related Entities	51
Those Charged with Governance	51
Documentation	52
Engagement Period	52
Mergers and Acquisitions	53
Communications with audit committees	54
Breach of a Provision of this Section	54
Application of the Conceptual Framework Approach to Independence	58
Financial Interests	58
Loans and Guarantees	62
Business Relationships	63
Family and Personal Relationships	64
Employment with an Audit Client	66
Temporary Staff Assignments	68
Recent Service with an Audit Client	69
Serving as a Director or Officer of an Audit Client	70
Long Association of Senior Personnel (Including Principal Rotation) with an Audit Client	70

Provision of Non-assurance Services to Audit Clients	72
Management Responsibilities.....	73
Preparing Accounting Records and Financial Statements	74
Valuation Services.....	76
Taxation Services.....	77
Internal Audit Services	81
IT Systems Services.....	83
Litigation Support Services.....	84
Legal Services.....	84
Recruiting Services	86
Corporate Finance Services	86
Fees	87
Contingent Fees.....	90
Compensation and Evaluation Policies.....	91
Gifts and Hospitality	91
Actual or Threatened Litigation.....	91
Reports that Include a Restriction on Use and Distribution	93
SECTION 291 Independence – Other Assurance Engagements	96
Structure of Section.....	97
A Conceptual Framework Approach to Independence.....	97
Assurance Engagements	99
Assertion-based Assurance Engagements.....	99
Direct Reporting Assurance Engagements.....	100
Reports that Include a Restriction on Use and Distribution	100
Multiple Responsible Parties	101
Documentation	102
Engagement Period.....	102
Breach of a Provision of this Section	103
Application of the Conceptual Framework Approach to Independence.....	105
Financial Interests	105
Loans and Guarantees	107
Business Relationships	108
Family and Personal Relationships	109
Employment with Assurance Clients.....	111
Recent Service with an Assurance Client	112

Serving as a Director or Officer of an Assurance Client	112
Long Association of Senior Personnel with Assurance Clients	113
Provision of Non-assurance Services to Assurance Clients.....	113
Management Responsibilities.....	113
Other Considerations	114
Fees.....	115
Contingent Fees.....	116
Gifts and Hospitality	116
Actual or Threatened Litigation.....	117
Interpretation 2005–01: Application of Section 291 to Assurance Engagements that are Not Financial Statement Audit Engagements.....	118
SECTION 292: Internal organisation of auditors	122
SECTION 293: Organisation of the work.....	123

SECTION 200: Introduction

200.1 This Part of the Code describes how the conceptual framework contained in Part A applies in certain situations to warrant holders in public practice. This Part does not describe all of the circumstances and relationships that could be encountered by a warrant holder in public practice that create or may create threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. Therefore, the warrant holder in public practice is encouraged to be alert for such circumstances and relationships.

200.2 A warrant holder in public practice shall not knowingly engage in any business, occupation, or activity that impairs or might impair integrity, objectivity or the good reputation of the profession and as a result would be incompatible with the fundamental principles.

Threats and Safeguards

200.3 Compliance with the fundamental principles may potentially be threatened by a broad range of circumstances and relationships. The nature and significance of the threats may differ depending on whether they arise in relation to the provision of services to an audit client and whether the audit client is a public interest entity, to an assurance client that is not an audit client, or to a non-assurance client.

Threats fall into one or more of the following categories:

- (a) Self-interest;
- (b) Self-review;
- (c) Advocacy;
- (d) Familiarity; and
- (e) Intimidation.

These threats are discussed further in Part A of this Code.

200.4 Examples of circumstances that create *self-interest* threats for a warrant holder in public practice include:

- A member of the assurance team having a direct financial interest in the assurance client.
- A firm having undue dependence on total fees from a client.
- A member of the assurance team having a significant close business relationship with an assurance client.
- A firm being concerned about the possibility of losing a significant client.
- A member of the audit team entering into employment negotiations with the audit client.
- A firm entering into a contingent fee arrangement relating to an assurance engagement.
- A warrant holder discovering a significant error when evaluating the results of a previous professional service performed by a member of the warrant holder's firm.

200.5 Examples of circumstances that create *self-review* threats for a warrant holder in public practice include:

- A firm issuing an assurance report on the effectiveness of the operation of financial systems after designing or implementing the systems.

- A firm having prepared the original data used to generate records that are the subject matter of the assurance engagement.
- A member of the assurance team being, or having recently been, a director or officer of the client.
- A member of the assurance team being, or having recently been, employed by the client in a position to exert significant influence over the subject matter of the engagement.
- The firm performing a service for an assurance client that directly affects the subject matter information of the assurance engagement.

200.6 Examples of circumstances that create *advocacy* threats for a warrant holder in public practice include:

- The firm promoting shares in an audit client.
- A warrant holder acting as an advocate on behalf of an audit client in litigation or disputes with third parties.

200.7 Examples of circumstances that create *familiarity* threats for a warrant holder in public practice include:

- A member of the engagement team having a close or immediate family member who is a director or officer of the client.
- A member of the engagement team having a close or immediate family member who is an employee of the client who is in a position to exert significant influence over the subject matter of the engagement.
- A director or officer of the client or an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the subject matter of the engagement having recently served as the engagement principal.
- A warrant holder accepting gifts or preferential treatment from a client, unless the value is trivial or inconsequential.
- Senior personnel having a long association with the assurance client.

200.8 Examples of circumstances that create *intimidation* threats for a warrant holder in public practice include:

- A firm being threatened with dismissal from a client engagement.
- An audit client indicating that it will not award a planned non-assurance contract to the firm if the firm continues to disagree with the client's accounting treatment for a particular transaction.
- A firm being threatened with litigation by the client.
- A firm being pressured to reduce inappropriately the extent of work performed in order to reduce fees.
- A warrant holder feeling pressured to agree with the judgement of a client employee because the employee has more expertise on the matter in question.
- A warrant holder being informed by a principal of the firm that a planned promotion will not occur unless he agrees with an audit client's inappropriate accounting treatment.

200.9 Safeguards that may eliminate or reduce threats to an acceptable level fall into two broad categories:

- (a) Safeguards created by the profession, legislation or regulation; and
- (b) Safeguards in the work environment.

Examples of safeguards created by the profession, legislation or regulation are described in paragraph 100.19 of Part A of this Code.

- 200.10 A warrant holder in public practice shall exercise judgement to determine how best to deal with threats that are not at an acceptable level, whether by applying safeguards to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level or by terminating or declining the relevant engagement. In exercising this judgement, a warrant holder in public practice shall consider whether a reasonable and informed third party, weighing all the specific facts and circumstances available to the warrant holder at that time, would be likely to conclude that the threats would be eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level by the application of safeguards, such that compliance with the fundamental principles is not compromised. This consideration will be affected by matters such as the significance of the threat, the nature of the engagement and the structure of the firm.
- 200.11 In the work environment, the relevant safeguards will vary depending on the circumstances. Work environment safeguards comprise firm-wide safeguards and engagement-specific safeguards.
- 200.12 Examples of *firm-wide safeguards* in the work environment include:
- Leadership of the firm that stresses the importance of compliance with the fundamental principles.
 - Leadership of the firm that establishes the expectation that members of an assurance team will act in the public interest.
 - Policies and procedures to implement and monitor quality control of engagements.
 - Documented policies regarding the need to identify threats to compliance with the fundamental principles, evaluate the significance of those threats, and apply safeguards to eliminate or reduce the threats to an acceptable level or, when appropriate safeguards are not available or cannot be applied, terminate or decline the relevant engagement.
 - Documented internal policies and procedures requiring compliance with the fundamental principles.
 - Policies and procedures that will enable the identification of interests or relationships between the firm or members of engagement teams and clients.
 - Policies and procedures to monitor and, if necessary, manage the reliance on revenue received from a single client.
 - Using different principals and engagement teams with separate reporting lines for the provision of non-assurance services to an assurance client.
 - Policies and procedures to prohibit individuals who are not members of an engagement team from inappropriately influencing the outcome of the engagement.
 - Timely communication of a firm's policies and procedures, including any changes to them, to all principals and professional staff, and appropriate training and education on such policies and procedures.
 - Designating a member of senior management to be responsible for overseeing the adequate functioning of the firm's quality control system.
 - Advising principals and professional staff of assurance clients and related entities from which independence is required.
 - A disciplinary mechanism to promote compliance with policies and procedures.

- Published policies and procedures to encourage and empower staff to communicate to senior levels within the firm any issue relating to compliance with the fundamental principles that concerns them.
- 200.13 Examples of *engagement-specific safeguards* in the work environment include:
- Having an expert who was not involved with the non-assurance service review the non-assurance work performed or otherwise advise as necessary.
 - Having an expert who was not a member of the assurance team review the assurance work performed or otherwise advise as necessary.
 - Consulting an independent third party, such as a committee of independent directors, the Accountancy Board, an accountancy body recognised under the Act or an expert.
 - Discussing ethical issues with those charged with governance of the client.
 - Disclosing to those charged with governance of the client the nature of services provided and extent of fees charged.
 - Involving another firm to perform or re-perform part of the engagement.
 - Rotating senior assurance team personnel.
- 200.14 Depending on the nature of the engagement, a warrant holder in public practice may also be able to rely on safeguards that the client has implemented. However it is not possible to rely solely on such safeguards to reduce threats to an acceptable level.
- 200.15 Examples of safeguards within the client's systems and procedures include:
- The client requires persons other than management to ratify or approve the appointment of a firm to perform an engagement.
 - The client has competent employees with experience and seniority to make managerial decisions.
 - The client has implemented internal procedures that ensure objective choices in commissioning non-assurance engagements.
 - The client has a corporate governance structure that provides appropriate oversight and communications regarding the firm's services.

Professional Scepticism

- 200.16 A warrant holder or a firm carrying out the statutory audit shall maintain professional scepticism throughout the audit, recognising the possibility of a material misstatement due to facts or behaviour indicating irregularities, including fraud or error, notwithstanding the warrant holder's or the firm's past experience of the honesty and integrity of the audited client's management and of the persons charged with its governance.
- 200.17 A warrant holder or a firm shall maintain professional scepticism in particular when reviewing management estimates relating to fair values, the impairment of assets, provisions, and future cash flow relevant to the audit client's ability to continue as a going concern.

SECTION 210: Professional Appointment

Client Acceptance

- 210.1 Before accepting a new client relationship, a warrant holder in public practice shall determine whether acceptance would create any threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. Potential threats to integrity or professional behaviour may be created from, for example, questionable issues associated with the client (its owners, management or activities).
- 210.2 Client issues that, if known, could threaten compliance with the fundamental principles include, for example, client involvement in illegal activities (such as money laundering), dishonesty or questionable financial reporting practices.
- 210.3 A warrant holder in public practice shall evaluate the significance of any threats and apply safeguards when necessary to eliminate them or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:
- Obtaining knowledge and understanding of the client, its owners, managers and those responsible for its governance and business activities; or
 - Securing the client's commitment to improve corporate governance practices or internal controls.
- 210.4 Where it is not possible to reduce the threats to an acceptable level, the warrant holder in public practice shall decline to enter into the client relationship.
- 210.5 It is recommended that a warrant holder in public practice periodically review acceptance decisions for recurring client engagements.

Engagement Acceptance

- 210.6 The fundamental principle of professional competence and due care imposes an obligation on a warrant holder in public practice to provide only those services that the warrant holder in public practice is competent to perform. Before accepting a specific client engagement, a warrant holder in public practice shall determine whether acceptance would create any threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. For example, a self-interest threat to professional competence and due care is created if the engagement team does not possess, or cannot acquire, the competencies necessary to properly carry out the engagement.
- 210.7 A warrant holder in public practice shall evaluate the significance of threats and apply safeguards, when necessary, to eliminate them or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:
- Acquiring an appropriate understanding of the nature of the client's business, the complexity of its operations, the specific requirements of the engagement and the purpose, nature and scope of the work to be performed.
 - Acquiring knowledge of relevant industries or subject matters.
 - Possessing or obtaining experience with relevant regulatory or reporting requirements.
 - Assigning sufficient staff with the necessary competencies.
 - Using experts where necessary.
 - Agreeing on a realistic time frame for the performance of the engagement.

- Complying with quality control policies and procedures designed to provide reasonable assurance that specific engagements are accepted only when they can be performed competently.

210.8 When a warrant holder in public practice intends to rely on the advice or work of an expert, the warrant holder in public practice shall determine whether such reliance is warranted. Factors to consider include: reputation, expertise, resources available and applicable professional and ethical standards. Such information may be gained from prior association with the expert or from consulting others.

Changes in a Professional Appointment

210.9 A warrant holder in public practice who is asked to replace another warrant holder in public practice, or who is considering tendering for an engagement currently held by another warrant holder in public practice, shall determine whether there are any reasons, professional or otherwise, for not accepting the engagement, such as circumstances that create threats to compliance with the fundamental principles that cannot be eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level by the application of safeguards. For example, there may be a threat to professional competence and due care if a warrant holder in public practice accepts the engagement before knowing all the pertinent facts.

210.10 A warrant holder in public practice shall evaluate the significance of any threats. Depending on the nature of the engagement, this may require direct communication with the existing warrant holder to establish the facts and circumstances regarding the proposed change so that the warrant holder in public practice can decide whether it would be appropriate to accept the engagement. For example, the apparent reasons for the change in appointment may not fully reflect the facts and may indicate disagreements with the existing accountant that may influence the decision to accept the appointment.

210.11 Safeguards shall be applied when necessary to eliminate any threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- When replying to requests to submit tenders, stating in the tender that, before accepting the engagement, contact with the existing warrant holder will be requested so that inquiries may be made as to whether there are any professional or other reasons why the appointment should not be accepted;
- Asking the existing warrant holder to provide known information on any facts or circumstances that, in the existing warrant holder's opinion, the proposed warrant holder needs to be aware of before deciding whether to accept the engagement; or
- Obtaining necessary information from other sources.

When the threats cannot be eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level through the application of safeguards, a warrant holder in public practice shall, unless there is satisfaction as to necessary facts by other means, decline the engagement.

210.12 A warrant holder in public practice may be asked to undertake work that is complementary or additional to the work of the existing warrant holder. Such circumstances may create threats to professional competence and due care resulting from, for example, a lack of or incomplete information. The significance of

any threats shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. An example of such a safeguard is notifying the existing warrant holder of the proposed work, which would give the existing warrant holder the opportunity to provide any relevant information needed for the proper conduct of the work.

- 210.13 An existing warrant holder is bound by confidentiality. Whether that warrant holder is permitted or required to discuss the affairs of a client with a proposed warrant holder will depend on the nature of the engagement and on:
- (a) Whether the client's permission to do so has been obtained; or
 - (b) The legal or ethical requirements relating to such communications and disclosure.

- 210.14 In the absence of specific instructions by their clients, warrant holders shall not ordinarily volunteer information about the clients' affairs. Nevertheless, in the case of a change in auditor, the outgoing auditor shall provide the incoming auditor with access to all the relevant information concerning the audited entity and the most recent audit of that entity to assist the incoming auditor in assessing whether to accept the engagement:

Provided that it shall be the sole obligation of the incoming auditor, when relying upon such information, to check its veracity and accuracy.

Circumstances where the warrant holder is or may be required to disclose confidential information or where such disclosure may otherwise be appropriate are set out in Section 140 of Part A of this Code.

- 210.15 A warrant holder in public practice will generally need to obtain the client's permission, preferably in writing, to initiate discussion with an existing warrant holder. Once that permission is obtained, the existing warrant holder shall comply with relevant legal and other regulations governing such requests. Where the existing warrant holder provides information, it shall be provided honestly and unambiguously. If the proposed warrant holder is unable to communicate with the existing warrant holder, the proposed warrant holder shall take reasonable steps to obtain information about any possible threats by other means, such as through inquiries of third parties or background investigations of senior management or those charged with governance of the client.
- 210.16 The safeguard of communicating with the existing warrant holder is mandatory in the case of audit appointments. In such cases, if the proposed auditor does not receive, within a period of fifteen days, a reply from the existing auditor to a request for information in terms of paragraph 210.11 above, the proposed auditor shall send a further letter, by registered post, stating that there is an assumption that there is no professional matter that the existing auditor wishes to communicate before the proposed appointment is accepted and that there is an intention to do so. If no reply is forthcoming within fifteen days from the date of the second letter the proposed auditor will be free to accept the nomination. The proposed auditor may also submit a complaint to the Accountancy Board for its attention.
- 210.17 Before accepting or continuing an engagement for a statutory audit, a warrant holder or a firm shall assess and document the following:

- (a) whether he, she or it complies with the requirements of independence of the statutory auditor;
- (b) whether there are threats to his, her or its independence and the safeguards applied to mitigate those threats; and
- (c) whether he, she or it has the competent employees, time and resources needed in order to carry out the statutory audit in an appropriate manner.

SECTION 220: Conflicts of Interest

220.1 A warrant holder in public practice may be faced with a conflict of interest when performing a professional service. A conflict of interest creates a threat to objectivity and may create threats to the other fundamental principles. Such threats may be created when:

- The warrant holder provides a professional service related to a particular matter for two or more clients whose interests with respect to that matter are in conflict; or
- The interests of the warrant holder with respect to a particular matter and the interests of the client for whom the warrant holder provides a professional service related to that matter are in conflict.

A warrant holder shall not allow a conflict of interest to compromise professional or business judgement.

When the professional service is an assurance service, compliance with the fundamental principle of objectivity also requires being independent of assurance clients in accordance with Sections 290 or 291 as appropriate.

220.2 Examples of situations in which conflicts of interest may arise include:

- Providing a transaction advisory service to a client seeking to acquire an audit client of the firm, where the firm has obtained confidential information during the course of the audit that may be relevant to the transaction.
- Advising two clients at the same time who are competing to acquire the same company where the advice might be relevant to the parties' competitive positions.
- Providing services to both a vendor and a purchaser in relation to the same transaction.
- Preparing valuations of assets for two parties who are in an adversarial position with respect to the assets.
- Representing two clients regarding the same matter who are in a legal dispute with each other, such as during divorce proceedings or the dissolution of a partnership.
- Providing an assurance report for a licensor on royalties due under a license agreement when at the same time advising the licensee of the correctness of the amounts payable.
- Advising a client to invest in a business in which, for example, the spouse of the warrant holder in public practice has a financial interest.
- Providing strategic advice to a client on its competitive position while having a joint venture or similar interest with a major competitor of the client.
- Advising a client on the acquisition of a business which the firm is also interested in acquiring.

- Advising a client on the purchase of a product or service while having a royalty or commission agreement with one of the potential vendors of that product or service.

220.3 When identifying and evaluating the interests and relationships that might create a conflict of interest and implementing safeguards, when necessary, to eliminate or reduce any threat to compliance with the fundamental principles to an acceptable level, a warrant holder in public practice shall exercise professional judgment and take into account whether a reasonable and informed third party, weighing all the specific facts and circumstances available to the warrant holder at the time, would be likely to conclude that compliance with the fundamental principles is not compromised.

220.4 When addressing conflicts of interest, including making disclosures or sharing information within the firm or network and seeking guidance of third parties, the warrant holder in public practice shall remain alert to the fundamental principle of confidentiality.

220.5 If the threat created by a conflict of interest is not at an acceptable level, the warrant holder in public practice shall apply safeguards to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. If safeguards cannot reduce the threat to an acceptable level, the warrant holder shall decline to perform or shall discontinue professional services that would result in the conflict of interest; or shall terminate relevant relationships or dispose of relevant interests to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level.

220.6 Before accepting a new client relationship, engagement, or business relationship, a warrant holder in public practice shall take reasonable steps to identify circumstances that might create a conflict of interest, including identification of:

- The nature of the relevant interests and relationships between the parties involved; and
- The nature of the service and its implication for relevant parties.

The nature of the services and the relevant interests and relationships may change during the course of the engagement. This is particularly true when a warrant holder is asked to conduct an engagement in a situation that may become adversarial, even though the parties who engage the warrant holder may not initially be involved in a dispute. The warrant holder shall remain alert to such changes for the purpose of identifying circumstances that might create a conflict of interest.

220.7 For the purpose of identifying interests and relationships that might create a conflict of interest, having an effective conflict identification process assists a warrant holder in public practice to identify actual or potential conflicts of interest prior to determining whether to accept an engagement and throughout an engagement. This includes matters identified by external parties, for example clients or potential clients. The earlier an actual or potential conflict of interest is identified, the greater the likelihood of the warrant holder being able to apply safeguards, when necessary, to eliminate the threat to objectivity and any threat to compliance with other fundamental principles or reduce it to an acceptable level. The process to identify actual or potential conflicts of interest will depend on such factors as:

- The nature of the professional services provided.

- The size of the firm.
 - The size and nature of the client base.
 - The structure of the firm, for example, the number and geographic location of offices.
- 220.8 If the firm is a member of a network, conflict identification shall include any conflicts of interest that the warrant holder in public practice has reason to believe may exist or might arise due to interests and relationships of a network firm. Reasonable steps to identify such interests and relationships involving a network firm will depend on factors such as the nature of the professional services provided, the clients served by the network and the geographic locations of all relevant parties.
- 220.9 If a conflict of interest is identified, the warrant holder in public practice shall evaluate:
- The significance of relevant interests or relationships; and
 - The significance of the threats created by performing the professional service or services. In general, the more direct the connection between the professional service and the matter on which the parties' interests are in conflict, the more significant the threat to objectivity and compliance with the other fundamental principles will be.
- 220.10 The warrant holder in public practice shall apply safeguards, when necessary, to eliminate the threats to compliance with the fundamental principles created by the conflict of interest or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of safeguards include:
- Implementing mechanisms to prevent unauthorized disclosure of confidential information when performing professional services related to a particular matter for two or more clients whose interests with respect to that matter are in conflict. This could include:
 - Using separate engagement teams who are provided with clear policies and procedures on maintaining confidentiality.
 - Creating separate areas of practice for specialty functions within the firm, which may act as a barrier to the passing of confidential client information from one practice area to another within a firm.
 - Establishing policies and procedures to limit access to client files, the use of confidentiality agreements signed by employees and principals of the firm and/or the physical and electronic separation of confidential information.
 - Regular review of the application of safeguards by a senior individual not involved with the client engagement or engagements.
 - Having a warrant holder who is not involved in providing the service or otherwise affected by the conflict, review the work performed to assess whether the key judgments and conclusions are appropriate.
 - Consulting with third parties, such as a professional body, legal counsel or another warrant holder.
- 220.11 In addition, it is generally necessary to disclose the nature of the conflict of interest and the related safeguards, if any, to clients affected by the conflict and, when safeguards are required to reduce the threat to an acceptable level, to obtain their consent to the warrant holder in public practice performing the professional services. Disclosure and consent may take different forms, for example:

- General disclosure to clients of circumstances where the warrant holder, in keeping with common commercial practice, does not provide services exclusively for any one client (for example, in a particular service in a particular market sector) in order for the client to provide general consent accordingly. Such disclosure might, for example, be made in the warrant holder's standard terms and conditions for the engagement.
- Specific disclosure to affected clients of the circumstances of the particular conflict, including a detailed presentation of the situation and a comprehensive explanation of any planned safeguards and the risks involved, sufficient to enable the client to make an informed decision with respect to the matter and to provide explicit consent accordingly.
- In certain circumstances, consent may be implied by the client's conduct where the warrant holder has sufficient evidence to conclude that clients know the circumstances at the outset and have accepted the conflict of interest if they do not raise an objection to the existence of the conflict.

The warrant holder shall determine whether the nature and significance of the conflict of interest is such that specific disclosure and explicit consent is necessary. For this purpose, the warrant holder shall exercise professional judgment in weighing the outcome of the evaluation of the circumstances that create a conflict of interest, including the parties that might be affected, the nature of the issues that might arise and the potential for the particular matter to develop in an unexpected manner.

- 220.12 Where a warrant holder in public practice has requested explicit consent from a client and that consent has been refused by the client, the warrant holder shall decline to perform or shall discontinue professional services that would result in the conflict of interest; or shall terminate relevant relationships or dispose of relevant interests to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level, such that consent can be obtained, after applying any additional safeguards if necessary.
- 220.13 When disclosure is verbal, or consent is verbal or implied, the warrant holder in public practice is encouraged to document the nature of the circumstances giving rise to the conflict of interest, the safeguards applied to reduce the threats to an acceptable level and the consent obtained.
- 220.14 In certain circumstances, making specific disclosure for the purpose of obtaining explicit consent would result in a breach of confidentiality. Examples of such circumstances may include:
- Performing a transaction-related service for a client in connection with a hostile takeover of another client of the firm.
 - Performing a forensic investigation for a client in connection with a suspected fraudulent act where the firm has confidential information obtained through having performed a professional service for another client who might be involved in the fraud.
 - The firm shall not accept or continue an engagement under such circumstances unless the following conditions are met:
 - The firm does not act in an advocacy role for one client where this requires the firm to assume an adversarial position against the other client with respect to the same matter;

- Specific mechanisms are in place to prevent disclosure of confidential information between the engagement teams serving the two clients; and
- The firm is satisfied that a reasonable and informed third party, weighing all the specific facts and circumstances available to the warrant holder in public practice at the time, would be likely to conclude that it is appropriate for the firm to accept or continue the engagement because a restriction on the firm's ability to provide the service would produce a disproportionate adverse outcome for the clients or other relevant third parties.

The warrant holder shall document the nature of the circumstances, including the role that the warrant holder is to undertake, the specific mechanisms in place to prevent disclosure of information between the engagement teams serving the two clients and the rationale for the conclusion that it is appropriate to accept the engagement.

SECTION 230: Second Opinions

- 230.1 Situations where a warrant holder in public practice is asked to provide a second opinion on the application of accounting, auditing, reporting or other standards or principles to specific circumstances or transactions by or on behalf of a company or an entity that is not an existing client may create threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. For example, there may be a threat to professional competence and due care in circumstances where the second opinion is not based on the same set of facts that were made available to the existing warrant holder or is based on inadequate evidence. The existence and significance of any threat will depend on the circumstances of the request and all the other available facts and assumptions relevant to the expression of a professional judgement.
- 230.2 When asked to provide such an opinion, a warrant holder in public practice shall evaluate the significance of any threats and apply safeguards when necessary to eliminate them or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include seeking client permission to contact the existing warrant holder, describing the limitations surrounding any opinion in communications with the client and providing the existing warrant holder with a copy of the opinion.
- 230.3 If the company or entity seeking the opinion will not permit communication with the existing warrant holder, a warrant holder in public practice shall determine whether, taking all the circumstances into account, it is appropriate to provide the opinion sought.

SECTION 240: Fees and Other Types of Remuneration

- 240.1 When entering into negotiations regarding professional services, a warrant holder in public practice may quote whatever fee is deemed appropriate. The fact that one warrant holder in public practice may quote a fee lower than another is not in itself unethical. Nevertheless, there may be threats to compliance with the fundamental principles arising from the level of fees quoted. For example, a self-interest threat to professional competence and due care is created if the fee quoted is so low that it may be difficult to perform the engagement in accordance with applicable technical and professional standards for that price.

- 240.2 The existence and significance of any threats created will depend on factors such as the level of fee quoted and the services to which it applies. The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:
- Making the client aware of the terms of the engagement and, in particular, the basis on which fees are charged and which services are covered by the quoted fee.
 - Assigning appropriate time and qualified staff to the task.
- 240.3 Furthermore a warrant holder shall ensure that adequate rules are in place which provide that fees for statutory audits are not influenced or determined by the provision of additional services to the audited entity.

Contingent Fees

- 240.4 Contingent fees may create threats to compliance with the fundamental principles in certain circumstances. They may create a self-interest threat to objectivity. The existence and significance of such threats will depend on factors including:
- The nature of the engagement.
 - The range of possible fee amounts.
 - The basis for determining the fee.
 - Whether the outcome or result of the transaction is to be reviewed by an independent third party.
- 240.5 The significance of any such threats shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:
- An advance written agreement with the client as to the basis of remuneration.
 - Disclosure to intended users of the work performed by the warrant holder in public practice and the basis of remuneration.
 - Quality control policies and procedures.
 - Review by an independent third party of the work performed by the warrant holder in public practice.

Commissions for referral of work

- 240.6 In certain circumstances, a warrant holder in public practice may receive a referral fee or commission relating to a client. For example, where the warrant holder in public practice does not provide the specific service required, a fee may be received for referring a continuing client to another warrant holder in public practice or other expert. A warrant holder in public practice may receive a commission from a third party (for example, a software vendor) in connection with the sale of goods or services to a client. Accepting such a referral fee or commission creates a self-interest threat to objectivity and professional competence and due care.
- 240.7 A warrant holder in public practice may also pay a referral fee to obtain a client, for example, where the client continues as a client of another warrant holder in public practice but requires specialist services not offered by the existing warrant holder. The payment of such a referral fee also creates a self-interest threat to objectivity and professional competence and due care.

- 240.8 The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:
- Disclosing to the client any arrangements to pay a referral fee to another warrant holder for the work referred.
 - Disclosing to the client any arrangements to receive a referral fee for referring the client to another warrant holder in public practice.
 - Obtaining advance agreement from the client for commission arrangements in connection with the sale by a third party of goods or services to the client.
- 240.9 A warrant holder in public practice may purchase all or part of another firm on the basis that payments will be made to individuals formerly owning the firm or to their heirs or estates. Such payments are not regarded as commissions or referral fees for the purpose of paragraphs 240.5–240.7 above.

SECTION 250: Marketing Professional Services

- 250.1 When a warrant holder in public practice solicits new work through advertising or other forms of marketing, there may be a threat to compliance with the fundamental principles. For example, a self-interest threat to compliance with the principle of professional behaviour is created if services, achievements, or products are marketed in a way that is inconsistent with that principle.
- 250.2 A warrant holder in public practice shall not bring the profession into disrepute when marketing professional services. The warrant holder in public practice shall be honest and truthful, and not:
- (a) Make exaggerated claims for services offered, qualifications possessed, or experience gained; or
 - (b) Make disparaging references or unsubstantiated comparisons to the work of another.

If the warrant holder in public practice is in doubt about whether a proposed form of advertising or marketing is appropriate, the warrant holder in public practice shall consider consulting with the Accountancy Board or an accountancy body recognised under the Act.

SECTION 260: Gifts and Hospitality

- 260.1 A warrant holder in public practice, or an immediate or close family member, may be offered gifts and hospitality from a client. Such an offer may create threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. For example, a self-interest or familiarity threat to objectivity may be created if a gift from a client is accepted; an intimidation threat to objectivity may result from the possibility of such offers being made public.
- 260.2 The existence and significance of any threat will depend on the nature, value, and intent of the offer. Where a reasonable and informed third party, weighing all the specific facts and circumstances, would consider any gifts or hospitality offered as trivial and inconsequential, a warrant holder in public practice may conclude that the offer is made in the normal course of business without the specific intent to influence decision making or to obtain information. In such cases, the warrant holder in public

practice may generally conclude that any threat to compliance with the fundamental principles is at an acceptable level.

- 260.3 A warrant holder in public practice shall evaluate the significance of any threats and apply safeguards when necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. When the threats cannot be eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level through the application of safeguards, a warrant holder in public practice shall not accept such an offer.

SECTION 270: Custody of Client Assets

- 270.1 A warrant holder in public practice shall not assume custody of client monies or other assets unless permitted to do so by law and, if so, in compliance with any additional legal duties imposed on a warrant holder in public practice holding such assets.
- 270.2 The holding of client assets creates threats to compliance with the fundamental principles; for example, there is a self-interest threat to professional behaviour and may be a self-interest threat to objectivity arising from holding client assets. A warrant holder in public practice entrusted with money (or other assets) belonging to others shall therefore:
- (a) Keep such assets separately from personal or firm assets;
 - (b) Use such assets only for the purpose for which they are intended;
 - (c) At all times be ready to account for those assets and any income, dividends, or gains generated, to any persons entitled to such accounting; and
 - (d) Comply with all relevant laws and regulations relevant to the holding of and accounting for such assets.
- 270.3 As part of client and engagement acceptance procedures for services that may involve the holding of client assets, a warrant holder in public practice shall make appropriate inquiries about the source of such assets and consider legal and regulatory obligations. For example, if the assets were derived from illegal activities, such as money laundering, a threat to compliance with the fundamental principles would be created. In such situations, the warrant holder may consider seeking legal advice.

SECTION 280: Objectivity – All Services

- 280.1 A warrant holder in public practice shall determine when providing any professional service whether there are threats to compliance with the fundamental principle of objectivity resulting from having interests in, or relationships with, a client or its directors, officers or employees. For example, a familiarity threat to objectivity may be created from a family or close personal or business relationship.
- 280.2 A warrant holder in public practice who provides an assurance service shall be independent of the assurance client. Independence of mind and in appearance is necessary to enable the warrant holder in public practice to express a conclusion, and be seen to express a conclusion, without bias, conflict of interest, or undue influence of others. Sections 290 and 291 provide specific guidance on independence requirements for warrant holders in public practice when performing assurance engagements.

280.3 The existence of threats to objectivity when providing any professional service will depend upon the particular circumstances of the engagement and the nature of the work that the warrant holder in public practice is performing.

280.4 A warrant holder in public practice shall evaluate the significance of any threats and apply safeguards when necessary to eliminate them or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Withdrawing from the engagement team.
- Supervisory procedures.
- Terminating the financial or business relationship giving rise to the threat.
- Discussing the issue with higher levels of management within the firm.
- Discussing the issue with those charged with governance of the client.

If safeguards cannot eliminate or reduce the threat to an acceptable level, the warrant holder shall decline or terminate the relevant engagement.

SECTION 290: Independence – Audit and Review Engagements**CONTENTS**

Structure of Section.....	47
A Conceptual Framework Approach to Independence.....	47
Networks and Network Firms	49
Public Interest Entities.....	50
Related Entities	51
Those Charged with Governance	51
Documentation	51
Engagement Period.....	52
Mergers and Acquisitions	53
Communications with audit committees.....	54
Breach of a Provision of this Section	54
Application of the Conceptual Framework Approach to Independence	58
Financial Interests	58
Loans and Guarantees	62
Business Relationships	63
Family and Personal Relationships	64
Employment with an Audit Client	66
Temporary Staff Assignments	68
Recent Service with an Audit Client.....	69
Serving as a Director or Officer of an Audit Client.....	70
Long Association of Senior Personnel (Including Principal Rotation) with an Audit Client.....	70
Provision of Non-assurance Services to Audit Clients	72
Management Responsibilities.....	73
Preparing Accounting Records and Financial Statements	74
Valuation Services.....	76
Taxation Services.....	77
Internal Audit Services	81
IT Systems Services.....	83
Litigation Support Services.....	84
Legal Services.....	84
Recruiting Services	86

PART B: WARRANT HOLDERS IN PUBLIC PRACTICE

Corporate Finance Services	86
Fees	87
Contingent Fees	90
Compensation and Evaluation Policies.....	91
Gifts and Hospitality	91
Actual or Threatened Litigation.....	91
Reports that Include a Restriction on Use and Distribution	93

Structure of Section

- 290.1 This section addresses the independence requirements for audit engagements and review engagements, which are assurance engagements in which a warrant holder in public practice expresses a conclusion on financial statements. Such engagements comprise audit and review engagements to report on a complete set of financial statements and a single financial statement. Independence requirements for assurance engagements that are not audit or review engagements are addressed in Section 291.
- 290.2 In certain circumstances involving audit engagements where the audit report includes a restriction on use and distribution and provided certain conditions are met, the independence requirements in this section may be modified as provided in paragraphs 290.500 to 290.514. The modifications are not permitted in the case of an audit of financial statements required by law or regulation.
- 290.3 In this section, the term(s):
- (a) "Audit," "audit team," "audit engagement," "audit client" and "audit report" includes review, review team, review engagement, review client and review report; and
 - (b) "Firm" includes network firm, except where otherwise stated.

A Conceptual Framework Approach to Independence

- 290.4 In the case of audit engagements, it is in the public interest and, therefore, required by this Code, that members of audit teams, firms and network firms shall be independent of audit clients.
- 290.5 The objective of this section is to assist firms and members of audit teams in applying the conceptual framework approach described below to achieving and maintaining independence.
- 290.6 Independence comprises:
- (a) Independence of Mind
The state of mind that permits the expression of a conclusion without being affected by influences that compromise professional judgment, thereby allowing an individual to act with integrity and exercise objectivity and professional scepticism.
 - (b) Independence in Appearance
The avoidance of facts and circumstances that are so significant that a reasonable and informed third party would be likely to conclude, weighing all the specific facts and circumstances, that a firm's, or a member of the audit team's, integrity, objectivity or professional scepticism has been compromised.
- 290.7 The conceptual framework approach shall be applied by warrant holders to:
- (a) Identify threats to independence;
 - (b) Evaluate the significance of the threats identified; and
 - (c) Apply safeguards, when necessary, to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level.

When the warrant holder determines that appropriate safeguards are not available or cannot be applied to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level, the warrant holder shall eliminate the circumstance or relationship creating the threats or decline or terminate the audit engagement.

A warrant holder shall use professional judgement in applying this conceptual framework.

- 290.8 Many different circumstances, or combinations of circumstances, may be relevant in assessing threats to independence. It is impossible to define every situation that creates threats to independence and to specify the appropriate action. Therefore, this Code establishes a conceptual framework that requires firms and members of audit teams to identify, evaluate, and address threats to independence. The conceptual framework approach assists warrant holders in public practice in complying with the ethical requirements in this Code. It accommodates many variations in circumstances that create threats to independence and can deter a warrant holder from concluding that a situation is permitted if it is not specifically prohibited.
- 290.9 Paragraphs 290.100 and onwards describe how the conceptual framework approach to independence is to be applied. These paragraphs do not address all the circumstances and relationships that create or may create threats to independence.
- 290.10 In deciding whether to accept or continue an engagement, or whether a particular individual may be a member of the audit team, a firm shall identify and evaluate threats to independence. If the threats are not at an acceptable level, and the decision is whether to accept an engagement or include a particular individual on the audit team, the firm shall determine whether safeguards are available to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. If the decision is whether to continue an engagement, the firm shall determine whether any existing safeguards will continue to be effective to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level or whether other safeguards will need to be applied or whether the engagement needs to be terminated. Whenever new information about a threat to independence comes to the attention of the firm during the engagement, the firm shall evaluate the significance of the threat in accordance with the conceptual framework approach.
- 290.11 Throughout this section, reference is made to the significance of threats to independence. In evaluating the significance of a threat, qualitative as well as quantitative factors shall be taken into account.
- 290.12 This section does not, in most cases, prescribe the specific responsibility of individuals within the firm for actions related to independence because responsibility may differ depending on the size, structure and organisation of a firm. The firm is required by *International Standards on Quality Control (ISQCs)* to establish policies and procedures designed to provide it with reasonable assurance that independence is maintained when required by relevant ethical requirements. In addition, *International Standards on Auditing (ISAs)* require the engagement principal to form a conclusion on compliance with the independence requirements that apply to the engagement.

Networks and Network Firms

- 290.13 If a firm is deemed to be a network firm, the firm shall be independent of the audit clients of the other firms within the network (unless otherwise stated in this Code). The independence requirements in this section that apply to a network firm apply to any entity, such as a consulting practice or professional law practice, that meets the definition of a network firm irrespective of whether the entity itself meets the definition of a firm.
- 290.14 To enhance their ability to provide professional services, firms frequently form larger structures with other firms and entities. Whether these larger structures create a network depends on the particular facts and circumstances and does not depend on whether the firms and entities are legally separate and distinct. For example, a larger structure may be aimed only at facilitating the referral of work, which in itself does not meet the criteria necessary to constitute a network. Alternatively, a larger structure might be such that it is aimed at co-operation and the firms share a common brand name, a common system of quality control, or significant professional resources and consequently is deemed to be a network.
- 290.15 The judgement as to whether the larger structure is a network shall be made in light of whether a reasonable and informed third party would be likely to conclude, weighing all the specific facts and circumstances, that the entities are associated in such a way that a network exists. This judgement shall be applied consistently throughout the network.
- 290.16 Where the larger structure is aimed at co-operation and it is clearly aimed at profit or cost sharing among the entities within the structure, it is deemed to be a network. However, the sharing of immaterial costs does not in itself create a network. In addition, if the sharing of costs is limited only to those costs related to the development of audit methodologies, manuals, or training courses, this would not in itself create a network. Further, an association between a firm and an otherwise unrelated entity to jointly provide a service or develop a product does not in itself create a network.
- 290.17 Where the larger structure is aimed at cooperation and the entities within the structure share common ownership, control or management, it is deemed to be a network. This could be achieved by contract or other means.
- 290.18 Where the larger structure is aimed at co-operation and the entities within the structure share common quality control policies and procedures, it is deemed to be a network. For this purpose, common quality control policies and procedures are those designed, implemented and monitored across the larger structure.
- 290.19 Where the larger structure is aimed at co-operation and the entities within the structure share a common business strategy, it is deemed to be a network. Sharing a common business strategy involves an agreement by the entities to achieve common strategic objectives. An entity is not deemed to be a network firm merely because it co-operates with another entity solely to respond jointly to a request for a proposal for the provision of a professional service.
- 290.20 Where the larger structure is aimed at co-operation and the entities within the structure share the use of a common brand name, it is deemed to be a network. A

common brand name includes common initials or a common name. A firm is deemed to be using a common brand name if it includes, for example, the common brand name as part of, or along with, its firm name, when a principal of the firm signs an audit report.

- 290.21 Even though a firm does not belong to a network and does not use a common brand name as part of its firm name, it may give the appearance that it belongs to a network if it makes reference in its stationery or promotional materials to being a member of an association of firms. Accordingly, if care is not taken in how a firm describes such memberships, a perception may be created that the firm belongs to a network.
- 290.22 If a firm sells a component of its practice, the sales agreement sometimes provides that, for a limited period of time, the component may continue to use the name of the firm, or an element of the name, even though it is no longer connected to the firm. In such circumstances, while the two entities may be practicing under a common name, the facts are such that they do not belong to a larger structure aimed at co-operation and are, therefore, not network firms. Those entities shall determine how to disclose that they are not network firms when presenting themselves to outside parties.
- 290.23 Where the larger structure is aimed at co-operation and the entities within the structure share a significant part of professional resources, it is deemed to be a network. Professional resources include:
- Common systems that enable firms to exchange information such as client data, billing and time records;
 - Principals and staff;
 - Technical departments that consult on technical or industry specific issues, transactions or events for assurance engagements;
 - Audit methodology or audit manuals; and
 - Training courses and facilities.
- 290.24 The determination of whether the professional resources shared are significant, and therefore the firms are network firms, shall be made based on the relevant facts and circumstances. Where the shared resources are limited to common audit methodology or audit manuals, with no exchange of personnel or client or market information, it is unlikely that the shared resources would be significant. The same applies to a common training endeavour. Where, however, the shared resources involve the exchange of people or information, such as where staff are drawn from a shared pool, or a common technical department is created within the larger structure to provide participating firms with technical advice that the firms are required to follow, a reasonable and informed third party is more likely to conclude that the shared resources are significant.

Public Interest Entities

- 290.25 Section 290 contains additional provisions that reflect the extent of public interest in certain entities. For the purpose of this section, public interest entities are entities whose transferable securities are admitted to trading on a regulated market within the meaning of point 14 of article 4(1) of Directive 2004/39/EC, a credit institution as defined in point 1 of Article 1 of Directive 2000/12/EC of the European Parliament

and of the Council of 20 March 2000 relating to the taking up and pursuit of the business of credit institutions, an insurance undertaking within the meaning of Article 2(1) of Directive 91/674/EEC and such other entities as may be prescribed by the Minister.

- 290.26 Firms are encouraged to determine whether to treat additional entities, or certain categories of entities, as public interest entities because they have a large number and wide range of stakeholders. Factors to be considered include:
- The nature of the business, such as the holding of assets in a fiduciary capacity for a large number of stakeholders. Examples may include financial institutions, such as banks and insurance companies, and pension funds;
 - Size; and
 - Number of employees.

Related Entities

- 290.27 In the case of an audit client that is a listed entity, references to an audit client in this section include related entities of the client (unless otherwise stated). For all other audit clients, references to an audit client in this section include related entities over which the client has direct or indirect control. When the audit team knows or has reason to believe that a relationship or circumstance involving another related entity of the client is relevant to the evaluation of the firm's independence from the client, the audit team shall include that related entity when identifying and evaluating threats to independence and applying appropriate safeguards.

Those Charged with Governance

- 290.28 Even when not required by the Code, applicable auditing standards, law or regulation, regular communication is encouraged between the firm and those charged with governance of the audit client regarding relationships and other matters that might, in the firm's opinion, reasonably bear on independence. Such communication enables those charged with governance to:
- (a) Consider the firm's judgements in identifying and evaluating threats to independence,
 - (b) Consider the appropriateness of safeguards applied to eliminate them or reduce them to an acceptable level, and
 - (c) Take appropriate action.

Such an approach can be particularly helpful with respect to intimidation and familiarity threats.

In complying with requirements in this section to communicate with those charged with governance, the firm shall determine, having regard to the nature and importance of the particular circumstances and matter to be communicated, the appropriate person(s) within the entity's governance structure with whom to communicate. If the firm communicates with a subgroup of those charged with governance, for example, an audit committee or an individual, the firm shall determine whether communication with all of those charged with governance is also necessary so that they are adequately informed.

Documentation

- 290.29 Documentation provides evidence of the warrant holder's judgements in forming conclusions regarding compliance with independence requirements. The absence of documentation is not a determinant of whether a firm considered a particular matter nor whether it is independent.
- The warrant holder shall document conclusions regarding compliance with independence requirements, and the substance of any relevant discussions that support those conclusions. Accordingly:
- (a) When safeguards are required to reduce a threat to an acceptable level, the warrant holder shall document the nature of the threat and the safeguards in place or applied that reduce the threat to an acceptable level; and
 - (b) When a threat required significant analysis to determine whether safeguards were necessary and the warrant holder concluded that they were not because the threat was already at an acceptable level, the warrant holder shall document the nature of the threat and the rationale for the conclusion.

Engagement Period

- 290.30 Independence from the audit client is required both during the engagement period and the period covered by the financial statements. The engagement period starts when the audit team begins to perform audit services. The engagement period ends when the audit report is issued. When the engagement is of a recurring nature, it ends at the later of the notification by either party that the professional relationship has terminated or the issuance of the final audit report.
- 290.31 When an entity becomes an audit client during or after the period covered by the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion, the firm shall determine whether any threats to independence are created by:
- (a) Financial or business relationships with the audit client during or after the period covered by the financial statements but before accepting the audit engagement; or
 - (b) Previous services provided to the audit client.
- 290.32 If a non-assurance service was provided to the audit client during or after the period covered by the financial statements but before the audit team begins to perform audit services and the service would not be permitted during the period of the audit engagement, the firm shall evaluate any threat to independence created by the service. If a threat is not at an acceptable level, the audit engagement shall only be accepted if safeguards are applied to eliminate any threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:
- Not including personnel who provided the non-assurance service as members of the audit team;
 - Having an expert review the audit and non-assurance work as appropriate; or
 - Engaging another firm to evaluate the results of the non-assurance service or having another firm re-perform the non-assurance service to the extent necessary to enable it to take responsibility for the service.

Mergers and Acquisitions

290.33 When, as a result of a merger or acquisition, an entity becomes a related entity of an audit client, the firm shall identify and evaluate previous and current interests and relationships with the related entity that, taking into account available safeguards, could affect its independence and therefore its ability to continue the audit engagement after the effective date of the merger or acquisition.

290.34 The firm shall take steps necessary to terminate, by the effective date of the merger or acquisition, any current interests or relationships that are not permitted under this Code. However, if such a current interest or relationship cannot reasonably be terminated by the effective date of the merger or acquisition, for example, because the related entity is unable by the effective date to effect an orderly transition to another service provider of a non-assurance service provided by the firm, the firm shall evaluate the threat that is created by such interest or relationship. The more significant the threat, the more likely the firm's objectivity will be compromised and it will be unable to continue as auditor. The significance of the threat will depend upon factors such as:

- The nature and significance of the interest or relationship;
- The nature and significance of the related entity relationship (for example, whether the related entity is a subsidiary or parent); and
- The length of time until the interest or relationship can reasonably be terminated.

The firm shall discuss with those charged with governance the reasons why the interest or relationship cannot reasonably be terminated by the effective date of the merger or acquisition and the evaluation of the significance of the threat.

290.35 If those charged with governance request the firm to continue as auditor, the firm shall do so only if:

- (a) The interest or relationship will be terminated as soon as reasonably possible and in all cases within three months of the effective date of the merger or acquisition;
- (b) Any individual who has such an interest or relationship, including one that has arisen through performing a non-assurance service that would not be permitted under this section, will not be a member of the engagement team for the audit or the individual responsible for the engagement quality control review; and
- (c) Appropriate transitional measures will be applied, as necessary, and discussed with those charged with governance. Examples of transitional measures include:
 - Having an expert review the audit or non-assurance work as appropriate;
 - Having an expert, who is not a member of the firm expressing the opinion on the financial statements, perform a review that is equivalent to an engagement quality control review; or
 - Engaging another firm to evaluate the results of the non-assurance service or having another firm re-perform the non-assurance service to the extent necessary to enable it to take responsibility for the service.

290.36 The firm may have completed a significant amount of work on the audit prior to the effective date of the merger or acquisition and may be able to complete the remaining audit procedures within a short period of time. In such circumstances, if

those charged with governance request the firm to complete the audit while continuing with an interest or relationship identified in paragraph 290.33, the firm shall do so only if it:

- (a) Has evaluated the significance of the threat created by such interest or relationship and discussed the evaluation with those charged with governance;
- (b) Complies with the requirements of paragraph 290.35(b)–(c); and
- (c) Ceases to be the auditor no later than the issuance of the audit report.

290.37 When addressing previous and current interests and relationships covered by paragraphs 290.33 to 290.36, the firm shall determine whether, even if all the requirements could be met, the interests and relationships create threats that would remain so significant that objectivity would be compromised and, if so, the firm shall cease to be the auditor.

290.38 The warrant holder shall document any interests or relationships covered by paragraphs 290.34 and 36 that will not be terminated by the effective date of the merger or acquisition and the reasons why they will not be terminated, the transitional measures applied, the results of the discussion with those charged with governance, and the rationale as to why the previous and current interests and relationships do not create threats that would remain so significant that objectivity would be compromised.

Communications with audit committees

290.39 Audit committees can have an important corporate governance role when they are independent of client management and can assist the Board of Directors in satisfying themselves that a firm is independent in carrying out its audit role. There should be regular communications between the firm and the audit committee (or other governance body if there is no audit committee) of public interest entities regarding relationships and other matters that might, in the firm's opinion, reasonably be thought to bear on independence.

290.40 Firms shall establish policies and procedures relating to independence communications with audit committees, or others charged with governance. In the case of the audit of public interest entities the firm shall with respect to statutory audit engagements adhere to Article 11 of the Audit Regulation including:

- (a) Confirm annually in writing to the Audit Committee its independence from the audited public-interest entity;
- (b) Disclose annually to the audit committee any additional services provided to the audited entity; and
- (c) Discuss with the Audit Committee the threats to their independence and the safeguards applied to eliminate those threats or reduce them to an acceptable level by using the documentation to be maintained in the audit working papers of all significant threats to independence as well as the safeguards applied to mitigate those threats.

Breach of a Provision of this Section

290.41 A breach of a provision of this section may occur despite the firm having policies and procedures designed to provide it with reasonable assurance that independence is

maintained. A consequence of a breach may be that termination of the audit engagement is necessary.

- 290.42 When the firm concludes that a breach has occurred, the firm shall terminate, suspend or eliminate the interest or relationship that caused the breach and address the consequences of the breach.
- 290.43 When a breach is identified, the firm shall consider whether there are any legal or regulatory requirements that apply with respect to the breach and, if so, shall comply with those requirements. The firm shall consider reporting the breach to a member body, relevant regulator or oversight authority if such reporting is common practice or is expected in the particular jurisdiction.
- 290.44 When a breach is identified, the firm shall, in accordance with its policies and procedures, promptly communicate the breach to the engagement principal, those with responsibility for the policies and procedures relating to independence, other relevant personnel in the firm, and, where appropriate, the network, and those subject to the independence requirements who need to take appropriate action. The firm shall evaluate the significance of that breach and its impact on the firm's objectivity and ability to issue an audit report. The significance of the breach will depend on factors such as:
- The nature and duration of the breach;
 - The number and nature of any previous breaches with respect to the current audit engagement;
 - Whether a member of the audit team had knowledge of the interest or relationship that caused the breach;
 - Whether the individual who caused the breach is a member of the audit team or another individual for whom there are independence requirements;
 - If the breach relates to a member of the audit team, the role of that individual;
 - If the breach was caused by the provision of a professional service, the impact of that service, if any, on the accounting records or the amounts recorded in the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion; and
 - The extent of the self-interest, advocacy, intimidation or other threats created by the breach.
- 290.45 Depending upon the significance of the breach, it may be necessary to terminate the audit engagement or it may be possible to take action that satisfactorily addresses the consequences of the breach. The firm shall determine whether such action can be taken and is appropriate in the circumstances. In making this determination, the firm shall exercise professional judgment and take into account whether a reasonable and informed third party, weighing the significance of the breach, the action to be taken and all the specific facts and circumstances available to the warrant holder at that time, would be likely to conclude that the firm's objectivity would be compromised and therefore the firm is unable to issue an audit report.
- 290.46 Examples of actions that the firm may consider include:
- Removing the relevant individual from the audit team;
 - Conducting an additional review of the affected audit work or re-performing that work to the extent necessary, in either case using different personnel;
 - Recommending that the audit client engage another firm to review or re-perform the affected audit work to the extent necessary; and

- Where the breach relates to a non-assurance service that affects the accounting records or an amount that is recorded in the financial statements, engaging another firm to evaluate the results of the non-assurance service or having another firm reperform the non-assurance service to the extent necessary to enable it to take responsibility for the service.
- 290.47 If the firm determines that action cannot be taken to satisfactorily address the consequences of the breach, the firm shall inform those charged with governance as soon as possible and take the steps necessary to terminate the audit engagement in compliance with any applicable legal or regulatory requirements relevant to terminating the audit engagement. Where termination is not permitted by law or regulation, the firm shall comply with any reporting or disclosure requirements.
- 290.48 If the firm determines that action can be taken to satisfactorily address the consequences of the breach, the firm shall discuss the breach and the action it has taken or proposes to take with those charged with governance. The firm shall discuss the breach and the action as soon as possible, unless those charged with governance have specified an alternative timing for reporting less significant breaches. The matters to be discussed shall include:
- The significance of the breach, including its nature and duration;
 - How the breach occurred and how it was identified;
 - The action taken or proposed to be taken and the firm's rationale for why the action will satisfactorily address the consequences of the breach and enable it to issue an audit report;
 - The conclusion that, in the firm's professional judgment, objectivity has not been compromised and the rationale for that conclusion; and
 - Any steps that the firm has taken or proposes to take to reduce or avoid the risk of further breaches occurring.
- 290.49 The firm shall communicate in writing with those charged with governance all matters discussed in accordance with paragraph 290.48 and obtain the concurrence of those charged with governance that action can be, or has been, taken to satisfactorily address the consequences of the breach. The communication shall include a description of the firm's policies and procedures relevant to the breach designed to provide it with reasonable assurance that independence is maintained and any steps that the firm has taken, or proposes to take, to reduce or avoid the risk of further breaches occurring. If those charged with governance do not concur that the action satisfactorily addresses the consequences of the breach, the firm shall take the steps necessary to terminate the audit engagement, where permitted by law or regulation, in compliance with any applicable legal or regulatory requirements relevant to terminating the audit engagement. Where termination is not permitted by law or regulation, the firm shall comply with any reporting or disclosure requirements.
- 290.50 If the breach occurred prior to the issuance of the previous audit report, the firm shall comply with this section in evaluating the significance of the breach and its impact on the firm's objectivity and its ability to issue an audit report in the current period. The firm shall also consider the impact of the breach, if any, on the firm's objectivity in relation to any previously issued audit reports, and the possibility of withdrawing such audit reports, and discuss the matter with those charged with governance.

290.51 The firm shall document the breach, the action taken, key decisions made and all the matters discussed with those charged with governance and any discussions with a member body, relevant regulator or oversight authority. When the firm continues with the audit engagement, the matters to be documented shall also include the conclusion that, in the firm's professional judgment, objectivity has not been compromised and the rationale for why the action taken satisfactorily addressed the consequences of the breach such that the firm could issue an audit report.

Paragraphs 290.52 to 290.99 are intentionally left blank.

Application of the Conceptual Framework Approach to Independence

- 290.100 Paragraphs 290.102 to 290.231 describe specific circumstances and relationships that create or may create threats to independence. The paragraphs describe the potential threats and the types of safeguards that may be appropriate to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level and identify certain situations where no safeguards could reduce the threats to an acceptable level. The paragraphs do not describe all of the circumstances and relationships that create or may create a threat to independence. The firm and the members of the audit team shall evaluate the implications of similar, but different, circumstances and relationships and determine whether safeguards, including the safeguards in paragraphs 200.12 to 200.15, can be applied when necessary to eliminate the threats to independence or reduce them to an acceptable level.
- 290.101 Paragraphs 290.102 to 290.125 contain references to the materiality of a financial interest, loan, or guarantee, or the significance of a business relationship. For the purpose of determining whether such an interest is material to an individual, the combined net worth of the individual and the individual's immediate family members may be taken into account.

Financial Interests

- 290.102 Holding a financial interest in an audit client may create a self-interest threat. The existence and significance of any threat created depends on:
- (a) The role of the person holding the financial interest,
 - (b) Whether the financial interest is direct or indirect, and
 - (c) The materiality of the financial interest.

Commitments to hold financial interests (e.g. contractual agreements to acquire a financial interest) and derivatives which are directly related to financial interests (e.g. stock options, futures, etc.) should be dealt with in the same way as would an already existing financial interest.

- 290.103 Financial interests may be held through an intermediary (for example, a collective investment vehicle, estate or trust). The determination of whether such financial interests are direct or indirect will depend upon whether the beneficial owner has control over the investment vehicle or the ability to influence its investment decisions. When control over the investment vehicle or the ability to influence investment decisions exists, this Code defines that financial interest to be a direct financial interest. Conversely, when the beneficial owner of the financial interest has no control over the investment vehicle or ability to influence its investment decisions, this Code defines that financial interest to be an indirect financial interest.
- 290.104 If a member of the audit team, a member of that individual's immediate family, or a firm has a direct financial interest or a material indirect financial interest in the audit client, the self-interest threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Therefore, none of the following shall have a direct financial interest or a material indirect financial interest in the client: a member of the audit team; a member of that individual's immediate family; or the firm.

- 290.105 When a member of the audit team has a close family member who the audit team member knows has a direct financial interest or a material indirect financial interest in the audit client, a self-interest threat is created. The significance of the threat will depend on factors such as:
- The nature of the relationship between the member of the audit team and the close family member; and
 - The materiality of the financial interest to the close family member.

The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- The close family member disposing, as soon as practicable, of all of the financial interest or disposing of a sufficient portion of an indirect financial interest so that the remaining interest is no longer material;
 - Having an expert review the work of the member of the audit team; or
 - Removing the individual from the audit team.
- 290.106 If a member of the audit team, a member of that individual's immediate family, or a firm has a direct or material indirect financial interest in an entity that has a controlling interest in the audit client, and the client is material to the entity, the self-interest threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Therefore, none of the following shall have such a financial interest: a member of the audit team; a member of that individual's immediate family; and the firm.
- 290.107 The holding by a firm's retirement benefit plan of a direct or material indirect financial interest in an audit client creates a self-interest threat. The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level.
- 290.108 If other principals in the office in which the engagement principal practices in connection with the audit engagement, or their immediate family members, hold a direct financial interest or a material indirect financial interest in that audit client, the self-interest threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Therefore, neither such principals nor their immediate family members shall hold any such financial interests in such an audit client.
- 290.109 The office in which the engagement principal practices in connection with the audit engagement is not necessarily the office to which that principal is assigned. Accordingly, when the engagement principal is located in a different office from that of the other members of the audit team, professional judgement shall be used to determine in which office the principal practices in connection with that engagement.
- 290.110 If other principals and managerial employees who provide non-audit services to the audit client, except those whose involvement is minimal, or their immediate family members, hold a direct financial interest or a material indirect financial interest in the audit client, the self-interest threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly, neither such

personnel nor their immediate family members shall hold any such financial interests in such an audit client.

- 290.111 Despite paragraphs 290.108 and 290.110, the holding of a financial interest in an audit client by an immediate family member of:
- (a) A principal located in the office in which the engagement principal practices in connection with the audit engagement, or
 - (b) A principal or managerial employee who provides non-audit services to the audit client,

is deemed not to compromise independence if the financial interest is received as a result of the immediate family member's employment rights (for example, through pension or share option plans) and, when necessary, safeguards are applied to eliminate any threat to independence or reduce it to an acceptable level.

However, when the immediate family member has or obtains the right to dispose of the financial interest or, in the case of a stock option, the right to exercise the option, the financial interest shall be disposed of or forfeited as soon as practicable.

- 290.112 A self-interest threat may be created if the firm or a member of the audit team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, has a financial interest in an entity and an audit client also has a financial interest in that entity. However, independence is deemed not to be compromised if these interests are immaterial and the audit client cannot exercise significant influence over the entity. If such interest is material to any party, and the audit client can exercise significant influence over the other entity, no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly, the firm shall not have such an interest and any individual with such an interest shall, before becoming a member of the audit team, either:
- (a) Dispose of the interest; or
 - (b) Dispose of a sufficient amount of the interest so that the remaining interest is no longer material.

- 290.113 A self-interest, familiarity or intimidation threat may be created if a member of the audit team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, or the firm, has a financial interest in an entity when a director, officer or controlling owner of the audit client is also known to have a financial interest in that entity. The existence and significance of any threat will depend upon factors such as:
- The role of the professional on the audit team;
 - Whether ownership of the entity is closely or widely held;
 - Whether the interest gives the investor the ability to control or significantly influence the entity; and
 - The materiality of the financial interest.

The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Removing the member of the audit team with the financial interest from the audit team; or
- Having an expert review the work of the member of the audit team.

- 290.114 The holding by a firm, or a member of the audit team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, of a direct financial interest or a material indirect financial interest in the audit client as a trustee creates a self-interest threat. Similarly, a self-interest threat is created when:
- (a) A principal in the office in which the engagement principal practices in connection with the audit;
 - (b) Other principals and managerial employees who provide non-assurance services to the audit client, except those whose involvement is minimal; or
 - (c) Their immediate family members,

hold a direct financial interest or a material indirect financial interest in the audit client as trustee.

Such an interest shall not be held unless:

- (a) Neither the trustee, nor an immediate family member of the trustee, nor the firm are beneficiaries of the trust;
- (b) The interest in the audit client held by the trust is not material to the trust;
- (c) The trust is not able to exercise significant influence over the audit client; and
- (d) The trustee, an immediate family member of the trustee, or the firm cannot significantly influence any investment decision involving a financial interest in the audit client.

- 290.115 Members of the audit team shall determine whether a self-interest threat is created by any known financial interests in the audit client held by other individuals including:
- (a) Principals and professional employees of the firm, other than those referred to above, or their immediate family members; and
 - (b) Individuals with a close personal relationship with a member of the audit team.

Whether these interests create a self-interest threat will depend on factors such as:

- The firm's organisational, operating and reporting structure; and
- The nature of the relationship between the individual and the member of the audit team.

The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Removing the member of the audit team with the personal relationship from the audit team;
- Excluding the member of the audit team from any significant decision-making concerning the audit engagement; or
- Having an expert review the work of the member of the audit team.

- 290.116 If a firm or a principal or employee of the firm, or a member of that individual's immediate family, receives a direct financial interest or a material indirect financial interest in an audit client, for example, by way of an inheritance, gift or as a result of a merger and such interest would not be permitted to be held under this section, then:

- (a) If the interest is received by the firm, the financial interest shall be disposed of immediately after the firm has knowledge of and the right to dispose of the financial interest, or a sufficient amount of an indirect financial interest shall be disposed of so that the remaining interest is no longer material;
- (b) If the interest is received by a member of the audit team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, the individual who received the financial interest shall dispose of the financial interest immediately after the individual has knowledge of and the right to dispose of the financial interest, or dispose of a sufficient amount of an indirect financial interest so that the remaining interest is no longer material; or
- (c) If the interest is received by an individual who is not a member of the audit team, or by an immediate family member of the individual, the financial interest shall be disposed of as soon as possible after the individual has knowledge of and the right to dispose of the financial interest, or a sufficient amount of an indirect financial interest shall be disposed of so that the remaining interest is no longer material. Pending the disposal of the financial interest, a determination shall be made as to whether any safeguards are necessary.

Loans and Guarantees

- 290.117 A loan, or a guarantee of a loan, to a member of the audit team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, or the firm from an audit client that is a bank or a similar institution may create a threat to independence. If the loan or guarantee is not made under normal lending procedures, terms and conditions, a self-interest threat would be created that would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly, neither a member of the audit team, a member of that individual's immediate family, nor a firm shall accept such a loan or guarantee.
- 290.118 If a loan to a firm from an audit client that is a bank or similar institution is made under normal lending procedures, terms and conditions and it is material to the audit client or firm receiving the loan, it may be possible to apply safeguards to reduce the self-interest threat to an acceptable level. An example of such a safeguard is having the work reviewed by an expert from a network firm that is neither involved with the audit nor received the loan.
- 290.119 A loan, or a guarantee of a loan, from an audit client that is a bank or a similar institution to a member of the audit team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, does not create a threat to independence if the loan or guarantee is made under normal lending procedures, terms and conditions. Examples of such loans include home mortgages, bank overdrafts, car loans and credit card balances.
- 290.120 If the firm or a member of the audit team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, accepts a loan from, or has a borrowing guaranteed by, an audit client that is not a bank or similar institution, the self-interest threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level, unless the loan or guarantee is immaterial to both (a) the firm or the member of the audit team and the immediate family member, and (b) the client.
- 290.121 Similarly, if the firm or a member of the audit team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, makes or guarantees a loan to an audit client, the self-interest

threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level, unless the loan or guarantee is immaterial to both (a) the firm or the member of the audit team and the immediate family member, and (b) the client.

- 290.122 If a firm or a member of the audit team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, has deposits or a brokerage account with an audit client that is a bank, broker or similar institution, a threat to independence is not created if the deposit or account is held under normal commercial terms.

Business Relationships

- 290.123 A close business relationship between a firm, or a member of the audit team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, and the audit client or its management, arises from a commercial relationship or common financial interest and may create self-interest or intimidation threats. Examples of such relationships include:

- Having a financial interest in a joint venture with either the client or a controlling owner, director, officer or other individual who performs senior managerial activities for that client.
- Arrangements to combine one or more services or products of the firm with one or more services or products of the client and to market the package with reference to both parties.
- Distribution or marketing arrangements under which the firm distributes or markets the client's products or services, or the client distributes or markets the firm's products or services.

Commitments to establish such relationships should be dealt with in the same way as an already established relationship.

Unless any financial interest is immaterial and the business relationship is insignificant to the firm and the client or its management, the threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Therefore, unless the financial interest is immaterial and the business relationship is insignificant, the business relationship shall not be entered into, or it shall be reduced to an insignificant level or terminated.

In the case of a member of the audit team, unless any such financial interest is immaterial and the relationship is insignificant to that member, the individual shall be removed from the audit team.

If the business relationship is between an immediate family member of a member of the audit team and the audit client or its management, the significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level.

- 290.124 A business relationship involving the holding of an interest by the firm, or a member of the audit team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, in a closely-held entity when the audit client or a director or officer of the client, or any group thereof, also holds an interest in that entity does not create threats to independence if:
- (a) The business relationship is insignificant to the firm, the member of the audit team and the immediate family member, and the client;

- (b) The financial interest is immaterial to the investor or group of investors; and
- (c) The financial interest does not give the investor, or group of investors, the ability to control the closely-held entity.

- 290.125 The purchase of goods and services from an audit client by the firm, or a member of the audit team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, does not generally create a threat to independence if the transaction is in the normal course of business and at arm's length. However, such transactions may be of such a nature or magnitude that they create a self-interest threat. The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:
- Eliminating or reducing the magnitude of the transaction; or
 - Removing the individual from the audit team.

Family and Personal Relationships

- 290.126 Family and personal relationships between a member of the audit team and a director or officer or certain employees (depending on their role) of the audit client may create self-interest, familiarity or intimidation threats. The existence and significance of any threats will depend on a number of factors, including the individual's responsibilities on the audit team, the role of the family member or other individual within the client and the closeness of the relationship.

- 290.127 When an immediate family member of a member of the audit team is:
- (a) a director or officer of the audit client; or
 - (b) an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the preparation of the client's accounting records or the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion,

or was in such a position during any period covered by the engagement or the financial statements, the threats to independence can only be reduced to an acceptable level by removing the individual from the audit team. The closeness of the relationship is such that no other safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly, no individual who has such a relationship shall be a member of the audit team.

- 290.128 Threats to independence are created when an immediate family member of a member of the audit team is an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the client's financial position, financial performance or cash flows. The significance of the threats will depend on factors such as:
- The position held by the immediate family member; and
 - The role of the professional on the audit team.

The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Removing the individual from the audit team; or
- Structuring the responsibilities of the audit team so that the professional does not deal with matters that are within the responsibility of the immediate family member.

290.129 Threats to independence are created when a close family member of a member of the audit team is:

- (a) A director or officer of the audit client; or
- (b) An employee in a position to exert significant influence over the preparation of the client's accounting records or the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion.

The significance of the threats will depend on factors such as:

- The nature of the relationship between the member of the audit team and the close family member;
- The position held by the close family member; and
- The role of the professional on the audit team.

The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Removing the individual from the audit team; or
- Structuring the responsibilities of the audit team so that the professional does not deal with matters that are within the responsibility of the close family member.

290.130 Threats to independence are created when a member of the audit team has a close relationship with a person who is not an immediate or close family member, but who is a director or officer or an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the preparation of the client's accounting records or the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion. A member of the audit team who has such a relationship shall consult in accordance with firm policies and procedures. The significance of the threats will depend on factors such as:

- The nature of the relationship between the individual and the member of the audit team;
- The position the individual holds with the client; and
- The role of the professional on the audit team.

The significance of the threats shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Removing the professional from the audit team; or
- Structuring the responsibilities of the audit team so that the professional does not deal with matters that are within the responsibility of the individual with whom the professional has a close relationship.

290.131 Self-interest, familiarity or intimidation threats may be created by a personal or family relationship between (a) a principal or employee of the firm who is not a member of the audit team and (b) a director or officer of the audit client or an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the preparation of the client's accounting records or the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion. Principals and employees of the firm who are aware of such

relationships shall consult in accordance with firm policies and procedures. The existence and significance of any threat will depend on factors such as:

- The nature of the relationship between the principal or employee of the firm and the director or officer or employee of the client;
- The interaction of the principal or employee of the firm with the audit team;
- The position of the principal or employee within the firm; and
- The position the individual holds with the client.

The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Structuring the principal's or employee's responsibilities to reduce any potential influence over the audit engagement; or
- Having an expert review the relevant audit work performed.

Employment with an Audit Client

290.132 Familiarity or intimidation threats may be created if a director or officer of the audit client, or an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the preparation of the client's accounting records or the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion, has been a member of the audit team or principal of the firm.

290.133 If a former member of the audit team or principal of the firm has joined the audit client in such a position and a significant connection remains between the firm and the individual, the threat would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Therefore, independence would be deemed to be compromised if a former member of the audit team or principal joins the audit client as a director or officer, or as an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the preparation of the client's accounting records or the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion, unless:

- (a) The individual is not entitled to any benefits or payments from the firm, unless made in accordance with fixed pre-determined arrangements, and any amount owed to the individual is not material to the firm; and
- (b) The individual does not continue to participate or appear to participate in the firm's business or professional activities.

290.134 If a former member of the audit team or principal of the firm has joined the audit client in such a position, and no significant connection remains between the firm and the individual, the existence and significance of any familiarity or intimidation threats will depend on factors such as:

- The position the individual has taken at the client;
- Any involvement the individual will have with the audit team;
- The length of time since the individual was a member of the audit team or principal of the firm; and
- The former position of the individual within the audit team or firm, for example, whether the individual was responsible for maintaining regular contact with the client's management or those charged with governance.

The significance of any threats created shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level.

Examples of such safeguards include:

- Modifying the audit plan;
- Assigning individuals to the audit team who have sufficient experience in relation to the individual who has joined the client; or
- Having an expert review the work of the former member of the audit team.

290.135 If a former principal of the firm has previously joined an entity in such a position and the entity subsequently becomes an audit client of the firm, the significance of any threat to independence shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level.

290.136 A self-interest threat is created when a member of the audit team participates in the audit engagement while knowing that the member of the audit team will, or may, join the client some-time in the future. Firm policies and procedures shall require members of an audit team to notify the firm when entering employment negotiations with the client. On receiving such notification, the significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Removing the individual from the audit team; or
- An immediate review of the audit work performed by the resigning or former member of the audit team in the current and/or (where appropriate) the most recent audit engagement. This review should be performed by a more senior person. If the individual joining the client is an audit principal or the key audit principal, the review should be performed by an audit principal who was not involved in the audit engagement. (Where, due to its size, the audit firm does not have a principal who was not involved in the audit engagement, it may seek either a review by another auditor or advice from the Accountancy Board or an accountancy body recognised under the Act.)

290.137 A warrant holder or a key audit principal who carries out a statutory audit on behalf of a firm shall not, before a period of at least one year, or in the case of statutory audit of public-interest entities a period of at least two years, has elapsed since he or she ceased to act as auditor or key audit principal in connection with the audit engagement:

- (a) Take up a key management position in the audit client;
- (b) Where applicable, become a member of the audit committee of the audit client or, where such committee does not exist, of the body performing equivalent functions to an audit committee;
- (c) Become a non-executive director of the audit client.

Employees and partners, other than key audit principals, of a warrant holder or of a firm carrying out an statutory audit, as well as any other natural person whose services are placed at the disposal or under the control of such warrant holder or firm do not, when such employees, partners or other natural persons are personally approved as auditors, take up any of the duties referred to in points (a), (b) and (c) before a period of at least one year has elapsed since he or she was directly involved in the statutory audit engagement

Audit Clients that are Public Interest Entities

- 290.138 Familiarity or intimidation threats are created when a key audit principal joins the audit client that is a public interest entity as:
- (a) A director or officer of the entity; or
 - (b) An employee in a position to exert significant influence over the preparation of the client's accounting records or the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion.

290.139 A key audit principal leaving the firm to join the audit client that is a public interest entity pursuant to paragraph 290.137, would be perceived to cause an unacceptably high level of independence risk. Therefore, a key audit principal shall not take up a key management position in the audited entity that is a public interest entity before a period of at least two years has elapsed since he or she resigned as key audit principal from the audit engagement.

- 290.140 An intimidation threat is created when the individual who was the firm's Senior or Managing Principal (Chief Executive or equivalent) joins an audit client that is a public interest entity as:
- (a) An employee in a position to exert significant influence over the preparation of the entity's accounting records or its financial statements; or
 - (b) A director or officer of the entity.

Independence would be deemed to be compromised unless twelve months have passed since the individual was the Senior or Managing Principal (Chief Executive or equivalent) of the firm.

- 290.141 Independence is deemed not to be compromised if, as a result of a business combination, a former key audit principal or the individual who was the firm's former Senior or Managing Principal is in a position as described in paragraphs 290.137 and 290.139, and:
- (a) The position was not taken in contemplation of the business combination;
 - (b) Any benefits or payments due to the former principal from the firm have been settled in full, unless made in accordance with fixed predetermined arrangements and any amount owed to the principal is not material to the firm;
 - (c) The former principal does not continue to participate or appear to participate in the firm's business or professional activities; and
 - (d) The position held by the former principal with the audit client is discussed with those charged with governance.

Temporary Staff Assignments

- 290.142 The lending of staff by a firm to an audit client may create a self-review threat. Such assistance may be given, but only for a short period of time and the firm's personnel shall not be involved in:
- (a) Providing non-assurance services that would not be permitted under this section; or
 - (b) Assuming management responsibilities.

In all circumstances, the audit client shall be responsible for directing and supervising the activities of the loaned staff.

The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Conducting an additional review of the work performed by the loaned staff;
- Not giving the loaned staff audit responsibility for any function or activity that the staff performed during the temporary staff assignment; or
- Not including the loaned staff as a member of the audit team.

Recent Service with an Audit Client

290.143 Self-interest, self-review or familiarity threats may be created if a member of the audit team has recently served as a director, officer, or employee of the audit client. This would be the case when, for example, a member of the audit team has to evaluate elements of the financial statements for which the member of the audit team had prepared the accounting records while with the client.

290.144 If, during the period covered by the audit report, a member of the audit team had served as a director or officer of the audit client, or was an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the preparation of the client's accounting records or the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion, the threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Consequently, such individuals shall not be assigned to the audit team.

Self-interest, self-review or familiarity threats may be created if, before the period covered by the audit report, a member of the audit team had served as a director or officer of the audit client, or was an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the preparation of the client's accounting records or financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion. For example, such threats would be created if a decision made or work performed by the individual in the prior period, while employed by the client, is to be evaluated in the current period as part of the current audit engagement. The existence and significance of any threats will depend on factors such as:

- The position the individual held with the client;
- The length of time since the individual left the client; and
- The role of the professional on the audit team.

The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to reduce the threat to an acceptable level. An example of such a safeguard is conducting a review of the work performed by the individual as a member of the audit team.

290.145 Despite paragraph 290.143, an individual who had served as a director or officer of the audit client, or was an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the preparation of the client's accounting records or the financial statements, shall not be assigned to that client's audit team at any time in the two year period after leaving the audit client. If the person is a member of the chain of command, he should not take part in any substantive decisions concerning an audit engagement with this client or with one of its related entities at any time in the two year period after leaving the audit client. This requirement also applies to a former employee of

the audit client unless the responsibilities he held and the tasks he performed at the audit client were insignificant in relation to the statutory audit function.

Serving as a Director or Officer of an Audit Client

- 290.146 If a principal or employee of the firm serves as a director or officer of an audit client, including company secretary, the self-review and self-interest threats created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threats to an acceptable level. Accordingly, no principal or employee shall serve as a director or officer of an audit client.
- 290.147 Performing routine administrative services to support a company secretarial function or providing advice in relation to company secretarial administration matters does not generally create threats to independence, as long as client management makes all relevant decisions.
- 290.148 An individual who is in a position to influence the outcome of the statutory audit or review engagement should not be a member of any management body (e.g. board of directors) or supervisory body (e.g. audit committee or supervisory board) of an audit client. Also, he should not be a member of such a body in an entity which holds directly or indirectly more than 20 % of the voting rights in the client, or in which the client holds directly or indirectly more than 20 % of the voting rights.

Long Association of Senior Personnel (Including Principal Rotation) with an Audit Client

General Provisions

- 290.149 Familiarity and self-interest threats are created by using the same senior personnel on an audit engagement over a long period of time. The significance of the threats will depend on factors such as:
- How long the individual has been a member of the audit team;
 - The role of the individual on the audit team;
 - The structure of the firm;
 - The nature of the audit engagement;
 - Whether the client's management team has changed; and
 - Whether the nature or complexity of the client's accounting and reporting issues has changed.

The significance of the threats shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Rotating the senior personnel off the audit team;
- Having an expert who was not a member of the audit team review the work of the senior personnel; or
- Regular independent internal or external quality reviews of the engagement.

Audit Clients that are Public Interest Entities

290.150 In respect of an audit of a public interest entity, an individual shall not be a key audit principal for more than seven years. After such time, the individual shall not be a member of the engagement team or be a key audit principal for the client for three years. During that period, the individual shall not participate in the audit of the entity, provide quality control for the engagement, consult with the engagement team or the client regarding technical or industry-specific issues, transactions or events or otherwise directly influence the outcome of the engagement. The firm is required to consider the independence risk which may arise in relation to the prolonged involvement of other engagement team members, and to adopt appropriate safeguards to reduce it to an acceptable level.

290.151 Despite paragraph 290.150, key audit principals whose continuity is especially important to audit quality may, in rare cases due to unforeseen circumstances outside the firm's control, be permitted an additional year on the audit team as long as the threat to independence can be eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level by applying safeguards. For example, a key audit principal may remain on the audit team for up to one additional year in circumstances where, due to unforeseen events, a required rotation was not possible, as might be the case due to serious illness of the intended engagement principal.

290.152 The long association of other principals with an audit client that is a public interest entity creates familiarity and self-interest threats. The significance of the threats will depend on factors such as:

- How long any such principal has been associated with the audit client;
- The role, if any, of the individual on the audit team; and
- The nature, frequency and extent of the individual's interactions with the client's management or those charged with governance.

The significance of the threats shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Rotating the principal off the audit team or otherwise ending the principal's association with the audit client; or
- Regular independent internal or external quality reviews of the engagement.

290.153 When an audit client becomes a public interest entity, the length of time the individual has served the audit client as a key audit principal before the client becomes a public interest entity shall be taken into account in determining the timing of the rotation. If the individual has served the audit client as a key audit principal for five years or less when the client becomes a public interest entity, the number of years the individual may continue to serve the client in that capacity before rotating off the engagement is seven years less the number of years already served. If the individual has served the audit client as a key audit principal for six or more years when the client becomes a public interest entity, the principal may continue to serve in that capacity for a maximum of two additional years before rotating off the engagement.

290.154 When a firm has only a few people with the necessary knowledge and experience to serve as a key audit principal on the audit of a public interest entity, rotation of key audit principals may not be an available safeguard. In such circumstances, an individual may remain a key audit principal for more than seven years provided that for the two years immediately following the seven year period, an independent external review is performed by a warrant holder who holds a practicing certificate in auditing, or by an individual holding a practicing certificate in auditing performing the external review on behalf of an audit firm (hereinafter the “external reviewer”). The external reviewer must comply with all the qualification and independence requirements of this Code, and such reviewer will also be considered a key audit principal for the purpose of that audit.

Provision of Non-assurance Services to Audit Clients

290.155 Firms have traditionally provided to their audit clients a range of non-assurance services that are consistent with their skills and expertise. Providing non-assurance services may, however, create threats to the independence of the firm or members of the audit team. The threats created are most often self-review, self-interest and advocacy threats.

290.156 New developments in business, the evolution of financial markets and changes in information technology make it impossible to draw up an all-inclusive list of non-assurance services that might be provided to an audit client. When specific guidance on a particular non-assurance service is not included in this section, the conceptual framework shall be applied when evaluating the particular circumstances.

290.157 Before the firm accepts an engagement to provide a non-assurance service to an audit client, a determination shall be made as to whether providing such a service would create a threat to independence. In evaluating the significance of any threat created by a particular non-assurance service, consideration shall be given to any threat that the audit team has reason to believe is created by providing other related non-assurance services. If a threat is created that cannot be reduced to an acceptable level by the application of safeguards, the non-assurance service shall not be provided.

290.158 A firm may provide non-assurance services that would otherwise be restricted under this section to the following related entities of the audit client:

- (a) An entity, which is not an audit client, that has direct or indirect control over the audit client;
- (b) An entity, which is not an audit client, with a direct financial interest in the client if that entity has significant influence over the client and the interest in the client is material to such entity; or
- (c) An entity, which is not an audit client, that is under common control with the audit client,

if it is reasonable to conclude that (a) the services do not create a self-review threat because the results of the services will not be subject to audit procedures and (b) any threats that are created by the provision of such services are eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level by the application of safeguards.

- 290.159 A non-assurance service provided to an audit client does not compromise the firm's independence when the client becomes a public interest entity if:
- (a) The previous non-assurance service complies with the provisions of this section that relate to audit clients that are not public interest entities;
 - (b) Services that are not permitted under this section for audit clients that are public interest entities are terminated before or as soon as practicable after the client becomes a public interest entity; and
 - (c) The firm applies safeguards when necessary to eliminate or reduce to an acceptable level any threats to independence arising from the service.
- 290.160 An auditor or an audit firm carrying out the statutory audit of a public-interest entity, or any member of the network to which the auditor or the audit firm belongs, shall not directly or indirectly provide to the audited entity, to its parent undertaking or to its controlled undertakings within the European Union any prohibited non-audit services, described in Article 18A of the Act, in:
- (a) The periods referred to in section 290.30; and
 - (b) In the case of services listed in sub-article (2)(e) of Article 18A of the Act, the financial year immediately preceding the period being audited.

Management Responsibilities

- 290.161 Management of an entity performs many activities in managing the entity in the best interests of stakeholders of the entity. It is not possible to specify every activity that is a management responsibility. However, management responsibilities involve leading and directing an entity, including making significant decisions regarding the acquisition, deployment and control of human, financial, physical and intangible resources.
- 290.162 Whether an activity is a management responsibility depends on the circumstances and requires the exercise of judgement. Examples of activities that would generally be considered a management responsibility include:
- Setting policies and strategic direction;
 - Directing and taking responsibility for the actions of the entity's employees;
 - Authorising transactions;
 - Deciding which recommendations of the firm or other third parties to implement;
 - Taking responsibility for the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework; and
 - Taking responsibility for designing, implementing and maintaining internal control.
- 290.163 Activities that are routine and administrative, or involve matters that are insignificant, generally are deemed not to be a management responsibility. For example, executing an insignificant transaction that has been authorised by management or monitoring the dates for filing statutory returns and advising an audit client of those dates is deemed not to be a management responsibility. Further, providing advice and recommendations to assist management in discharging its responsibilities is not assuming a management responsibility.
- 290.164 If a firm were to assume a management responsibility for an audit client, the threats created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threats to an acceptable level. For example, deciding which recommendations of the firm to

implement will create self-review and self-interest threats. Further, assuming a management responsibility creates a familiarity threat because the firm becomes too closely aligned with the views and interests of management. Therefore, the firm shall not assume a management responsibility for an audit client.

- 290.165 To avoid the risk of assuming a management responsibility when providing non-assurance services to an audit client, the firm shall be satisfied that a member of management is responsible for making the significant judgments and decisions that are the proper responsibility of management, evaluating the results of the service and accepting responsibility for the actions to be taken arising from the results of the service. This reduces the risk of the firm inadvertently making any significant judgements or decisions on behalf of management. The risk is further reduced when the firm gives the client the opportunity to make judgements and decisions based on an objective and transparent analysis and presentation of the issues.

Preparing Accounting Records and Financial Statements

General Provisions

- 290.166 Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework. These responsibilities include:
- Originating or changing journal entries, or determining the account classifications of transactions; and
 - Preparing or changing source documents or originating data, in electronic or other form, evidencing the occurrence of a transaction (for example, purchase orders, payroll time records, and customer orders).
- 290.167 Providing an audit client with accounting and bookkeeping services, such as preparing accounting records or financial statements, creates a self-review threat when the firm subsequently audits the financial statements.
- 290.168 The audit process, however, necessitates dialogue between the firm and management of the audit client, which may involve:
- The application of accounting standards or policies and financial statement disclosure requirements;
 - The appropriateness of financial and accounting control and the methods used in determining the stated amounts of assets and liabilities; or
 - Proposing adjusting journal entries.

These activities are considered to be a normal part of the audit process and do not, generally, create threats to independence.

- 290.169 Similarly, the client may request technical assistance from the firm on matters such as resolving account reconciliation problems or analysing and accumulating information for regulatory reporting. In addition, the client may request technical advice on accounting issues such as the conversion of existing financial statements from one financial reporting framework to another (for example, to comply with group accounting policies or to transition to a different financial reporting framework). Such services do not, generally, create threats to independence provided the firm does not assume a management responsibility for the client.

Audit clients that are not public interest entities

290.170 The firm may provide services related to the preparation of accounting records and financial statements to an audit client that is not a public interest entity where the services are of a routine or mechanical nature, so long as any self-review threat created is reduced to an acceptable level. Examples of such services include:

- Providing payroll services based on client-originated data;
- Recording transactions for which the client has determined or approved the appropriate account classification;
- Posting transactions coded by the client to the general ledger;
- Posting client-approved entries to the trial balance; and
- Preparing financial statements based on information in the trial balance.

In all cases, the significance of any threat created shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Arranging for such services to be performed by an individual who is not a member of the audit team; or
- If such services are performed by a member of the audit team, using a principal or senior staff member with appropriate expertise who is not a member of the audit team to review the work performed.

Audit clients that are public interest entities

290.171 Except in emergency situations, a firm shall not provide to an audit client that is a public interest entity accounting and bookkeeping services, including payroll services, or prepare financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion or financial information which forms the basis of the financial statements.

290.172 Despite paragraph 290.171, a firm may provide accounting and bookkeeping services, including payroll services and the preparation of financial statements or other financial information, of a routine or mechanical nature for divisions or related entities of an audit client that is a public interest entity if the personnel providing the services are not members of the audit team and:

- (a) The divisions or related entities for which the service is provided are collectively immaterial to the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion; or
- (b) The services relate to matters that are collectively immaterial to the financial statements of the division or related entity.

Emergency Situations

290.173 Accounting and bookkeeping services, which would otherwise not be permitted under this section, may be provided to audit clients in emergency or other unusual situations when it is impractical for the audit client to make other arrangements. This may be the case when (a) only the firm has the resources and necessary knowledge of the client's systems and procedures to assist the client in the timely preparation of its accounting records and financial statements, and (b) a restriction on the firm's ability to provide the services would result in significant difficulties for the client (for

example, as might result from a failure to meet regulatory reporting requirements). In such situations, the following conditions shall be met:

- (a) Those who provide the services are not members of the audit team;
- (b) The services are provided for only a short period of time and are not expected to recur; and
- (c) The situation is discussed with those charged with governance.

Valuation Services

General Provisions

290.174 A valuation comprises the making of assumptions with regard to future developments, the application of appropriate methodologies and techniques, and the combination of both to compute a certain value, or range of values, for an asset, a liability or for a business as a whole.

290.175 Performing valuation services for an audit client may create a self-review threat. The existence and significance of any threat will depend on factors such as:

- Whether the valuation will have a material effect on the financial statements.
- The extent of the client's involvement in determining and approving the valuation methodology and other significant matters of judgment.
- The availability of established methodologies and professional guidelines.
- For valuations involving standard or established methodologies, the degree of subjectivity inherent in the item.
- The reliability and extent of the underlying data.
- The degree of dependence on future events of a nature that could create significant volatility inherent in the amounts involved.
- The extent and clarity of the disclosures in the financial statements.

The significance of any threat created shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Having a professional who was not involved in providing the valuation service review the audit or valuation work performed; or
- Making arrangements so that personnel providing such services do not participate in the audit engagement.

290.176 Certain valuations do not involve a significant degree of subjectivity. This is likely the case where the underlying assumptions are either established by law or regulation, or are widely accepted and when the techniques and methodologies to be used are based on generally accepted standards or prescribed by law or regulation. In such circumstances, the results of a valuation performed by two or more parties are not likely to be materially different.

290.177 If a firm is requested to perform a valuation to assist an audit client with its tax reporting obligations or for tax planning purposes and the results of the valuation will not have a direct effect on the financial statements, the provisions included in paragraph 290.190 apply.

Audit clients that are not public interest entities

290.178 In the case of an audit client that is not a public interest entity, if the valuation service has a material effect on the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion and the valuation involves a significant degree of subjectivity, no safeguards could reduce the self-review threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly a firm shall not provide such a valuation service to an audit client.

Audit clients that are public interest entities

290.179 A firm shall not provide valuation services to an audit client that is a public interest entity if the valuations would have a material effect, separately or in the aggregate, on the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion.

Taxation Services

290.180 Taxation services comprise a broad range of services, including:

- Tax return preparation;
- Tax calculations for the purpose of preparing the accounting entries;
- Tax planning and other tax advisory services; and
- Assistance in the resolution of tax disputes.

While taxation services provided by a firm to an audit client are addressed separately under each of these broad headings, in practice, these activities are often interrelated.

290.181 Performing certain tax services creates self-review and advocacy threats. The existence and significance of any threats will depend on factors such as:

- The system by which the tax authorities assess and administer the tax in question and the role of the firm in that process;
- The complexity of the relevant tax regime and the degree of judgment necessary in applying it;
- The particular characteristics of the engagement; and
- The level of tax expertise of the client's employees.

Tax Return Preparation

290.182 Tax return preparation services involve assisting clients with their tax reporting obligations by drafting and completing information, including the amount of tax due (usually on standardised forms) required to be submitted to the applicable tax authorities. Such services also include advising on the tax return treatment of past transactions and responding on behalf of the audit client to the tax authorities' requests for additional information and analysis (including providing explanations of and technical support for the approach being taken). Tax return preparation services are generally based on historical information and principally involve analysis and presentation of such historical information under existing tax law, including precedents and established practice. Further, the tax returns are subject to whatever review or approval process the tax authority deems appropriate. Accordingly, providing such services does not generally create a threat to independence if management takes responsibility for the returns including any significant judgements made.

Tax Calculations for the Purpose of Preparing Accounting Entries
Audit clients that are not public interest entities

- 290.183 Preparing calculations of current and deferred tax liabilities (or assets) for an audit client for the purpose of preparing accounting entries that will be subsequently audited by the firm creates a self-review threat. The significance of the threat will depend on:
- (a) The complexity of the relevant tax law and regulation and the degree of judgment necessary in applying them;
 - (b) The level of tax expertise of the client's personnel; and
 - (c) The materiality of the amounts to the financial statements.

Safeguards shall be applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Using professionals who are not members of the audit team to perform the service;
- If the service is performed by a member of the audit team, using a principal or senior staff member with appropriate expertise who is not a member of the audit team to review the tax calculations; or
- Obtaining advice on the service from an external tax professional.

Audit clients that are public interest entities

290.184 Except in emergency situations, in the case of an audit client that is a public interest entity, a firm shall not prepare tax calculations of current and deferred tax liabilities (or assets) for the purpose of preparing accounting entries that are material to the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion.

- 290.185 The preparation of calculations of current and deferred tax liabilities (or assets) for an audit client for the purpose of the preparation of accounting entries, which would otherwise not be permitted under this section, may be provided to audit clients in emergency or other unusual situations when it is impractical for the audit client to make other arrangements. This may be the case when (a) only the firm has the resources and necessary knowledge of the client's business to assist the client in the timely preparation of its calculations of current and deferred tax liabilities (or assets), and (b) a restriction on the firm's ability to provide the services would result in significant difficulties for the client (for example, as might result from a failure to meet regulatory reporting requirements). In such situations, the following conditions shall be met:
- (a) Those who provide the services are not members of the audit team;
 - (b) The services are provided for only a short period of time and are not expected to recur; and
 - (c) The situation is discussed with those charged with governance.

Tax Planning and Other Tax Advisory Services

- 290.186 Tax planning or other tax advisory services comprise a broad range of services, such as advising the client how to structure its affairs in a tax efficient manner or advising on the application of a new tax law or regulation.
- 290.187 A self-review threat may be created where the advice will affect matters to be reflected in the financial statements. The existence and significance of any threat will depend on factors such as:
- The degree of subjectivity involved in determining the appropriate treatment for the tax advice in the financial statements;
 - The extent to which the outcome of the tax advice will have a material effect on the financial statements;
 - Whether the effectiveness of the tax advice depends on the accounting treatment or presentation in the financial statements and there is doubt as to the appropriateness of the accounting treatment or presentation under the relevant financial reporting framework;
 - The level of tax expertise of the client's employees;
 - The extent to which the advice is supported by tax law or regulation, other precedent or established practice; and
 - Whether the tax treatment is supported by a private ruling or has otherwise been cleared by the tax authority before the preparation of the financial statements.

For example, providing tax planning and other tax advisory services where the advice is clearly supported by tax authority or other precedent, by established practice or has a basis in tax law that is likely to prevail does not generally create a threat to independence.

- 290.188 The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:
- Using professionals who are not members of the audit team to perform the service;
 - Having a tax professional, who was not involved in providing the tax service, advise the audit team on the service and review the financial statement treatment;
 - Obtaining advice on the service from an external tax professional; or
 - Obtaining pre-clearance or advice from the tax authorities.
- 290.189 Where the effectiveness of the tax advice depends on a particular accounting treatment or presentation in the financial statements and:
- (a) The audit team has reasonable doubt as to the appropriateness of the related accounting treatment or presentation under the relevant financial reporting framework; and
 - (b) The outcome or consequences of the tax advice will have a material effect on the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion;

The self-review threat would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly, a firm shall not provide such tax advice to an audit client.

290.190 In providing tax services to an audit client, a firm may be requested to perform a valuation to assist the client with its tax reporting obligations or for tax planning purposes. Where the result of the valuation will have a direct effect on the financial statements, the provisions included in paragraphs 290.172 to 290.177 relating to valuation services are applicable. Where the valuation is performed for tax purposes only and the result of the valuation will not have a direct effect on the financial statements (that is, the financial statements are only affected through accounting entries related to tax), this would not generally create threats to independence if such effect on the financial statements is immaterial or if the valuation is subject to external review by a tax authority or similar regulatory authority. If the valuation is not subject to such an external review and the effect is material to the financial statements, the existence and significance of any threat created will depend upon factors such as:

- The extent to which the valuation methodology is supported by tax law or regulation, other precedent or established practice and the degree of subjectivity inherent in the valuation.
- The reliability and extent of the underlying data.

The significance of any threat created shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Using professionals who are not members of the audit team to perform the service;
- Having a professional review the audit work or the result of the tax service; or
- Obtaining pre-clearance or advice from the tax authorities.

Assistance in the Resolution of Tax Disputes

290.191 An advocacy or self-review threat may be created when the firm represents an audit client in the resolution of a tax dispute once the tax authorities have notified the client that they have rejected the client's arguments on a particular issue and either the tax authority or the client is referring the matter for determination in a formal proceeding, for example before a tribunal or court. The existence and significance of any threat will depend on factors such as:

- Whether the firm has provided the advice which is the subject of the tax dispute;
- The extent to which the outcome of the dispute will have a material effect on the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion;
- The extent to which the matter is supported by tax law or regulation, other precedent, or established practice;
- Whether the proceedings are conducted in public; and
- The role management plays in the resolution of the dispute.

The significance of any threat created shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Using professionals who are not members of the audit team to perform the service;

- Having a tax professional, who was not involved in providing the tax service, advise the audit team on the services and review the financial statement treatment; or
- Obtaining advice on the service from an external tax professional.

290.192 Where the taxation services involve acting as an advocate for an audit client before a public tribunal or court in the resolution of a tax matter and the amounts involved are material to the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion, the advocacy threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could eliminate or reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Therefore, the firm shall not perform this type of service for an audit client.

290.193 The firm is not, however, precluded from having a continuing advisory role (for example, responding to specific requests for information, providing factual accounts or testimony about the work performed or assisting the client in analysing the tax issues) for the audit client in relation to the matter that is being heard before a public tribunal or court.

Internal Audit Services

General Provisions

290.194 The scope and objectives of internal audit activities vary widely and depend on the size and structure of the entity and the requirements of management and those charged with governance. Internal audit activities may include:

- Monitoring of internal control – reviewing controls, monitoring their operation and recommending improvements thereto;
- Examination of financial and operating information – reviewing the means used to identify, measure, classify and report financial and operating information, and specific inquiry into individual items including detailed testing of transactions, balances and procedures;
- Review of the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of operating activities including non-financial activities of an entity; and
- Review of compliance with laws, regulations and other external requirements, and with management policies and directives and other internal requirements.

290.195 Internal audit services involve assisting the audit client in the performance of its internal audit activities. The provision of internal audit services to an audit client creates a self-review threat to independence if the firm uses the internal audit work in the course of a subsequent external audit. Performing a significant part of the client's internal audit activities increases the possibility that firm personnel providing internal audit services will assume a management responsibility. If the firm's personnel assume a management responsibility when providing internal audit services to an audit client, the threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly, a firm's personnel shall not assume a management responsibility when providing internal audit services to an audit client.

290.196 Examples of internal audit services that involve assuming management responsibilities include:

- (a) Setting internal audit policies or the strategic direction of internal audit activities;

- (b) Directing and taking responsibility for the actions of the entity's internal audit employees;
- (c) Deciding which recommendations resulting from internal audit activities shall be implemented;
- (d) Reporting the results of the internal audit activities to those charged with governance on behalf of management;
- (e) Performing procedures that form part of the internal control, such as reviewing and approving changes to employee data access privileges;
- (f) Taking responsibility for designing, implementing and maintaining internal control; and
- (g) Performing outsourced internal audit services, comprising all or a substantial portion of the internal audit function, where the firm is responsible for determining the scope of the internal audit work and may have responsibility for one or more of the matters noted in (a)–(f).

290.197 To avoid assuming a management responsibility, the firm shall only provide internal audit services to an audit client if it is satisfied that:

- (a) The client designates an appropriate and competent resource, preferably within senior management, to be responsible at all times for internal audit activities and to acknowledge responsibility for designing, implementing, and maintaining internal control;
- (b) The client's management or those charged with governance reviews, assesses and approves the scope, risk and frequency of the internal audit services;
- (c) The client's management evaluates the adequacy of the internal audit services and the findings resulting from their performance;
- (d) The client's management evaluates and determines which recommendations resulting from internal audit services to implement and manages the implementation process; and
- (e) The client's management reports to those charged with governance the significant findings and recommendations resulting from the internal audit services.

290.198 When a firm uses the work of an internal audit function, ISAs require the performance of procedures to evaluate the adequacy of that work. When a firm accepts an engagement to provide internal audit services to an audit client, and the results of those services will be used in conducting the external audit, a self-review threat is created because of the possibility that the audit team will use the results of the internal audit service without appropriately evaluating those results or exercising the same level of professional scepticism as would be exercised when the internal audit work is performed by individuals who are not members of the firm. The significance of the threat will depend on factors such as:

- The materiality of the related financial statement amounts;
- The risk of misstatement of the assertions related to those financial statement amounts; and
- The degree of reliance that will be placed on the internal audit service.

The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. An example of such a safeguard is using professionals who are not members of the audit team to perform the internal audit service.

Audit clients that are public interest entities

- 290.199 In the case of an audit client that is a public interest entity, a firm shall not provide internal audit services that relate to:
- (a) A significant part of the internal controls over financial reporting;
 - (b) Financial accounting systems that generate information that is, separately or in the aggregate, significant to the client's accounting records or financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion; or
 - (c) Amounts or disclosures that are, separately or in the aggregate, material to the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion.

IT Systems Services

General Provisions

- 290.200 Services related to information technology (IT) systems include the design or implementation of hardware or software systems. The systems may aggregate source data, form part of the internal control over financial reporting or generate information that affects the accounting records or financial statements, or the systems may be unrelated to the audit client's accounting records, the internal control over financial reporting or financial statements. Providing systems services may create a self-review threat depending on the nature of the services and the IT systems.
- 290.201 The following IT systems services are deemed not to create a threat to independence as long as the firm's personnel do not assume a management responsibility:
- (a) Design or implementation of IT systems that are unrelated to internal control over financial reporting;
 - (b) Design or implementation of IT systems that do not generate information forming a significant part of the accounting records or financial statements;
 - (c) Implementation of "off-the-shelf" accounting or financial information reporting software that was not developed by the firm if the customisation required to meet the client's needs is not significant; and
 - (d) Evaluating and making recommendations with respect to a system designed, implemented or operated by another service provider or the client.

Audit clients that are not public interest entities

- 290.202 Providing services to an audit client that is not a public interest entity involving the design or implementation of IT systems that (a) form a significant part of the internal control over financial reporting or (b) generate information that is significant to the client's accounting records or financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion creates a self-review threat.
- 290.203 The self-review threat is too significant to permit such services unless appropriate safeguards are put in place ensuring that:
- (a) The client acknowledges its responsibility for establishing and monitoring a system of internal controls;

- (b) The client assigns the responsibility to make all management decisions with respect to the design and implementation of the hardware or software system to a competent employee, preferably within senior management;
- (c) The client makes all management decisions with respect to the design and implementation process;
- (d) The client evaluates the adequacy and results of the design and implementation of the system; and
- (e) The client is responsible for operating the system (hardware or software) and for the data it uses or generates.

290.204 Depending on the degree of reliance that will be placed on the particular IT systems as part of the audit, a determination shall be made as to whether to provide such non-assurance services only with personnel who are not members of the audit team and who have different reporting lines within the firm. The significance of any remaining threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. An example of such a safeguard is having an expert review the audit or non-assurance work.

Audit clients that are public interest entities

290.205 In the case of an audit client that is a public interest entity, a firm shall not provide services involving the design or implementation of IT systems that (a) form a significant part of the internal control over financial reporting or (b) generate information that is significant to the client's accounting records or financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion.

Litigation Support Services

290.206 Litigation support services may include activities such as acting as an expert witness, calculating estimated damages or other amounts that might become receivable or payable as the result of litigation or other legal dispute, and assistance with document management and retrieval. These services may create a self-review or advocacy threat.

290.207 If the firm provides a litigation support service to an audit client and the service involves estimating damages or other amounts that affect the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion, the valuation service provisions included in paragraphs 290.172 to 290.177 shall be followed. In the case of other litigation support services, the significance of any threat created shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level.

Legal Services

290.208 For the purpose of this section, legal services are defined as any services for which the person providing the services must either be admitted to practice law before the courts of the jurisdiction in which such services are to be provided or have the required legal training to practice law. Such legal services may include, depending on the jurisdiction, a wide and diversified range of areas including both corporate and commercial services to clients, such as contract support, litigation, mergers and acquisition legal advice and support and assistance to clients' internal legal

departments. Providing legal services to an entity that is an audit client may create both self-review and advocacy threats.

290.209 Legal services that support an audit client in executing a transaction (for example, contract support, legal advice, legal due diligence and restructuring) may create self-review threats. The existence and significance of any threat will depend on factors such as:

- The nature of the service;
- Whether the service is provided by a member of the audit team; and
- The materiality of any matter in relation to the client's financial statements.

The significance of any threat created shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Using professionals who are not members of the audit team to perform the service; or
- Having a professional who was not involved in providing the legal services provide advice to the audit team on the service and review any financial statement treatment.

290.210 Acting in an advocacy role for an audit client in resolving a dispute or litigation when the amounts involved are material to the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion would create advocacy and self-review threats so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Therefore, the firm shall not perform this type of service for an audit client.

290.211 When a firm is asked to act in an advocacy role for an audit client in resolving a dispute or litigation when the amounts involved are not material to the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion, the firm shall evaluate the significance of any advocacy and self-review threats created and apply safeguards when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Using professionals who are not members of the audit team to perform the service; or
- Having a professional who was not involved in providing the legal services advise the audit team on the service and review any financial statement treatment.

290.212 The appointment of a principal or an employee of the firm as General Counsel for legal affairs of an audit client would create self-review and advocacy threats that are so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threats to an acceptable level. The position of General Counsel is generally a senior management position with broad responsibility for the legal affairs of a company, and consequently, no member of the firm shall accept such an appointment for an audit client.

Recruiting Services

General Provisions

290.213 Providing recruiting services to an audit client may create self-interest, familiarity or intimidation threats. The existence and significance of any threat will depend on factors such as:

- The nature of the requested assistance; and
- The role of the person to be recruited.

The significance of any threat created shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. In all cases, the firm shall not assume management responsibilities, including acting as a negotiator on the client's behalf, and the hiring decision shall be left to the client.

The firm may generally provide such services as reviewing the professional qualifications of a number of applicants and providing advice on their suitability for the post. In addition, the firm may interview candidates and advise on a candidate's competence for financial accounting, administrative or control positions.

Audit clients that are public interest entities

290.214 A firm shall not provide the following recruiting services to an audit client that is a public interest entity with respect to a director or officer of the entity or senior management in a position to exert significant influence over the preparation of the client's accounting records or the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion:

- Searching for or seeking out candidates for such positions; and
- Undertaking reference checks of prospective candidates for such positions.

Corporate Finance Services

290.215 Providing corporate finance services such as:

- assisting an audit client in developing corporate strategies;
- identifying possible targets for the audit client to acquire;
- advising on disposal transactions;
- assisting finance raising transactions; and
- providing structuring advice,

may create advocacy and self-review threats. The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Using professionals who are not members of the audit team to provide the services; or
- Having a professional who was not involved in providing the corporate finance service advise the audit team on the service and review the accounting treatment and any financial statement treatment.

290.216 Providing a corporate finance service, for example advice on the structuring of a corporate finance transaction or on financing arrangements that will directly affect amounts that will be reported in the financial statements on which the firm will

provide an opinion may create a self-review threat. The existence and significance of any threat will depend on factors such as:

- The degree of subjectivity involved in determining the appropriate treatment for the outcome or consequences of the corporate finance advice in the financial statements;
- The extent to which the outcome of the corporate finance advice will directly affect amounts recorded in the financial statements and the extent to which the amounts are material to the financial statements; and
- Whether the effectiveness of the corporate finance advice depends on a particular accounting treatment or presentation in the financial statements and there is doubt as to the appropriateness of the related accounting treatment or presentation under the relevant financial reporting framework.

The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Using professionals who are not members of the audit team to perform the service; or
- Having a professional who was not involved in providing the corporate finance service to the client advise the audit team on the service and review the accounting treatment and any financial statement treatment.

290.217 Where the effectiveness of corporate finance advice depends on a particular accounting treatment or presentation in the financial statements and:

- (a) The audit team has reasonable doubt as to the appropriateness of the related accounting treatment or presentation under the relevant financial reporting framework; and
- (b) The outcome or consequences of the corporate finance advice will have a material effect on the financial statements on which the firm will express an opinion;

The self-review threat would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level, in which case the corporate finance advice shall not be provided.

290.218 Providing corporate finance services involving promoting, dealing in, or underwriting an audit client's shares would create an advocacy or self-review threat that is so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly, a firm shall not provide such services to an audit client.

Fees

Fees – Relative Size

290.219 When the total fees from an audit client represent a large proportion of the total fees of the firm expressing the audit opinion, the dependence on that client and concern about losing the client creates a self-interest or intimidation threat. The significance of the threat will depend on factors such as:

- The operating structure of the firm;
- Whether the firm is well established or new; and

- The significance of the client qualitatively and/or quantitatively to the firm.

The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Reducing the dependency on the client;
- External quality control reviews; or
- Consulting a third party or institution, such as the Accountancy Board or an accountancy body recognised under the Act, or an expert, on key audit judgments.

290.220 A self-interest or intimidation threat is also created when the fees generated from an audit client represent a large proportion of the revenue from an individual principal's clients or a large proportion of the revenue of an individual office of the firm. The significance of the threat will depend upon factors such as:

- The significance of the client qualitatively and/or quantitatively to the principal or office; and
- The extent to which the remuneration of the principal, or the principals in the office, is dependent upon the fees generated from the client.

The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Reducing the dependency on the audit client;
- Having an expert review the work or otherwise advise as necessary; or
- Regular independent internal or external quality reviews of the engagement.

Audit Clients that are Public Interest Entities

290.221 Where an audit client is a public interest entity and, for two consecutive years, the total fees from the client and its related entities (subject to the considerations in paragraph 290.27) represent more than 15% of the total fees received by the firm expressing the opinion on the financial statements of the client, the firm shall disclose to the audit committee of the audit client the fact that the total of such fees represents more than 15% of the total fees received by the firm, and discuss which of the safeguards below it will apply to reduce the threat to an acceptable level, and apply the selected safeguard:

- Prior to the issuance of the audit opinion on the second year's financial statements, an expert, who is not a member of the firm expressing the opinion on the financial statements, performs an engagement quality control review of that engagement ("a pre-issuance review"); or
- After the audit opinion on the second year's financial statements has been issued, and before the issuance of the audit opinion on the third year's financial statements, an expert, who is not a member of the firm expressing the opinion on the financial statements, or a professional regulatory body performs a review of the second year's audit that is equivalent to an engagement quality control review ("a post-issuance review").

When the total fees significantly exceed 15%, the firm shall determine whether the significance of the threat is such that a post-issuance review would not reduce the threat to an acceptable level and, therefore, a pre-issuance review is required. In such circumstances a pre-issuance review shall be performed.

Where the fees received from such a public-interest entity, continue to exceed fifteen (15) per cent of the total fees received by such an auditor or, as the case may be, by a group auditor carrying out the statutory audit, the audit committee shall decide on the basis of objective grounds whether the statutory auditor or the audit firm or the group auditor, of such an entity or group of entities may continue to carry out the statutory audit for an additional period which shall not, in any case, exceed two years.

In the case when it has been determined that the audit can be carried out for a further two years, a pre-issuance review is required.

- 290.222 When the auditor provides to the audited public-interest entity, its parent undertaking or its controlled undertakings, for a period of three or more consecutive financial years, non-audit services other than those referred to in article 18A of the Act, the total fees for such services shall be limited to no more than seventy (70) per cent of the average of the fees paid in the last three consecutive financial years for the statutory audit(s) of the audited entity and, where applicable, of its parent undertaking, of its controlled undertakings and of the consolidated financial statements of that group of undertakings.

For the purposes of the limits specified in the first subparagraph, non-audit services, other than those referred to in article 18A of the Act, required by European Union or Maltese legislation shall be excluded.

The Board may, upon a request by the auditor, on an exceptional basis, allow that auditor to be exempt from the requirements in the first subparagraph in respect of an audited entity for a period not exceeding two financial years.

The three or more consecutive years as referred to in this section shall commence on or after 17 June 2016.

Fees – Overdue

- 290.223 A self-interest threat may be created if fees due from an audit client remain unpaid for a long time, especially if a significant part is not paid before the issue of the audit report for the following year. Generally the firm is expected to require payment of such fees before such audit report is issued. If fees remain unpaid after the report has been issued, the existence and significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. An example of such a safeguard is having an additional expert who did not take part in the audit engagement provide advice or review the work performed. The firm shall determine whether the overdue fees might be regarded as being equivalent to a loan to the client and whether, because of the significance of the overdue fees, it is appropriate for the firm to be reappointed or continue the audit engagement.

Contingent Fees

- 290.224 Contingent fees are fees calculated on a predetermined basis relating to the outcome of a transaction or the result of the services performed by the firm. For the purposes of this section, a fee is not regarded as being contingent if established by a court or other public authority.
- 290.225 A contingent fee charged directly or indirectly, for example through an intermediary, by a firm in respect of an assurance engagement creates a self-interest threat that is so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly, a firm shall not enter into any such fee arrangement. In order to avoid any appearance of contingency, the basis for the calculation of the audit fees must be agreed for each year in advance. This should include scope for variation so as to take account of unexpected factors in the work.
- 290.226 A contingent fee charged directly or indirectly, for example through an intermediary, by a firm in respect of a non-assurance service provided to an audit client may also create a self-interest threat. The threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level if:
- (a) The fee is charged by the firm expressing the opinion on the financial statements and the fee is material or expected to be material to that firm;
 - (b) The fee is charged by a network firm that participates in a significant part of the audit and the fee is material or expected to be material to that firm; or
 - (c) The outcome of the non-assurance service, and therefore the amount of the fee, is dependent on a future or contemporary judgment related to the audit of a material amount in the financial statements.

Accordingly, such arrangements shall not be accepted.

- 290.227 For other contingent fee arrangements charged by a firm for a non-assurance service to an audit client, the existence and significance of any threats will depend on factors such as:
- The range of possible fee amounts;
 - Whether an appropriate authority determines the outcome of the matter upon which the contingent fee will be determined;
 - The nature of the service; and
 - The effect of the event or transaction on the financial statements.

The significance of any threats shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Having an expert review the relevant audit work or otherwise advise as necessary; or
- Using professionals who are not members of the audit team to perform the non-assurance service.

Compensation and Evaluation Policies

- 290.228 A self-interest threat is created when a member of the audit team is evaluated on or compensated for selling non-assurance services to that audit client. The significance of the threat will depend on:
- The proportion of the individual's compensation or performance evaluation that is based on the sale of such services;
 - The role of the individual on the audit team; and
 - Whether promotion decisions are influenced by the sale of such services.

The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and, if the threat is not at an acceptable level, the firm shall either revise the compensation plan or evaluation process for that individual or apply safeguards to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Removing such members from the audit team; or
- Having an expert review the work of the member of the audit team.

- 290.229 A key audit principal shall not be evaluated on or compensated based on that principal's success in selling non-assurance services to the principal's audit client. This is not intended to prohibit normal profit-sharing arrangements between principals of a firm.

Gifts and Hospitality

- 290.230 Accepting gifts or hospitality from an audit client may create self-interest and familiarity threats. If a firm or a member of the audit team accepts gifts or hospitality, unless the value is trivial and inconsequential, the threats created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threats to an acceptable level. Consequently, a firm or a member of the audit team shall not accept such gifts or hospitality.

Actual or Threatened Litigation

- 290.231 When litigation takes place, or appears likely, between the firm or a member of the audit team and the audit client, self-interest and intimidation threats are created. The relationship between client management and the members of the audit team must be characterised by complete candour and full disclosure regarding all aspects of a client's business operations. When the firm and the client's management are placed in adversarial positions by actual or threatened litigation, affecting management's willingness to make complete disclosures, self-interest and intimidation threats are created. The significance of the threats created will depend on such factors as:
- The materiality of the litigation; and
 - Whether the litigation relates to a prior audit engagement.

The significance of the threats shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- If the litigation involves a member of the audit team, removing that individual from the audit team; or

- Having a professional review the work performed.

If such safeguards do not reduce the threats to an acceptable level, the only appropriate action is to withdraw from, or decline, the audit engagement.

Paragraphs 290.232 to 290.499 are intentionally left blank.

Reports that Include a Restriction on Use and Distribution

Introduction

- 290.500 The independence requirements in Section 290 apply to all audit engagements. However, in certain circumstances involving audit engagements where the report includes a restriction on use and distribution, and provided the conditions described in paragraphs 290.501 to 290.502 are met, the independence requirements in this section may be modified as provided in paragraphs 290.505 to 290.514. These paragraphs are only applicable to an audit engagement on special purpose financial statements (a) that is intended to provide a conclusion in positive or negative form that the financial statements are prepared in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework, including, in the case of a fair presentation framework, that the financial statements give a true and fair view or are presented fairly, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework, and (b) where the audit report includes a restriction on use and distribution. The modifications are not permitted in the case of an audit of financial statements required by law or regulation.
- 290.501 The modifications to the requirements of Section 290 are permitted if the intended users of the report (a) are knowledgeable as to the purpose and limitations of the report, and (b) explicitly agree to the application of the modified independence requirements. Knowledge as to the purpose and limitations of the report may be obtained by the intended users through their participation, either directly or indirectly through their representative who has the authority to act for the intended users, in establishing the nature and scope of the engagement. Such participation enhances the ability of the firm to communicate with intended users about independence matters, including the circumstances that are relevant to the evaluation of the threats to independence and the applicable safeguards necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level, and to obtain their agreement to the modified independence requirements that are to be applied.
- 290.502 The firm shall communicate (for example, in an engagement letter) with the intended users regarding the independence requirements that are to be applied with respect to the provision of the audit engagement. Where the intended users are a class of users (for example, lenders in a syndicated loan arrangement) who are not specifically identifiable by name at the time the engagement terms are established, such users shall subsequently be made aware of the independence requirements agreed to by the representative (for example, by the representative making the firm's engagement letter available to all users).
- 290.503 If the firm also issues an audit report that does not include a restriction on use and distribution for the same client, the provisions of paragraphs 290.500 to 290.514 do not change the requirement to apply the provisions of paragraphs 290.1 to 290.231 to that audit engagement.
- 290.504 The modifications to the requirements of Section 290 that are permitted in the circumstances set out above are described in paragraphs 290.505 to 290.514. Compliance in all other respects with the provisions of Section 290 is required.

Public Interest Entities

290.505 When the conditions set out in paragraphs 290.500 to 290.502 are met, it is not necessary to apply the additional requirements in paragraphs 290.100 to 290.231 that apply to audit engagements for public interest entities.

Related Entities

290.506 When the conditions set out in paragraphs 290.500 to 290.502 are met, references to audit client do not include its related entities. However, when the audit team knows or has reason to believe that a relationship or circumstance involving a related entity of the client is relevant to the evaluation of the firm's independence of the client, the audit team shall include that related entity when identifying and evaluating threats to independence and applying appropriate safeguards.

Networks and Network Firms

290.507 When the conditions set out in paragraphs 290.500 to 290.502 are met, reference to the firm does not include network firms. However, when the firm knows or has reason to believe that threats are created by any interests and relationships of a network firm, they shall be included in the evaluation of threats to independence.

Financial Interests, Loans and Guarantees, Close Business Relationships and Family and Personal Relationships

290.508 When the conditions set out in paragraphs 290.500 to 290.502 are met, the relevant provisions set out in paragraphs 290.102 to 290.145 apply only to the members of the engagement team, their immediate family members and close family members.

290.509 In addition, a determination shall be made as to whether threats to independence are created by interests and relationships, as described in paragraphs 290.102 to 290.145, between the audit client and the following members of the audit team:

- (a) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry specific issues, transactions or events; and
- (b) Those who provide quality control for the engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review.

An evaluation shall be made of the significance of any threats that the engagement team has reason to believe are created by interests and relationships between the audit client and others within the firm who can directly influence the outcome of the audit engagement, including those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the audit engagement principal in connection with the performance of the audit engagement (including those at all successively senior levels above the engagement principal through to the individual who is the firm's Senior or Managing Principal (Chief Executive or equivalent)).

290.510 An evaluation shall also be made of the significance of any threats that the engagement team has reason to believe are created by financial interests in the audit client held by individuals, as described in paragraphs 290.108 to 290.111 and paragraphs 290.113 to 290.115.

- 290.511 Where a threat to independence is not at an acceptable level, safeguards shall be applied to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level.
- 290.512 In applying the provisions set out in paragraphs 290.106 and 290.115 to interests of the firm, if the firm has a material financial interest, whether direct or indirect, in the audit client, the self-interest threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly, the firm shall not have such a financial interest.

Employment with an Audit Client

- 290.513 An evaluation shall be made of the significance of any threats from any employment relationships as described in paragraphs 290.132 to 290.137. Where a threat exists that is not at an acceptable level, safeguards shall be applied to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of safeguards that might be appropriate include those set out in paragraph 290.134.

Provision of Non-Assurance Services

- 290.514 If the firm conducts an engagement to issue a restricted use and distribution report for an audit client and provides a non-assurance service to the audit client, the provisions of paragraphs 290.155 to 290.231 shall be complied with, subject to paragraphs 290.504 to 290.507.

SECTION 291 Independence – Other Assurance Engagements**CONTENTS**

Structure of Section.....	97
A Conceptual Framework Approach to Independence.....	97
Assurance Engagements	99
Assertion-based Assurance Engagements.....	99
Direct Reporting Assurance Engagements.....	100
Reports that Include a Restriction on Use and Distribution.....	100
Multiple Responsible Parties	101
Documentation	102
Engagement Period.....	102
Breach of a Provision of this Section	103
Application of the Conceptual Framework Approach to Independence.....	105
Financial Interests	105
Loans and Guarantees.....	107
Business Relationships	108
Family and Personal Relationships	109
Employment with Assurance Clients.....	111
Recent Service with an Assurance Client	112
Serving as a Director or Officer of an Assurance Client.....	112
Long Association of Senior Personnel with Assurance Clients	113
Provision of Non-assurance Services to Assurance Clients.....	113
Management Responsibilities.....	113
Other Considerations	114
Fees.....	115
Contingent Fees.....	116
Gifts and Hospitality	116
Actual or Threatened Litigation.....	117

Structure of Section

- 291.1 This section addresses independence requirements for assurance engagements that are not audit or review engagements. Independence requirements for audit and review engagements are addressed in Section 290. If the assurance client is also an audit or review client, the requirements in Section 290 also apply to the firm, network firms and members of the audit or review team. In certain circumstances involving assurance engagements where the assurance report includes a restriction on use and distribution and provided certain conditions are met, the independence requirements in this section may be modified as provided in paragraphs 291.21 to 291.27.
- 291.2 Assurance engagements are designed to enhance intended users' degree of confidence about the outcome of the evaluation or measurement of a subject matter against criteria. The International Framework for Assurance Engagements (the Assurance Framework) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board describes the elements and objectives of an assurance engagement and identifies engagements to which International Standards on Assurance Engagements (ISAEs) apply. For a description of the elements and objectives of an assurance engagement, refer to the Assurance Framework.
- 291.3 Compliance with the fundamental principle of objectivity requires being independent of assurance clients. In the case of assurance engagements, it is in the public interest and, therefore, required by this Code of Ethics, that members of assurance teams and firms be independent of assurance clients and that any threats that the firm has reason to believe are created by a network firm's interests and relationships be evaluated. In addition, when the assurance team knows or has reason to believe that a relationship or circumstance involving a related entity of the assurance client is relevant to the evaluation of the firm's independence from the client, the assurance team shall include that related entity when identifying and evaluating threats to independence and applying appropriate safeguards.

A Conceptual Framework Approach to Independence

- 291.4 The objective of this section is to assist firms and members of assurance teams in applying the conceptual framework approach described below to achieving and maintaining independence.
- 291.5 Independence comprises:
- (a) Independence of Mind

The state of mind that permits the expression of a conclusion without being affected by influences that compromise professional judgement, thereby allowing an individual to act with integrity and exercise objectivity and professional scepticism.
 - (b) Independence in Appearance

The avoidance of facts and circumstances that are so significant that a reasonable and informed third party would be likely to conclude, weighing all the specific facts and circumstances, that a firm's, or a member of the assurance team's, integrity, objectivity or professional scepticism has been compromised.

- 291.6 The conceptual framework approach shall be applied by warrant holders to:
- (a) Identify threats to independence
 - (b) Evaluate the significance of the threats identified; an
 - (c) Apply safeguards when necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level.

When the warrant holder determines that appropriate safeguards are not available or cannot be applied to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level, the warrant holder shall eliminate the circumstance or relationship creating the threats or decline or terminate the assurance engagement.

A warrant holder shall use professional judgement in applying this conceptual framework.

- 291.7 Many different circumstances, or combinations of circumstances, may be relevant in assessing threats to independence. It is impossible to define every situation that creates threats to independence and to specify the appropriate action. Therefore, this Code establishes a conceptual framework that requires firms and members of assurance teams to identify, evaluate, and address threats to independence. The conceptual framework approach assists warrant holders in public practice in complying with the ethical requirements in this Code. It accommodates many variations in circumstances that create threats to independence and can deter a warrant holder from concluding that a situation is permitted if it is not specifically prohibited.
- 291.8 Paragraphs 291.100 and onwards describe how the conceptual framework approach to independence is to be applied. These paragraphs do not address all the circumstances and relationships that create or may create threats to independence.
- 291.9 In deciding whether to accept or continue an engagement, or whether a particular individual may be a member of the assurance team, a firm shall identify and evaluate any threats to independence. If the threats are not at an acceptable level, and the decision is whether to accept an engagement or include a particular individual on the assurance team, the firm shall determine whether safeguards are available to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. If the decision is whether to continue an engagement, the firm shall determine whether any existing safeguards will continue to be effective to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level or whether other safeguards will need to be applied or whether the engagement needs to be terminated. Whenever new information about a threat comes to the attention of the firm during the engagement, the firm shall evaluate the significance of the threat in accordance with the conceptual framework approach.
- 291.10 Throughout this section, reference is made to the significance of threats to independence. In evaluating the significance of a threat, qualitative as well as quantitative factors shall be taken into account.
- 291.11 This section does not, in most cases, prescribe the specific responsibility of individuals within the firm for actions related to independence because responsibility may differ depending on the size, structure and organisation of a firm. The firm is required by ISQCs to establish policies and procedures designed to provide it with

reasonable assurance that independence is maintained when required by relevant ethical standards.

Assurance Engagements

- 291.12 As further explained in the Assurance Framework, in an assurance engagement the warrant holder in public practice expresses a conclusion designed to enhance the degree of confidence of the intended users (other than the responsible party) about the outcome of the evaluation or measurement of a subject matter against criteria.
- 291.13 The outcome of the evaluation or measurement of a subject matter is the information that results from applying the criteria to the subject matter. The term “subject matter information” is used to mean the outcome of the evaluation or measurement of a subject matter. For example, the Framework states that an assertion about the effectiveness of internal control (subject matter information) results from applying a framework for evaluating the effectiveness of internal control, such as COSO¹ or CoCo² (criteria), to internal control, a process (subject matter).
- 291.14 Assurance engagements may be assertion-based or direct reporting. In either case, they involve three separate parties: a warrant holder in public practice, a responsible party and intended users.
- 291.15 In an assertion-based assurance engagement, the evaluation or measurement of the subject matter is performed by the responsible party, and the subject matter information is in the form of an assertion by the responsible party that is made available to the intended users.
- 291.16 In a direct reporting assurance engagement, the warrant holder in public practice either directly performs the evaluation or measurement of the subject matter, or obtains a representation from the responsible party that has performed the evaluation or measurement that is not available to the intended users. The subject matter information is provided to the intended users in the assurance report.

Assertion-based Assurance Engagements

- 291.17 In an assertion-based assurance engagement, the members of the assurance team and the firm shall be independent of the assurance client (the party responsible for the subject matter information, and which may be responsible for the subject matter). Such independence requirements prohibit certain relationships between members of the assurance team and (a) directors or officers, and (b) individuals at the client in a position to exert significant influence over the subject matter information. Also, a determination shall be made as to whether threats to independence are created by relationships with individuals at the client in a position to exert significant influence over the subject matter of the engagement. An evaluation shall be made of the significance of any threats that the firm has reason to believe are created by network firm³ interests and relationships.

¹ “Internal Control – Integrated Framework” The Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission.

² “Guidance on Assessing Control – The CoCo Principles” Criteria of Control Board, The Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants.

³ See paragraphs 290.13 to 290.24 for guidance on what constitutes a network firm.

- 291.18 In the majority of assertion-based assurance engagements, the responsible party is responsible for both the subject matter information and the subject matter. However, in some engagements, the responsible party may not be responsible for the subject matter. For example, when a warrant holder in public practice is engaged to perform an assurance engagement regarding a report that an environmental consultant has prepared about a company's sustainability practices for distribution to intended users, the environmental consultant is the responsible party for the subject matter information but the company is responsible for the subject matter (the sustainability practices).
- 291.19 In assertion-based assurance engagements where the responsible party is responsible for the subject matter information but not the subject matter, the members of the assurance team and the firm shall be independent of the party responsible for the subject matter information (the assurance client). In addition, an evaluation shall be made of any threats the firm has reason to believe are created by interests and relationships between a member of the assurance team, the firm, a network firm and the party responsible for the subject matter.

Direct Reporting Assurance Engagements

- 291.20 In a direct reporting assurance engagement, the members of the assurance team and the firm shall be independent of the assurance client (the party responsible for the subject matter). An evaluation shall also be made of any threats the firm has reason to believe are created by network firm interests and relationships.

Reports that Include a Restriction on Use and Distribution

- 291.21 In certain circumstances where the assurance report includes a restriction on use and distribution, and provided the conditions in this paragraph and in paragraph 291.22 are met, the independence requirements in this section may be modified. The modifications to the requirements of Section 291 are permitted if the intended users of the report (a) are knowledgeable as to the purpose, subject matter information and limitations of the report and (b) explicitly agree to the application of the modified independence requirements. Knowledge as to the purpose, subject matter information, and limitations of the report may be obtained by the intended users through their participation, either directly or indirectly through their representative who has the authority to act for the intended users, in establishing the nature and scope of the engagement. Such participation enhances the ability of the firm to communicate with intended users about independence matters, including the circumstances that are relevant to the evaluation of the threats to independence and the applicable safeguards necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level, and to obtain their agreement to the modified independence requirements that are to be applied.
- 291.22 The firm shall communicate (for example, in an engagement letter) with the intended users regarding the independence requirements that are to be applied with respect to the provision of the assurance engagement. Where the intended users are a class of users (for example, lenders in a syndicated loan arrangement) who are not specifically identifiable by name at the time the engagement terms are established, such users shall subsequently be made aware of the independence requirements agreed to by the representative (for example, by the representative making the firm's engagement letter available to all users).

- 291.23 If the firm also issues an assurance report that does not include a restriction on use and distribution for the same client, the provisions of paragraphs 291.25 to 291.27 do not change the requirement to apply the provisions of paragraphs 291.1 to 291.157 to that assurance engagement. If the firm also issues an audit report, whether or not it includes a restriction on use and distribution, for the same client, the provisions of Section 290 shall apply to that audit engagement.
- 291.24 The modifications to the requirements of Section 291 that are permitted in the circumstances set out above are described in paragraphs 291.25 to 291.27. Compliance in all other respects with the provisions of Section 291 is required.
- 291.25 When the conditions set out in paragraphs 291.21 and 291.22 are met, the relevant provisions set out in paragraphs 291.104 to 291.134 apply to all members of the engagement team, and their immediate and close family members. In addition, a determination shall be made as to whether threats to independence are created by interests and relationships between the assurance client and the following other members of the assurance team:
- (a) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry specific issues, transactions or events; and
 - (b) Those who provide quality control for the engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review.
- An evaluation shall also be made, by reference to the provisions set out in paragraphs 291.104 to 291.134, of any threats that the engagement team has reason to believe are created by interests and relationships between the assurance client and others within the firm who can directly influence the outcome of the assurance engagement, including those who recommend the compensation, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight, of the assurance engagement principal in connection with the performance of the assurance engagement.
- 291.26 Even though the conditions set out in paragraphs 291.21 to 291.22 are met, if the firm had a material financial interest, whether direct or indirect, in the assurance client, the self-interest threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly, the firm shall not have such a financial interest. In addition, the firm shall comply with the other applicable provisions of this section described in paragraphs 291.113 to 291.157.
- 291.27 An evaluation shall also be made of any threats that the firm has reason to believe are created by network firm interests and relationships.

Multiple Responsible Parties

- 291.28 In some assurance engagements, whether assertion-based or direct reporting, there might be several responsible parties. In determining whether it is necessary to apply the provisions in this section to each responsible party in such engagements, the firm may take into account whether an interest or relationship between the firm, or a member of the assurance team, and a particular responsible party would create a threat to independence that is not trivial and inconsequential in the context of the subject matter information. This will take into account factors such as:

- The materiality of the subject matter information (or of the subject matter) for which the particular responsible party is responsible; and
- The degree of public interest associated with the engagement.

If the firm determines that the threat to independence created by any such interest or relationship with a particular responsible party would be trivial and inconsequential, it may not be necessary to apply all of the provisions of this section to that responsible party.

Documentation

- 291.29 Documentation provides evidence of the warrant holder's judgements in forming conclusions regarding compliance with independence requirements. The absence of documentation is not a determinant of whether a firm considered a particular matter nor whether it is independent.
- The warrant holder shall document conclusions regarding compliance with independence requirements, and the substance of any relevant discussions that support those conclusions. Accordingly:
- (a) When safeguards are required to reduce a threat to an acceptable level, the warrant holder shall document the nature of the threat and the safeguards in place or applied that reduce the threat to an acceptable level; and
 - (b) When a threat required significant analysis to determine whether safeguards were necessary and the warrant holder concluded that they were not because the threat was already at an acceptable level, the warrant holder shall document the nature of the threat and the rationale for the conclusion.

Engagement Period

- 291.30 Independence from the assurance client is required both during the engagement period and the period covered by the subject matter information. The engagement period starts when the assurance team begins to perform assurance services with respect to the particular engagement. The engagement period ends when the assurance report is issued. When the engagement is of a recurring nature, it ends at the later of the notification by either party that the professional relationship has terminated or the issuance of the final assurance report.
- 291.31 When an entity becomes an assurance client during or after the period covered by the subject matter information on which the firm will express a conclusion, the firm shall determine whether any threats to independence are created by:
- (a) Financial or business relationships with the assurance client during or after the period covered by the subject matter information but before accepting the assurance engagement; or
 - (b) Previous services provided to the assurance client.
- 291.32 If a non-assurance service was provided to the assurance client during or after the period covered by the subject matter information but before the assurance team begins to perform assurance services and the service would not be permitted during the period of the assurance engagement, the firm shall evaluate any threat to independence created by the service. If any threat is not at an acceptable level, the assurance engagement shall only be accepted if safeguards are applied to eliminate any threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Not including personnel who provided the non-assurance service as members of the assurance team;
- Having an expert review the assurance and non-assurance work as appropriate; or
- Engaging another firm to evaluate the results of the non-assurance service or having another firm re-perform the non-assurance service to the extent necessary to enable it to take responsibility for the service.

However, if the non-assurance service has not been completed and it is not practical to complete or terminate the service before the commencement of professional services in connection with the assurance engagement, the firm shall only accept the assurance engagement if it is satisfied:

- (a) The non-assurance service will be completed within a short period of time; or
- (b) The client has arrangements in place to transition the service to another provider within a short period of time.

During the service period, safeguards shall be applied when necessary. In addition, the matter shall be discussed with those charged with governance.

Breach of a Provision of this Section

- 291.33 When a breach of a provision of this section is identified, the firm shall terminate, suspend or eliminate the interest or relationship that caused the breach, and shall evaluate the significance of that breach and its impact on the firm's objectivity and ability to issue an assurance report. The firm shall determine whether action can be taken that satisfactorily addresses the consequences of the breach. In making this determination, the firm shall exercise professional judgment and take into account whether a reasonable and informed third party, weighing the significance of the breach, the action to be taken and all the specific facts and circumstances available to the professional accountant at that time, would be likely to conclude that the firm's objectivity would be compromised such that the firm is unable to issue an assurance report.
- 291.34 If the firm determines that action cannot be taken to satisfactorily address the consequences of the breach, the firm shall, as soon as possible, inform the party that engaged the firm or those charged with governance, as appropriate, and take the steps necessary to terminate the assurance engagement in compliance with any applicable legal or regulatory requirements relevant to terminating the assurance engagement.
- 291.35 If the firm determines that action can be taken to satisfactorily address the consequences of the breach, the firm shall discuss the breach and the action it has taken or proposes to take with the party that engaged the firm or those charged with governance, as appropriate. The firm shall discuss the breach and the proposed action on a timely basis, taking into account the circumstances of the engagement and the breach.
- 291.36 If the party that engaged the firm or those charged with governance, as appropriate, do not concur that the action satisfactorily addresses the consequences of the breach, the firm shall take the steps necessary to terminate the assurance

engagement in compliance with any applicable legal or regulatory requirements relevant to terminating the assurance engagement.

- 291.37 The firm shall document the breach, the actions taken, key decisions made and all the matters discussed with the party that engaged the firm or those charged with governance. When the firm continues with the assurance engagement, the matters to be documented shall also include the conclusion that, in the firm's professional judgment, objectivity has not been compromised and the rationale for why the action taken satisfactorily addressed the consequences of the breach such that the firm could issue an assurance report.

Paragraphs 291.38 to 291.99 are intentionally left blank.

Application of the Conceptual Framework Approach to Independence

- 291.100 Paragraphs 291.104 to 291.155 describe specific circumstances and relationships that create or may create threats to independence. The paragraphs describe the potential threats and the types of safeguards that may be appropriate to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level and identify certain situations where no safeguards could reduce the threats to an acceptable level. The paragraphs do not describe all of the circumstances and relationships that create or may create a threat to independence. The firm and the members of the assurance team shall evaluate the implications of similar, but different, circumstances and relationships and determine whether safeguards, including the safeguards in paragraphs 200.11 to 200.14 can be applied when necessary to eliminate the threats to independence or reduce them to an acceptable level.
- 291.101 The paragraphs demonstrate how the conceptual framework approach applies to assurance engagements and are to be read in conjunction with paragraph 291.28 which explains that, in the majority of assurance engagements, there is one responsible party and that responsible party is the assurance client. However, in some assurance engagements there are two or more responsible parties. In such circumstances, an evaluation shall be made of any threats the firm has reason to believe are created by interests and relationships between a member of the assurance team, the firm, a network firm and the party responsible for the subject matter. For assurance reports that include a restriction on use and distribution, the paragraphs are to be read in the context of paragraphs 291.21 to 291.27.
- 291.102 Interpretation 2005–01 provides further guidance on applying the independence requirements contained in this section to assurance engagements.
- 291.103 Paragraphs 291.104 to 291.119 contain references to the materiality of a financial interest, loan, or guarantee, or the significance of a business relationship. For the purpose of determining whether such an interest is material to an individual, the combined net worth of the individual and the individual's immediate family members may be taken into account.

Financial Interests

- 291.104 Holding a financial interest in an assurance client may create a self-interest threat. The existence and significance of any threat created depends on:
- (a) The role of the person holding the financial interest,
 - (b) Whether the financial interest is direct or indirect, and
 - (c) The materiality of the financial interest.
- 291.105 Financial interests may be held through an intermediary (for example, a collective investment vehicle, estate or trust). The determination of whether such financial interests are direct or indirect will depend upon whether the beneficial owner has control over the investment vehicle or the ability to influence its investment decisions. When control over the investment vehicle or the ability to influence investment decisions exists, this Code defines that financial interest to be a direct financial interest. Conversely, when the beneficial owner of the financial interest has no control over the investment vehicle or ability to influence its investment decisions, this Code defines that financial interest to be an indirect financial interest.

291.106 If a member of the assurance team, a member of that individual's immediate family, or a firm has a direct financial interest or a material indirect financial interest in the assurance client, the self-interest threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Therefore, none of the following shall have a direct financial interest or a material indirect financial interest in the client: a member of the assurance team; a member of that individual's immediate family member; or the firm.

291.107 When a member of the assurance team has a close family member who the assurance team member knows has a direct financial interest or a material indirect financial interest in the assurance client, a self-interest threat is created. The significance of the threat will depend on factors such as

- The nature of the relationship between the member of the assurance team and the close family member; and
- The materiality of the financial interest to the close family member.

The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- The close family member disposing, as soon as practicable, of all of the financial interest or disposing of a sufficient portion of an indirect financial interest so that the remaining interest is no longer material;
- Having an expert review the work of the member of the assurance team; or
- Removing the individual from the assurance team.

291.108 If a member of the assurance team, a member of that individual's immediate family, or a firm has a direct or material indirect financial interest in an entity that has a controlling interest in the assurance client, and the client is material to the entity, the self-interest threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Therefore, none of the following shall have such a financial interest: a member of the assurance team; a member of that individual's immediate family; and the firm.

291.109 The holding by a firm or a member of the assurance team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, of a direct financial interest or a material indirect financial interest in the assurance client as a trustee creates a self-interest threat. Such an interest shall not be held unless:

- (a) Neither the trustee, nor an immediate family member of the trustee, nor the firm are beneficiaries of the trust;
- (b) The interest in the assurance client held by the trust is not material to the trust;
- (c) The trust is not able to exercise significant influence over the assurance client; and
- (d) The trustee, an immediate family member of the trustee, or the firm cannot significantly influence any investment decision involving a financial interest in the assurance client.

291.110 Members of the assurance team shall determine whether a self-interest threat is created by any known financial interests in the assurance client held by other individuals including:

- (a) Principals and professional employees of the firm, other than those referred to above, or their immediate family members; and
- (b) Individuals with a close personal relationship with a member of the assurance team.

Whether these interests create a self-interest threat will depend on factors such as:

- The firm's organisational, operating and reporting structure; and
- The nature of the relationship between the individual and the member of the assurance team.

The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Removing the member of the assurance team with the personal relationship from the assurance team;
- Excluding the member of the assurance team from any significant decision-making concerning the assurance engagement; or
- Having an expert review the work of the member of the assurance team.

- 291.111 If a firm, a member of the assurance team, or an immediate family member of the individual, receives a direct financial interest or a material indirect financial interest in an assurance client, for example, by way of an inheritance, gift or as a result of a merger, and such interest would not be permitted to be held under this section, then:
- (a) If the interest is received by the firm, the financial interest shall be disposed of immediately, or a sufficient amount of an indirect financial interest shall be disposed of so that the remaining interest is no longer material, or
 - (b) If the interest is received by a member of the assurance team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, the individual who received the financial interest shall immediately dispose of the financial interest, or dispose of a sufficient amount of an indirect financial interest so that the remaining interest is no longer material.

Loans and Guarantees

- 291.112 A loan, or a guarantee of a loan, to a member of the assurance team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, or the firm from an assurance client that is a bank or a similar institution, may create a threat to independence. If the loan or guarantee is not made under normal lending procedures, terms and conditions, a self-interest threat would be created that would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly, neither a member of the assurance team, a member of that individual's immediate family, nor a firm shall accept such a loan or guarantee.
- 291.113 If a loan to a firm from an assurance client that is a bank or similar institution is made under normal lending procedures, terms and conditions and it is material to the assurance client or firm receiving the loan, it may be possible to apply safeguards to reduce the self-interest threat to an acceptable level. An example of such a safeguard is having the work reviewed by an expert from a network firm that is neither involved with the assurance engagement nor received the loan.

- 291.114 A loan, or a guarantee of a loan, from an assurance client that is a bank or a similar institution to a member of the assurance team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, does not create a threat to independence if the loan or guarantee is made under normal lending procedures, terms and conditions. Examples of such loans include home mortgages, bank overdrafts, car loans and credit card balances.
- 291.115 If the firm or a member of the assurance team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, accepts a loan from, or has a borrowing guaranteed by, an assurance client that is not a bank or similar institution, the self-interest threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level, unless the loan or guarantee is immaterial to both the firm, or the member of the assurance team and the immediate family member, and the client.
- 291.116 Similarly, if the firm, or a member of the assurance team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, makes or guarantees a loan to an assurance client, the self-interest threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level, unless the loan or guarantee is immaterial to both the firm, or the member of the assurance team and the immediate family member, and the client.
- 291.117 If a firm or a member of the assurance team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, has deposits or a brokerage account with an assurance client that is a bank, broker, or similar institution, a threat to independence is not created if the deposit or account is held under normal commercial terms.

Business Relationships

- 291.118 A close business relationship between a firm, or a member of the assurance team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, and the assurance client or its management arises from a commercial relationship or common financial interest and may create self-interest or intimidation threats. Examples of such relationships include:
- Having a financial interest in a joint venture with either the client or a controlling owner, director or officer or other individual who performs senior managerial activities for that client.
 - Arrangements to combine one or more services or products of the firm with one or more services or products of the client and to market the package with reference to both parties.
 - Distribution or marketing arrangements under which the firm distributes or markets the client's products or services, or the client distributes or markets the firm's products or services.

Unless any financial interest is immaterial and the business relationship is insignificant to the firm and the client or its management, the threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level.

Therefore, unless the financial interest is immaterial and the business relationship is insignificant, the business relationship shall not be entered into, or shall be reduced to an insignificant level or terminated.

In the case of a member of the assurance team, unless any such financial interest is immaterial and the relationship is insignificant to that member, the individual shall be removed from the assurance team.

If the business relationship is between an immediate family member of a member of the assurance team and the assurance client or its management, the significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level.

- 291.119 The purchase of goods and services from an assurance client by the firm, or a member of the assurance team, or a member of that individual's immediate family, does not generally create a threat to independence if the transaction is in the normal course of business and at arm's length. However, such transactions may be of such a nature or magnitude that they create a self-interest threat. The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:
- Eliminating or reducing the magnitude of the transaction; or
 - Removing the individual from the assurance team.

Family and Personal Relationships

- 291.120 Family and personal relationships between a member of the assurance team and a director or officer or certain employees (depending on their role) of the assurance client, may create self-interest, familiarity or intimidation threats. The existence and significance of any threats will depend on a number of factors, including the individual's responsibilities on the assurance team, the role of the family member or other individual within the client, and the closeness of the relationship.

- 291.121 When an immediate family member of a member of the assurance team is:
- (a) A director or officer of the assurance client, or
 - (b) An employee in a position to exert significant influence over the subject matter information of the assurance engagement,

or was in such a position during any period covered by the engagement or the subject matter information, the threats to independence can only be reduced to an acceptable level by removing the individual from the assurance team. The closeness of the relationship is such that no other safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly, no individual who has such a relationship shall be a member of the assurance team.

- 291.122 Threats to independence are created when an immediate family member of a member of the assurance team is an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the subject matter of the engagement. The significance of the threats will depend on factors such as:
- The position held by the immediate family member; and
 - The role of the professional on the assurance team.

The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Removing the individual from the assurance team; or

- Structuring the responsibilities of the assurance team so that the professional does not deal with matters that are within the responsibility of the immediate family member.

291.123 Threats to independence are created when a close family member of a member of the assurance team is:

- A director or officer of the assurance client; or
- An employee in a position to exert significant influence over the subject matter information of the assurance engagement.

The significance of the threats will depend on factors such as:

- The nature of the relationship between the member of the assurance team and the close family member;
- The position held by the close family member; and
- The role of the professional on the assurance team.

The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Removing the individual from the assurance team; or
- Structuring the responsibilities of the assurance team so that the professional does not deal with matters that are within the responsibility of the close family member.

291.124 Threats to independence are created when a member of the assurance team has a close relationship with a person who is not an immediate or close family member, but who is a director or officer or an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the subject matter information of the assurance engagement. A member of the assurance team who has such a relationship shall consult in accordance with firm policies and procedures. The significance of the threats will depend on factors such as:

- The nature of the relationship between the individual and the member of the assurance team;
- The position the individual holds with the client; and
- The role of the professional on the assurance team.

The significance of the threats shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Removing the professional from the assurance team; or
- Structuring the responsibilities of the assurance team so that the professional does not deal with matters that are within the responsibility of the individual with whom the professional has a close relationship.

291.125 Self-interest, familiarity or intimidation threats may be created by a personal or family relationship between (a) a principal or employee of the firm who is not a member of the assurance team and (b) a director or officer of the assurance client or an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the subject matter

information of the assurance engagement. The existence and significance of any threat will depend on factors such as:

- The nature of the relationship between the principal or employee of the firm and the director or officer or employee of the client;
- The interaction of the principal or employee of the firm with the assurance team;
- The position of the principal or employee within the firm; and
- The role of the individual within the client.

The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Structuring the principal's or employee's responsibilities to reduce any potential influence over the assurance engagement; or
- Having an expert review the relevant assurance work performed.

Employment with Assurance Clients

291.126 Familiarity or intimidation threats may be created if a director or officer of the assurance client, or an employee who is in a position to exert significant influence over the subject matter information of the assurance engagement, has been a member of the assurance team or principal of the firm.

291.127 If a former member of the assurance team or principal of the firm has joined the assurance client in such a position, the existence and significance of any familiarity or intimidation threats will depend on factors such as:

- The position the individual has taken at the client;
- Any involvement the individual will have with the assurance team;
- The length of time since the individual was a member of the assurance team or principal of the firm; and
- The former position of the individual within the assurance team or firm, for example, whether the individual was responsible for maintaining regular contact with the client's management or those charged with governance.

In all cases the individual shall not continue to participate in the firm's business or professional activities.

The significance of any threats created shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level.

Examples of such safeguards include:

- Making arrangements such that the individual is not entitled to any benefits or payments from the firm, unless made in accordance with fixed pre-determined arrangements.
- Making arrangements such that any amount owed to the individual is not material to the firm;
- Modifying the plan for the assurance engagement;
- Assigning individuals to the assurance team who have sufficient experience in relation to the individual who has joined the client; or
- Having an expert review the work of the former member of the assurance team.

291.128 If a former principal of the firm has previously joined an entity in such a position and the entity subsequently becomes an assurance client of the firm, the significance of

any threats to independence shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary, to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level.

- 291.129 A self-interest threat is created when a member of the assurance team participates in the assurance engagement while knowing that he or she will, or may, join the client some-time in the future. Firm policies and procedures shall require members of an assurance team to notify the firm when entering employment negotiations with the client. On receiving such notification, the significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:
- Removing the individual from the assurance team; or
 - A review of any significant judgments made by that individual while on the team.

Recent Service with an Assurance Client

- 291.130 Self-interest, self-review or familiarity threats may be created if a member of the assurance team has recently served as a director, officer, or employee of the assurance client. This would be the case when, for example, a member of the assurance team has to evaluate elements of the subject matter information the member of the assurance team had prepared while with the client.

- 291.131 If, during the period covered by the assurance report, a member of the assurance team had served as director or officer of the assurance client, or was an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the subject matter information of the assurance engagement, the threat created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Consequently, such individuals shall not be assigned to the assurance team.

- 291.132 Self-interest, self-review or familiarity threats may be created if, before the period covered by the assurance report, a member of the assurance team had served as director or officer of the assurance client, or was an employee in a position to exert significant influence over the subject matter information of the assurance engagement. For example, such threats would be created if a decision made or work performed by the individual in the prior period, while employed by the client, is to be evaluated in the current period as part of the current assurance engagement. The existence and significance of any threats will depend on factors such as:
- The position the individual held with the client;
 - The length of time since the individual left the client; and
 - The role of the professional on the assurance team.

The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to reduce the threat to an acceptable level. An example of such a safeguard is conducting a review of the work performed by the individual as part of the assurance team.

Serving as a Director or Officer of an Assurance Client

- 291.133 If a principal or employee of the firm serves a director or officer of an assurance client, including company secretary, the self-review and self-interest threats would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threats to an acceptable level. Accordingly, no principal or employee shall serve as a director or officer of an assurance client.

- 291.134 Performing routine administrative services to support a company secretarial function or providing advice in relation to company secretarial administration matters does not generally create threats to independence, as long as client management makes all relevant decisions.

Long Association of Senior Personnel with Assurance Clients

- 291.135 Familiarity and self-interest threats are created by using the same senior personnel on an assurance engagement over a long period of time. The significance of the threats will depend on factors such as:
- How long the individual has been a member of the assurance team;
 - The role of the individual on the assurance team;
 - The structure of the firm;
 - The nature of the assurance engagement;
 - Whether the client's management team has changed; and
 - Whether the nature or complexity of the subject matter information has changed.

The significance of the threats shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Rotating the senior personnel off the assurance team;
- Having an expert who was not a member of the assurance team review the work of the senior personnel; or
- Regular independent internal or external quality reviews of the engagement.

Provision of Non-assurance Services to Assurance Clients

- 291.136 Firms have traditionally provided to their assurance clients a range of non-assurance services that are consistent with their skills and expertise. Providing non-assurance services may, however, create threats to the independence of the firm or members of the assurance team. The threats created are most often self-review, self-interest and advocacy threats.
- 291.137 When specific guidance on a particular non-assurance service is not included in this section, the conceptual framework shall be applied when evaluating the particular circumstances.
- 291.138 Before the firm accepts an engagement to provide a non-assurance service to an assurance client, a determination shall be made as to whether providing such a service would create a threat to independence. In evaluating the significance of any threat created by a particular non-assurance service, consideration shall be given to any threat that the assurance team has reason to believe is created by providing other related non-assurance services. If a threat is created that cannot be reduced to an acceptable level by the application of safeguards the non-assurance service shall not be provided.

Management Responsibilities

- 291.139 Management of an entity performs many activities in managing the entity in the best interests of stakeholders of the entity. It is not possible to specify every activity that

is a management responsibility. However, management responsibilities involve leading and directing an entity, including making significant decisions regarding the acquisition, deployment and control of human, financial, physical and intangible resources.

- 291.140 Whether an activity is a management responsibility depends on the circumstances and requires the exercise of judgment. Examples of activities that would generally be considered a management responsibility include:
- Setting policies and strategic direction;
 - Directing and taking responsibility for the actions of the entity's employees;
 - Authorising transactions;
 - Deciding which recommendations of the firm or other third parties to implement; and
 - Taking responsibility for designing, implementing and maintaining internal control.
- 291.141 Activities that are routine and administrative, or involve matters that are insignificant, generally are deemed not to be a management responsibility. For example, executing an insignificant transaction that has been authorised by management or monitoring the dates for filing statutory returns and advising an assurance client of those dates is deemed not to be a management responsibility. Further, providing advice and recommendations to assist management in discharging its responsibilities is not assuming a management responsibility.
- 291.142 Assuming a management responsibility for an assurance client may create threats to independence. If a firm were to assume a management responsibility as part of the assurance service, the threats created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threats to an acceptable level. Accordingly, in providing assurance services to an assurance client, a firm shall not assume a management responsibility as part of the assurance service. If the firm assumes a management responsibility as part of any other services provided to the assurance client, it shall ensure that the responsibility is not related to the subject matter and subject matter information of an assurance engagement provided by the firm.
- 291.143 To avoid the risk of assuming a management responsibility related to the subject matter or subject matter information of the assurance engagement, the firm shall be satisfied that a member of management is responsible for making the significant judgments and decisions that are the proper responsibility of management, evaluating the results of the service and accepting responsibility for the actions to be taken arising from the results of the service. This reduces the risk of the firm inadvertently making any significant judgements or decisions on behalf of management. This risk is further reduced when the firm gives the client the opportunity to make judgments and decisions based on an objective and transparent analysis and presentation of the issues.

Other Considerations

- 291.144 Threats to independence may be created when a firm provides a non-assurance service related to the subject matter information of an assurance engagement. In such cases, an evaluation of the significance of the firm's involvement with the subject matter information of the engagement shall be made, and a determination

shall be made of whether any self-review threats that are not at an acceptable level can be reduced to an acceptable level by the application of safeguards.

291.145 A self-review threat may be created if the firm is involved in the preparation of subject matter information which is subsequently the subject matter information of an assurance engagement. For example, a self-review threat would be created if the firm developed and prepared prospective financial information and subsequently provided assurance on this information. Consequently, the firm shall evaluate the significance of any self-review threat created by the provision of such services and apply safeguards when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level.

291.146 When a firm performs a valuation that forms part of the subject matter information of an assurance engagement, the firm shall evaluate the significance of any self-review threat and apply safeguards when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level.

Fees

Fees – Relative Size

291.147 When the total fees from an assurance client represent a large proportion of the total fees of the firm expressing the conclusion, the dependence on that client and concern about losing the client creates a self-interest or intimidation threat. The significance of the threat will depend on factors such as:

- The operating structure of the firm;
- Whether the firm is well established or new; and
- The significance of the client qualitatively and/or quantitatively to the firm.

The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Reducing the dependency on the client;
- External quality control reviews; or
- Consulting a third party or institution, such as the Accountancy Board or an accountancy body recognised under the Act, or an expert, on key assurance judgments.

291.148 A self-interest or intimidation threat is also created when the fees generated from an assurance client represent a large proportion of the revenue from an individual principal's clients. The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. An example of such a safeguard is having an additional expert who was not a member of the assurance team review the work or otherwise advise as necessary.

Fees – Overdue

291.149 A self-interest threat may be created if fees due from an assurance client remain unpaid for a long time, especially if a significant part is not paid before the issue of the assurance report, if any, for the following period. Generally the firm is expected to require payment of such fees before any such report is issued. If fees remain unpaid after the report has been issued, the existence and significance of any threat

shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. An example of such a safeguard is having another expert who did not take part in the assurance engagement provide advice or review the work performed. The firm shall determine whether the overdue fees might be regarded as being equivalent to a loan to the client and whether, because of the significance of the overdue fees, it is appropriate for the firm to be re-appointed or continue the assurance engagement.

Contingent Fees

- 291.150 Contingent fees are fees calculated on a predetermined basis relating to the outcome of a transaction or the result of the services performed by the firm. For the purposes of this section, fees are not regarded as being contingent if established by a court or other public authority.
- 291.151 A contingent fee charged directly or indirectly, for example through an intermediary, by a firm in respect of an assurance engagement creates a self-interest threat that is so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly, a firm shall not enter into any such fee arrangement.
- 291.152 A contingent fee charged directly or indirectly, for example through an intermediary, by a firm in respect of a non-assurance service provided to an assurance client may also create a self-interest threat. If the outcome of the non-assurance service, and therefore, the amount of the fee, is dependent on a future or contemporary judgment related to a matter that is material to the subject matter information of the assurance engagement, no safeguards could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Accordingly, such arrangements shall not be accepted.
- 291.153 For other contingent fee arrangements charged by a firm for a non-assurance service to an assurance client, the existence and significance of any threats will depend on factors such as:
- The range of possible fee amounts;
 - Whether an appropriate authority determines the outcome of the matter upon which the contingent fee will be determined;
 - The nature of the service; and
 - The effect of the event or transaction on the subject matter information.

The significance of any threats shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Having an expert review the relevant assurance work or otherwise advise as necessary; or
- Using professionals who are not members of the assurance team to perform the non-assurance service.

Gifts and Hospitality

- 291.154 Accepting gifts or hospitality from an assurance client may create self-interest and familiarity threats. If a firm or a member of the assurance team accepts gifts or hospitality, unless the value is trivial and inconsequential, the threats created would be so significant that no safeguards could reduce the threats to an acceptable level.

Consequently, a firm or a member of the assurance team shall not accept such gifts or hospitality.

Actual or Threatened Litigation

- 291.155 When litigation takes place, or appears likely, between the firm or a member of the assurance team and the assurance client, self-interest and intimidation threats are created. The relationship between client management and the members of the assurance team must be characterised by complete candour and full disclosure regarding all aspects of a client's business operations. When the firm and the client's management are placed in adversarial positions by actual or threatened litigation, affecting management's willingness to make complete disclosures self-interest and intimidation threats are created. The significance of the threats created will depend on such factors as:
- The materiality of the litigation; and
 - Whether the litigation relates to a prior assurance engagement.

The significance of the threats shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- If the litigation involves a member of the assurance team, removing that individual from the assurance team; or
- Having a professional review the work performed.

If such safeguards do not reduce the threats to an acceptable level, the only appropriate action is to withdraw from, or decline, the assurance engagement.

Interpretation 2005–01: Application of Section 291 to Assurance Engagements that are Not Financial Statement Audit Engagements

(Revised July 2009 to conform to changes resulting from the IESBA's project to improve the clarity of the Code)

This interpretation provides guidance on the application of the independence requirements contained in Section 291 to assurance engagements that are not financial statement audit engagements.

This interpretation focuses on the application issues that are particular to assurance engagements that are not financial statement audit engagements. There are other matters noted in Section 291 that are relevant in the consideration of independence requirements for all assurance engagements. For example, paragraph 291.3 states that an evaluation shall be made of any threats the firm has reason to believe are created by a network firm's interests and relationships. It also states that when the assurance team has reason to believe that a related entity of such an assurance client is relevant to the evaluation of the firm's independence of the client, the assurance team shall include the related entity when evaluating threats to independence and when necessary applying safeguards. These matters are not specifically addressed in this interpretation.

As explained in the International Framework for Assurance Engagements issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board, in an assurance engagement, the warrant holder in public practice expresses a conclusion designed to enhance the degree of confidence of the intended users other than the responsible party about the outcome of the evaluation or measurement of a subject matter against criteria.

Assertion-Based Assurance Engagements

In an assertion-based assurance engagement, the evaluation or measurement of the subject matter is performed by the responsible party, and the subject matter information is in the form of an assertion by the responsible party that is made available to the intended users.

In an assertion-based assurance engagement independence is required from the responsible party, which is responsible for the subject matter information and may be responsible for the subject matter.

In those assertion-based assurance engagements where the responsible party is responsible for the subject matter information but not the subject matter, independence is required from the responsible party. In addition, an evaluation shall be made of any threats the firm has reason to believe are created by interests and relationships between a member of the assurance team, the firm, a network firm and the party responsible for the subject matter.

Direct Reporting Assurance Engagements

In a direct reporting assurance engagement, the warrant holder in public practice either directly performs the evaluation or measurement of the subject matter, or obtains a representation from the responsible party that has performed the evaluation or measurement that is not available to the intended users. The subject matter information is provided to the intended users in the assurance report.

In a direct reporting assurance engagement independence is required from the responsible party, which is responsible for the subject matter.

Multiple Responsible Parties

In both assertion-based assurance engagements and direct reporting assurance engagements there may be several responsible parties. For example, a public accountant in public practice may be asked to provide assurance on the monthly circulation statistics of a number of independently owned newspapers. The assignment could be an assertion based assurance engagement where each newspaper measures its circulation and the statistics are presented in an assertion that is available to the intended users. Alternatively, the assignment could be a direct reporting assurance engagement, where there is no assertion and there may or may not be a written representation from the newspapers.

In such engagements, when determining whether it is necessary to apply the provisions in Section 291 to each responsible party, the firm may take into account whether an interest or relationship between the firm, or a member of the assurance team, and a particular responsible party would create a threat to independence that is not trivial and inconsequential in the context of the subject matter information. This will take into account:

- (a) The materiality of the subject matter information (or the subject matter) for which the particular responsible party is responsible; and
- (b) The degree of public interest that is associated with the engagement.

If the firm determines that the threat to independence created by any such relationships with a particular responsible party would be trivial and inconsequential it may not be necessary to apply all of the provisions of this section to that responsible party.

Example

The following example has been developed to demonstrate the application of Section 291. It is assumed that the client is not also a financial statement audit client of the firm, or a network firm.

A firm is engaged to provide assurance on the total proven oil reserves of 10 independent companies. Each company has conducted geographical and engineering surveys to determine their reserves (subject matter). There are established criteria to determine when a reserve may be considered to be proven which the warrant holder in public practice determines to be suitable criteria for the engagement. The proven reserves for each company as at December 31, 20X0 were as follows:

	Proven oil reserves thousands of barrels
Company 1	5,200
Company 2	725
Company 3	3,260
Company 4	15,000
Company 5	6,700
Company 6	39,126
Company 7	345
Company 8	175
Company 9	24,135
Company 10	9,635
Total	104,301

The engagement could be structured in differing ways:

- Assertion-Based Engagements

A1 Each company measures its reserves and provides an assertion to the firm and to intended users.

A2 An entity other than the companies measures the reserves and provides an assertion to the firm and to intended users.

- Direct Reporting Engagements

D1 Each company measures the reserves and provides the firm with a written representation that measures its reserves against the established criteria for measuring proven reserves. The representation is not available to the intended users.

D2 The firm directly measures the reserves of some of the companies.

Application of Approach

A1 Each company measures its reserves and provides an assertion to the firm and to intended users.

There are several responsible parties in this engagement (Companies 1–10). When determining whether it is necessary to apply the independence provisions to all of the companies, the firm may take into account whether an interest or relationship with a particular company would create a threat to independence that is not at an acceptable level. This will take into account factors such as:

- The materiality of the company's proven reserves in relation to the total reserves to be reported on; and
- The degree of public interest associated with the engagement (paragraph 291.28).

For example Company 8 accounts for 0.17% of the total reserves, therefore a business relationship or interest with Company 8 would create less of a threat than a similar relationship with Company 6, which accounts for approximately 37.5% of the reserves.

Having determined those companies to which the independence requirements apply, the assurance team and the firm are required to be independent of those responsible parties that would be considered to be the assurance client (paragraph 291.28).

A2 An entity other than the companies measures the reserves and provides an assertion to the firm and to intended users.

The firm shall be independent of the entity that measures the reserves and provides an assertion to the firm and to intended users (paragraph 291.19). That entity is not responsible for the subject matter and so an evaluation shall be made of any threats the firm has reason to believe are created by interests/relationships with the party responsible for the subject matter (paragraph 291.19). There are several parties responsible for the subject matter in this engagement (Companies 1–10). As discussed in example A1 above, the firm may take into account whether an interest or relationship with a particular company would create a threat to independence that is not at an acceptable level.

D1 Each company provides the firm with a representation that measures its reserves against the established criteria for measuring proven reserves.

The representation is not available to the intended users. There are several responsible parties in this engagement (Companies 1–10). When determining whether it is necessary to apply the independence provisions to all of the companies, the firm may take into account whether an interest or relationship with a particular company would create a threat to independence that is not at an acceptable level. This will take into account factors such as:

- The materiality of the company's proven reserves in relation to the total reserves to be reported on; and
- The degree of public interest associated with the engagement (paragraph 291.28).

For example, Company 8 accounts for 0.17% of the reserves, therefore a business relationship or interest with Company 8 would create less of a threat than a similar relationship with Company 6 that accounts for approximately 37.5% of the reserves.

Having determined those companies to which the independence requirements apply, the assurance team and the firm shall be independent of those responsible parties that would be considered to be the assurance client (paragraph 291.28).

D2 The firm directly measures the reserves of some of the companies.

The application is the same as in example D1.

SECTION 292: Internal organisation of auditors

292.1 An auditor shall comply with the following organisational requirements:

(a) An audit firm shall establish appropriate policies and procedures to ensure that its owners or shareholders, as well as the directors of the firm, or of an affiliate firm, do not intervene in the carrying-out of a statutory audit in any way which jeopardises the independence and objectivity of the warrant holder who carries out the statutory audit on behalf of the firm;

(b) An auditor shall have sound administrative and accounting procedures, internal quality control mechanisms, effective procedures for risk assessment, and effective control and safeguard arrangements for information processing systems.

Those internal quality control mechanisms shall be designed to secure compliance with decisions and procedures at all levels of the audit firm or of the working structure of the auditor;

(d) An auditor shall establish appropriate policies and procedures to ensure that his, her or its employees and any other natural persons whose services are placed at his or her disposal or under his, her or its control, and who are directly involved in the statutory audit activities, have appropriate knowledge and experience for the duties assigned;

(e) An auditor shall establish appropriate policies and procedures to ensure that outsourcing of important audit functions is not undertaken in such a way as to impair the quality of the auditor's internal quality control and the ability of the competent authorities to supervise the auditor's compliance with the obligations laid down in the Act, the regulations made under it, and, where applicable, in the Audit Regulation.

(f) An auditor shall establish appropriate and effective organisational and administrative arrangements to prevent, identify, eliminate or manage and disclose any threats to their independence;

(g) An auditor shall establish appropriate policies and procedures for carrying out statutory audits, coaching, supervising and reviewing employees activities and organising the structure of the audit file as referred to in paragraph 293.5;

(h) An auditor shall establish an internal quality control system to ensure the quality of the statutory audit.

The quality control system shall at least cover the policies and procedures described in point (f). In the case of an audit firm, responsibility for the internal quality control system shall lie with a person who is qualified as an auditor.

(i) An auditor shall use appropriate systems, resources and procedures to ensure continuity and regularity in the carrying out of his, her or its statutory audit activities.

(j) An auditor shall also establish appropriate and effective organisational and administrative arrangements for dealing with and recording incidents which have, or may have, serious consequences for the integrity of is, her or its statutory audit activities;

(k) An auditor shall have in place adequate remuneration policies, including profit-sharing policies, providing sufficient performance incentives to secure audit

quality. In particular, the amount of revenue that the auditor derives from providing non-audit services to the audit client shall not form part of the performance evaluation and remuneration of any person involved in, or able to influence the carrying out of, the audit;

- (l) An auditor shall monitor and evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of his or her systems, internal quality control mechanisms and arrangements established in accordance with the Act, the regulations made under it, and, where applicable, the Audit Regulation and take appropriate measures to address any deficiencies. An auditor shall in particular carry out an annual evaluation of the internal quality control system, referred to in point (g). An auditor shall keep records of the findings of that evaluation and any proposed measure to modify the internal quality control system.

The policies and procedures referred to in the first subparagraph shall be documented and communicated to the employees of the auditor.

Any outsourcing of audit functions as referred to in point (d) of this paragraph shall not affect the responsibility of the auditor towards the audited entity.

- 292.2 The auditor shall take into consideration the scale and complexity of his or her activities when complying with the requirements set out in paragraph 292.1.

The auditor shall be able to demonstrate to the competent authority that the policies and procedures designed to achieve such compliance are appropriate given the scale and complexity of activities of the auditor.

SECTION 293: Organisation of the work

- 293.1 When the statutory audit is carried out by an audit firm, that audit firm shall designate at least one key audit principal.-The audit firm shall provide the key audit principal(s) with sufficient resources and with personnel that have the necessary competence and capabilities to carry out his, her or its duties appropriately.

Securing audit quality, independence and competence shall be the main criteria when the audit firm selects the key audit principal(s) to be designated.

The key audit principal(s) shall be actively involved in the carrying-out of the statutory audit.

- 293.2 When carrying out the statutory audit, the auditor shall devote sufficient time to the engagement and shall assign sufficient resources to enable him or her to carry out his or her duties appropriately.

- 293.3 The auditor shall keep records of any breaches of the provisions of the Act, the regulations made under it, the Statutory Audit Directive and, where applicable, of the Audit Regulation. Auditors shall also keep records of any consequence of any breach, including the measures taken to address such breach and to modify their internal quality control system. They shall prepare an annual report containing an overview of any such measures taken and shall communicate that report internally.

When an auditor asks external experts for advice, he, she or it shall document the request made and the advice received.

293.4 An auditor shall maintain a client account record. Such record shall include the following data for each audit client:

- (a) the name, the address and the place of business;
- (b) in the case of an audit firm, the name(s) of the key audit principal(s);
- (c) the fees charged for the statutory audit and the fees charged for other services in any financial year.

293.5 An auditor shall create an audit file for each statutory audit.

The auditor shall document at least the data pursuant to paragraph 210.17 of this Code, and, where applicable, Articles 6 to 8 of the Audit Regulation.

The auditor shall retain any other data and documents that are of importance in support of the report referred to in Article 179 of the Companies Act (Cap. 386) and, where applicable, Articles 10 and 11 of the Audit Regulation and for monitoring compliance with this Directive and other applicable legal requirements.

The audit file shall be closed no later than 60 days after the date of signature of the audit report referred to in Article 179 of the Companies Act (Cap. 386) and, where applicable, Article 10 of the Audit Regulation.

293.6 The auditor shall keep records of any complaints made in writing about the performance of the statutory audits carried out.

PART C: WARRANT HOLDERS IN BUSINESS

SECTION 300: Introduction.....	126
SECTION 310: Conflicts of Interest.....	128
SECTION 320: Preparation and Reporting of Information	130
SECTION 330: Acting with Sufficient Expertise.....	131
SECTION 340: Financial Interests, Compensation and Incentives Linked to Financial Reporting and Decision Making	132
SECTION 350: Inducements.....	133

SECTION 300: Introduction

- 300.1 This Part of the Code describes how the conceptual framework contained in Part A applies in certain situations to warrant holders in business. This Part does not describe all of the circumstances and relationships that could be encountered by a warrant holder in business that create or may create threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. Therefore, the warrant holder in business is encouraged to be alert for such circumstances and relationships.
- 300.2 Investors, creditors, employers and other sectors of the business community, as well as governments and the public at large, all may rely on the work of warrant holders in business. Warrant holders in business may be solely or jointly responsible for the preparation and reporting of financial and other information, which both their employing organisations and third parties may rely on. They may also be responsible for providing effective financial management and competent advice on a variety of business-related matters.
- 300.3 A warrant holder in business may be a salaried employee, a partner, director (whether executive or non-executive), an owner manager, a volunteer or another working for one or more employing organisation. The legal form of the relationship with the employing organisation, if any, has no bearing on the ethical responsibilities incumbent on the warrant holder in business.
- 300.4 A warrant holder in business has a responsibility to further the legitimate aims of the accountant's employing organisation. This Code does not seek to hinder a warrant holder in business from properly fulfilling that responsibility, but addresses circumstances in which compliance with the fundamental principles may be compromised.
- 300.5 A warrant holder in business may hold a senior position within an organisation. The more senior the position, the greater will be the ability and opportunity to influence events, practices and attitudes. A warrant holder in business is expected, therefore, to encourage an ethics-based culture in an employing organisation that emphasises the importance that senior management places on ethical behaviour.
- 300.6 A warrant holder in business shall not knowingly engage in any business, occupation, or activity that impairs or might impair integrity, objectivity or the good reputation of the profession and as a result would be incompatible with the fundamental principles.
- 300.7 Compliance with the fundamental principles may potentially be threatened by a broad range of circumstances and relationships. Threats fall into one or more of the following categories:
- (a) Self-interest;
 - (b) Self-review;
 - (c) Advocacy;
 - (d) Familiarity; and
 - (e) Intimidation.

These threats are discussed further in Part A of this Code.

- 300.8 Examples of circumstances that may create self-interest threats for a warrant holder in business include:
- Holding a financial interest in, or receiving a loan or guarantee from the employing organisation.
 - Participating in incentive compensation arrangements offered by the employing organisation.
 - Inappropriate personal use of corporate assets.
 - Concern over employment security.
 - Commercial pressure from outside the employing organisation.
- 300.9 An example of a circumstance that creates a self-review threat for a warrant holder in business is determining the appropriate accounting treatment for a business combination after performing the feasibility study that supported the acquisition decision.
- 300.10 When furthering the legitimate goals and objectives of their employing organisations, warrant holders in business may promote the organisation's position, provided any statements made are neither false nor misleading. Such actions generally would not create an advocacy threat.
- 300.11 Examples of circumstances that may create familiarity threats for a warrant holder in business include:
- Being responsible for the employing organisation's financial reporting when an immediate or close family member employed by the entity makes decisions that affect the entity's financial reporting.
 - Long association with business contacts influencing business decisions.
 - Accepting a gift or preferential treatment, unless the value is trivial and inconsequential.
- 300.12 Examples of circumstances that may create intimidation threats for a warrant holder in business include:
- Threat of dismissal or replacement of the warrant holder in business or a close or immediate family member over a disagreement about the application of an accounting principle or the way in which financial information is to be reported.
 - A dominant personality attempting to influence the decision making process, for example with regard to the awarding of contracts or the application of an accounting principle.
- 300.13 Safeguards that may eliminate or reduce threats to an acceptable level fall into two broad categories:
- (a) Safeguards created by the profession, legislation or regulation; and
 - (b) Safeguards in the work environment.
- Examples of safeguards created by the profession, legislation or regulation are detailed in paragraph 100.19 of Part A of this Code.
- 300.14 Safeguards in the work environment include:
- The employing organisation's systems of corporate oversight or other oversight structures.
 - The employing organisation's ethics and conduct programs.

- Recruitment procedures in the employing organisation emphasising the importance of employing high calibre competent staff.
- Strong internal controls.
- Appropriate disciplinary processes.
- Leadership that stresses the importance of ethical behaviour and the expectation that employees will act in an ethical manner.
- Policies and procedures to implement and monitor the quality of employee performance.
- Timely communication of the employing organisation's policies and procedures, including any changes to them, to all employees and appropriate training and education on such policies and procedures.
- Policies and procedures to empower and encourage employees to communicate to senior levels within the employing organisation any ethical issues that concern them without fear of retribution.
- Consultation with another appropriate warrant holder.

300.15 In circumstances where a warrant holder in business believes that unethical behaviour or actions by others will continue to occur within the employing organisation, the warrant holder in business may consider obtaining legal advice. In those extreme situations where all available safeguards have been exhausted and it is not possible to reduce the threat to an acceptable level, a warrant holder in business may conclude that it is appropriate to resign from the employing organisation.

SECTION 310: Conflicts of Interest

310.1 A warrant holder in business may be faced with a conflict of interest when undertaking a professional activity. A conflict of interest creates a threat to objectivity and may create threats to the other fundamental principles. Such threats may be created when:

- The warrant holder undertakes a professional activity related to a particular matter for two or more parties whose interests with respect to that matter are in conflict; or
- The interests of the warrant holder with respect to a particular matter and the interests of a party for whom the warrant holder undertakes a professional activity related to that matter are in conflict.

A party may include an employing organisation, a vendor, a customer, a lender, a shareholder, or another party.

A warrant holder shall not allow a conflict of interest to compromise professional or business judgment.

310.2 Examples of situations in which conflicts of interest may arise include:

- Serving in a management or governance position for two employing organisations and acquiring confidential information from one employing organisation that could be used by the warrant holder to the advantage or disadvantage of the other employing organisation.
- Undertaking a professional activity for each of two parties in a partnership employing the warrant holder to assist them to dissolve their partnership.

- Preparing financial information for certain members of management of the entity employing the warrant holder who are seeking to undertake a management buy-out.
- Being responsible for selecting a vendor for the warrant holder's employing organisation when an immediate family member of the warrant holder could benefit financially from the transaction.
- Serving in a governance capacity in an employing organisation that is approving certain investments for the company where one of those specific investments will increase the value of the personal investment portfolio of the warrant holder or an immediate family member.

310.3 When identifying and evaluating the interests and relationships that might create a conflict of interest and implementing safeguards, when necessary, to eliminate or reduce any threat to compliance with the fundamental principles to an acceptable level, a warrant holder in business shall exercise professional judgment and be alert to all interests and relationships that a reasonable and informed third party, weighing all the specific facts and circumstances available to the warrant holder at the time, would be likely to conclude might compromise compliance with the fundamental principles.

310.4 When addressing a conflict of interest, a warrant holder in business is encouraged to seek guidance from within the employing organisation or from others, such as a professional body, legal counsel or another warrant holder. When making disclosures or sharing information within the employing organisation and seeking guidance of third parties, the warrant holder shall remain alert to the fundamental principle of confidentiality.

310.5 If the threat created by a conflict of interest is not at an acceptable level, the warrant holder in business shall apply safeguards to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. If safeguards cannot reduce the threat to an acceptable level, the warrant holder shall decline to undertake or discontinue the professional activity that would result in the conflict of interest; or shall terminate the relevant relationships or dispose of relevant interests to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level.

310.6 In identifying whether a conflict of interest exists or may be created, a warrant holder in business shall take reasonable steps to determine:

- The nature of the relevant interests and relationships between the parties involved; and
- The nature of the activity and its implication for relevant parties.

The nature of the activities and the relevant interests and relationships may change over time. The warrant holder shall remain alert to such changes for the purposes of identifying circumstances that might create a conflict of interest.

310.7 If a conflict of interest is identified, the warrant holder in business shall evaluate:

- The significance of relevant interests or relationships; and
- The significance of the threats created by undertaking the professional activity or activities. In general, the more direct the connection between the professional activity and the matter on which the parties' interests are in conflict, the more significant the threat to objectivity and compliance with the other fundamental principles will be.

- 310.8 The warrant holder in business shall apply safeguards, when necessary, to eliminate the threats to compliance with the fundamental principles created by the conflict of interest or reduce them to an acceptable level. Depending on the circumstances giving rise to the conflict of interest, application of one or more of the following safeguards may be appropriate:
- Restructuring or segregating certain responsibilities and duties.
 - Obtaining appropriate oversight, for example, acting under the supervision of an executive or non-executive director.
 - Withdrawing from the decision-making process related to the matter giving rise to the conflict of interest.
 - Consulting with third parties, such as a professional body, legal counsel or another warrant holder.
- 310.9 In addition, it is generally necessary to disclose the nature of the conflict to the relevant parties, including to the appropriate levels within the employing organisation and, when safeguards are required to reduce the threat to an acceptable level, to obtain their consent to the warrant holder in business undertaking the professional activity. In certain circumstances, consent may be implied by a party's conduct where the warrant holder has sufficient evidence to conclude that parties know the circumstances at the outset and have accepted the conflict of interest if they do not raise an objection to the existence of the conflict.
- 310.10 When disclosure is verbal, or consent is verbal or implied, the warrant holder in business is encouraged to document the nature of the circumstances giving rise to the conflict of interest, the safeguards applied to reduce the threats to an acceptable level and the consent obtained.
- 310.11 A warrant holder in business may encounter other threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. This may occur, for example, when preparing or reporting financial information as a result of undue pressure from others within the employing organisation or financial, business or personal relationships that close or immediate family members of the warrant holder have with the employing organisation. Guidance on managing such threats is covered by Sections 320 and 340 of the Code.

SECTION 320: Preparation and Reporting of Information

- 320.1 Warrant holders in business are often involved in the preparation and reporting of information that may be either made public or used by others inside or outside the employing organisation. Such information may include financial or management information, for example, forecasts and budgets, financial statements, management's discussion and analysis, and the management letter of representation provided to the auditors during the audit of the entity's financial statements. A warrant holder in business shall prepare or present such information fairly, honestly and in accordance with relevant professional standards so that the information will be understood in its context.
- 320.2 A warrant holder in business who has responsibility for the preparation or approval of the general purpose financial statements of an employing organisation shall be satisfied that those financial statements are presented in accordance with the applicable financial reporting standards.

- 320.3 A warrant holder in business shall take reasonable steps to maintain information for which the warrant holder in business is responsible in a manner that:
- (a) Describes clearly the true nature of business transactions, assets, or liabilities;
 - (b) Classifies and records information in a timely and proper manner; and
 - (c) Represents the facts accurately and completely in all material respects.
- 320.4 Threats to compliance with the fundamental principles, for example, self-interest or intimidation threats to integrity, objectivity or professional competence and due care, are created where a warrant holder in business is pressured (either externally or by the possibility of personal gain) to prepare or report information in a misleading way or to become associated with misleading information through the actions of others.
- 320.5 The significance of such threats will depend on factors such as the source of the pressure and the corporate culture within the employing organisation. The warrant holder in business shall be alert to the principle of integrity, which imposes an obligation on all warrant holders to be straightforward and honest in all professional and business relationships. Where the threats arise from compensation and incentive arrangements, the guidance in section 340 is relevant.
- 320.6 The significance of any threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Such safeguards include consultation with superiors within the employing organisation, the audit committee or those charged with governance of the organisation, or with a relevant professional body.
- 320.7 Where it is not possible to reduce the threat to an acceptable level, a warrant holder in business shall refuse to be or remain associated with information the warrant holder determines is misleading. A warrant holder in business may have been unknowingly associated with misleading information. Upon becoming aware of this, the warrant holder in business shall take steps to be disassociated from that information. In determining whether there is a requirement to report the circumstances outside the organisation, the warrant holder in business may consider obtaining legal advice. In addition, the warrant holder may consider whether to resign.

SECTION 330: Acting with Sufficient Expertise

- 330.1 The fundamental principle of professional competence and due care requires that a warrant holder in business only undertake significant tasks for which the warrant holder in business has, or can obtain, sufficient specific training or experience. A warrant holder in business shall not intentionally mislead an employer as to the level of expertise or experience possessed, nor shall a warrant holder in business fail to seek appropriate expert advice and assistance when required.
- 330.2 Circumstances that create a threat to a warrant holder in business performing duties with the appropriate degree of professional competence and due care include having:

- Insufficient time for properly performing or completing the relevant duties.
- Incomplete, restricted or otherwise inadequate information for performing the duties properly.
- Insufficient experience, training and/or education.
- Inadequate resources for the proper performance of the duties.

330.3 The significance of the threat will depend on factors such as the extent to which the warrant holder in business is working with others, relative seniority in the business, and the level of supervision and review applied to the work. The significance of the threat shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. Examples of such safeguards include:

- Obtaining additional advice or training.
- Ensuring that there is adequate time available for performing the relevant duties.
- Obtaining assistance from someone with the necessary expertise.
- Consulting, where appropriate, with:
 - Superiors within the employing organisation;
 - Independent experts; or
 - The Accountancy Board or an accountancy body recognised under the Act.

330.4 When threats cannot be eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level, warrant holders in business shall determine whether to refuse to perform the duties in question. If the warrant holder in business determines that refusal is appropriate, the reasons for doing so shall be clearly communicated.

SECTION 340: Financial Interests, Compensation and Incentives Linked to Financial Reporting and Decision Making

340.1 Warrant holders in business may have financial interests, including those arising from compensation or incentive arrangements, or may know of financial interests of immediate or close family members, that, in certain circumstances, may create threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. For example, self-interest threats to objectivity or confidentiality may be created through the existence of the motive and opportunity to manipulate price-sensitive information in order to gain financially. Examples of circumstances that may create self-interest threats include situations where the warrant holder in business or an immediate or close family member:

- Holds a direct or indirect financial interest in the employing organisation and the value of that financial interest could be directly affected by decisions made by the warrant holder in business.
- Is eligible for a profit-related bonus and the value of that bonus could be directly affected by decisions made by the warrant holder in business.
- Holds, directly or indirectly, deferred bonus share entitlements or share options in the employing organisation, the value of which could be directly affected by decisions made by the warrant holder in business.
- Otherwise participates in compensation arrangements which provide incentives to achieve performance targets or to support efforts to maximise the value of the employing organisation's shares, for example, through participation in long-term incentive plans which are linked to certain performance conditions being met.

- 340.2 Self-interest threats arising from compensation or incentive arrangements may be further compounded by pressure from superiors or peers in the employing organisation who participate in the same arrangements. For example, such arrangements often entitle participants to be awarded shares in the employing organisation at little or no cost to the employee provided certain performance criteria are met. In some cases, the value of the shares awarded may be significantly greater than the base salary of the warrant holder in business.
- 340.3 A warrant holder in business shall not manipulate information or use confidential information for personal gain or for the financial gain of others. The more senior the position that the warrant holder in business holds, the greater the ability and opportunity to influence financial reporting and decision making and the greater the pressure there might be from superiors and peers to manipulate information. In such situations, the warrant holder in business shall be particularly alert to the principle of integrity, which imposes an obligation on all warrant holders to be straightforward and honest in all professional and business relationships.
- 340.4 The significance of any threat created by financial interests, shall be evaluated and safeguards applied, when necessary, to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level. In evaluating the significance of any threat, and, when necessary, determining the appropriate safeguards to be applied, a warrant holder in business shall evaluate the nature of the interest. This includes evaluating the significance of the interest. What constitutes a significant interest will depend on personal circumstances. Examples of such safeguards include:
- Policies and procedures for a committee independent of management to determine the level or form of remuneration of senior management.
 - Disclosure of all relevant interests, and of any plans to exercise entitlements or trade in relevant shares, to those charged with the governance of the employing organisation, in accordance with any internal policies.
 - Consultation, where appropriate, with superiors within the employing organisation.
 - Consultation, where appropriate, with those charged with the governance of the employing organisation or relevant professional bodies.
 - Internal and external audit procedures.
 - Up-to-date education on ethical issues and on the legal restrictions and other regulations around potential insider trading.

SECTION 350: Inducements

Receiving Offers

- 350.1 A warrant holder in business or an immediate or close family member may be offered an inducement. Inducements may take various forms, including gifts, hospitality, preferential treatment, and inappropriate appeals to friendship or loyalty.
- 350.2 Offers of inducements may create threats to compliance with the fundamental principles. When a warrant holder in business or an immediate or close family member is offered an inducement, the situation shall be evaluated. Self-interest threats to objectivity or confidentiality are created when an inducement is made in an attempt to unduly influence actions or decisions, encourage illegal or

dishonest behaviour, or obtain confidential information. Intimidation threats to objectivity or confidentiality are created if such an inducement is accepted and it is followed by threats to make that offer public and damage the reputation of either the warrant holder in business or an immediate or close family member.

- 350.3 The existence and significance of any threats will depend on the nature, value and intent behind the offer. If a reasonable and informed third party, weighing all the specific facts and circumstances, would consider the inducement insignificant and not intended to encourage unethical behaviour, then a warrant holder in business may conclude that the offer is made in the normal course of business and may generally conclude that there is no significant threat to compliance with the fundamental principles.
- 350.4 The significance of any threats shall be evaluated and safeguards applied when necessary to eliminate them or reduce them to an acceptable level. When the threats cannot be eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level through the application of safeguards, a warrant holder in business shall not accept the inducement. As the real or apparent threats to compliance with the fundamental principles do not merely arise from acceptance of an inducement but, sometimes, merely from the fact of the offer having been made, additional safeguards shall be adopted. A warrant holder in business shall evaluate any threats created by such offers and determine whether to take one or more of the following actions:
- (a) Informing higher levels of management or those charged with governance of the employing organisation immediately when such offers have been made;
 - (b) Informing third parties of the offer – for example, the Accountancy Board or an accountancy body recognised under the Act or the employer of the individual who made the offer; a warrant holder in business may however, consider seeking legal advice before taking such a step; and
 - (c) Advising immediate or close family members of relevant threats and safeguards where they are potentially in positions that might result in offers of inducements, for example, as a result of their employment situation; and
 - (d) Informing higher levels of management or those charged with governance of the employing organisation where immediate or close family members are employed by competitors or potential suppliers of that organisation.

Making Offers

- 350.5 A warrant holder in business may be in a situation where the warrant holder in business is expected, or is under other pressure, to offer inducements to influence the judgment or decision-making process of an individual or organisation, or obtain confidential information.
- 350.6 Such pressure may come from within the employing organisation, for example, from a colleague or superior. It may also come from an external individual or organisation suggesting actions or business decisions that would be advantageous to the employing organisation, possibly influencing the warrant holder in business improperly.
- 350.7 A warrant holder in business shall not offer an inducement to improperly influence professional judgment of a third party.

- 350.8 Where the pressure to offer an unethical inducement comes from within the employing organisation, the warrant holder shall follow the principles and guidance regarding ethical conflict resolution set out in Part A of this Code.