

Financial Reporting Council

Report on Independent Audit Oversight

> Press Briefing 10 October 2013

Agenda

- Opening Remarks
- Preparation of the Report
- Report Findings
- Q&A Session





Opening Remarks

Mr John Poon, JP Chairman Financial Reporting Council

Evolution of audit oversight





Independent audit oversight reform - for Hong Kong



- Independent of the profession
 - Governance of the audit regulator
 - Majority must be non-practitioners
 - Funding of the audit regulator
 - Free from influence by auditors and audit firms



- Listed entities in Hong Kong
 - 1,600 companies listed on Hong Kong Stock Exchange
 - Market capitalisation: approx. HK\$22 trillion (approx. US\$2.8 trillion)
- Auditors in Hong Kong
 - 4,200 practising certificate holders
 - Over 30,000 non-practising CPAs in Hong Kong
- Approximately 60 audit practices/firms engaged in audits of listed entities



- A public oversight body which has the ultimate responsibility and authority for overseeing auditors and audit firms
 - Inspection
 - Investigation
- Registration
- Standard setting
- Enforcement
- Continuing education



US – over 5,000 listed entities; market capitalisation: approx. US\$20 trillion

- Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB)
 - A statutory body under Sarbanes-Oxley Act
 - Oversees six areas

Directly responsible for			
Registration	Inspection	Investigation	
Enforcement	Standard setting (audit and ethics)	Continuing education	

- 2013 Budget: approx. US\$250 million
- Headcount: 770



UK – over 2,400 listed entities; market capitalisation: approx. £4 trillion (approx. US\$6.4 trillion)

- Financial Reporting Council
 - Independent audit regulator
 - Oversees six areas

Directly responsible for						
Inspection Investigation		Enforcement	Standard setting (audit and ethics)			
Delegated to professional bodies subject to FRC's oversight						
Registration		Continuing education				

- 2013 Budget: £25 million (approx. US\$40 million)
- Headcount: 110



40 jurisdictions worldwide are both EC compliant and IFIAR members

International Forum of Independent Audit Regulators (IFIAR) members:

Abu Dhabi Liechtenstein Albania Lithuania Australia Luxembourg Austria Malaysia Belaium Malta Brazil Mauritius Netherlands Bulgaria Canada Norway Croatia Poland Denmark Portugal Dubai Singapore Slovak Republic Egypt Finland Slovenia France South Africa Germany Spain Gibraltar Sri Lanka Greece Sweden Switzerland Hungary Indonesia Chinese Taipei Ireland Thailand Italy Turkey Japan UK USA Korea

c **Europea** Austria Belgium Bulgaria Cyprus Czech Rep Denmark Estonia

European Union (EU) member states: Austria Finland Latvia Romania

BelgiumFranceLithuaniaSlovakiaBulgariaGermanyLuxembourgSloveniaCyprusGreeceMaltaSpainCzech RepublicHungaryNetherlandsSwedenDenmarkIrelandPolandUKEstoniaItalyPortugal

* Equivalence of third countries' regulatory systems is determined by the EC, the executive body of the EU. Auditors of an entity incorporated outside the EEA (the EU plus Norway, Liechtenstein and Iceland) but listed on an EEA regulated market must generally be registered as third country auditors. However, if the systems of public oversight, quality assurance, investigations and penalties are deemed to be equivalent by the EC, these requirements may be disapplied.

(**Bold font** denotes the jurisdictions covered in this study)

Third countries with European Commission (EC) equivalence* status:

Hong Kong

Abu Dhabi **Australia** Brazil **Canada** China Croatia Dubai International Finance Centre Guernsey Indonesia Isle of Man

Japan Jersey Malaysia **Singapore** South Africa South Korea Switzerland Taiwan Thailand **USA** EC and IFIAR foster cross border co-operation and reciprocity in enforcement between independent audit regulators

Requirements

EC

- Registration
- Inspection
- Investigation
- Enforcement
- Standard setting
- Continuing education

IFIAR

- Registration
- Inspection
- Investigation
- Enforcement





Preparation of the Report

Mr Mark Dickens, JP Chief Executive Officer

Financial Reporting Council

Preparation of the report



Deloitte LLP (UK)

Name	Position	Relevant experience
David Barnes (Lead UK Partner)	Partner	 Managing Partner for Public Policy Former Head of London Audit Financial Services Former Chairman of the Deloitte Audit Committee
Stuart Diack (Lead Engagement Partner)	Partner	 Involved in Deloitte's UK Audit Public Policy, Quality & Risk Management function, with a focus on the evolving regulatory landscape in the UK, Europe and globally Member of the Investigations Committee of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales



Scope of the study

- Jurisdictions covered in the report
 - Hong Kong, European Union, the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia and Singapore
- The gap analyses include:
 - Hong Kong versus IFIAR and EC
 - Hong Kong versus five jurisdictions
- Possible approaches to audit oversight
- Overview of global audit regulatory reform





Independent audit oversight Report briefing

David Barnes \ 10th October 2013

Agenda

- Background and scope
- Key IFIAR / EC requirements
- Key gaps and possible approaches

Background and scope

- Deloitte's study comprises gap analyses between Hong Kong and:
 - 1. International Forum of Independent Audit Regulators (IFIAR) and European Commission (EC) equivalence requirements
 - 2. Other key jurisdictions
- The study sets out possible approaches to various areas of auditor oversight by those major jurisdictions, and comparisons between those approaches
- It focuses on the following areas:
 - Registration
 - Inspection
 - Investigation
 - Enforcement
 - Standard setting
 - Continuing professional education (CPE)
 - Funding models

Key IFIAR / EC requirements

The oversight system must:

Registration	 have ultimate responsibility for the oversight of approval and registration, and the right to remove registration
Inspection	 be responsible for the inspection of auditors of public interest entities (PIEs), including at least listed entities be mainly governed by non-practitioners and operationally independent
Investigation	have the right to investigate
Enforcement	 and enforce penalties / sanctions and the capability to ensure findings / recommendations are appropriately addressed have access to effective, proportionate and dissuasive penalties
Standard setting	 have ultimate responsibility for adoption of standards on professional ethics, internal quality control and auditing
CPE	have ultimate responsibility for oversight
Funding	 have a stable source of funds which is secured and free from any undue influence by the profession

Key gaps and possible approaches

Hong Kong's current audit regulatory system has served the market well but it does not meet certain key IFIAR / EC requirements

1. Funding - Source of funding of HKICPA

- The HKICPA's funding is mainly sourced from its members and students and the subscription fee is determined by the HKICPA Council.
- The regulator is intended to be independent and self-funding. Funding options might include: a levy on companies whose audits are regulated or a subset thereof; a levy on professional bodies; a levy on individual firms or practitioners; government subsidy.

2. Inspection - Frequency of reviews

- Auditors of listed entities are reviewed every three years, meeting EC criteria. But other audit firms are not reviewed on a regular basis (IFIAR requirement).
- > Many regimes impose shorter inspection cycles. For example:
 - US: annual inspection for firms auditing over 100 issuers; at least once every three years for others.
 - UK: annual inspection of four largest firms; other major firms auditing PIEs reviewed on cycle of up to three years; auditors that do not audit PIEs reviewed at least every six years (size-dependent).

Key gaps and possible approaches (continued)

3. Inspection - Composition of the Practice Review Committee

- The Quality Assurance Department carries out practice reviews following the Committee's instructions and reports to it. The Committee mainly comprises practising members. This creates a gap in relation to (perceived) objectivity and independence of the quality assurance system.
- UK and Singapore: Independent regulatory body performs inspections of PIEs and delegates inspections of non-PIEs audits to professional bodies.

4. Enforcement - Disciplinary mechanism

- The Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) which is comprised mainly of practising CPAs has the sole power to dismiss complaint cases or recommend the HKICPA Council to refer more serious complaints to the Disciplinary Panels. This creates a gap as there is no independent public oversight body with specific oversight of the PCC and the ability to enforce disciplinary actions.
- Independent regulatory body has the right to investigate and impose sanctions or establish tribunal to do so or delegate to professional body for non-PIEs.

Key gaps and possible approaches (continued)

5. System of public oversight and Governance structure of the HKICPA Council

- No independent public oversight body with ultimate responsibility for oversight of registration, inspection, standard setting, CPE and disciplinary systems.
- The composition of the HKICPA Council, the governing body, does not guarantee that the membership of the Council would always have a 'non-practitioner' majority.

In major jurisdictions, audit regulatory oversight of at least registration, inspection, investigation, enforcement, standard setting and continuing professional education is vested in an independent regulatory body.

Delegation in certain cases may be permissible provided that there is oversight by the independent regulatory body.

Key gaps and possible approaches (continued)

Oversight bodies vs delegation

Oversight Body: Function:	EU requirements	IFIAR	UK (FRC)	US (PCAOB)	Canada (CPAB)	Australia (ASIC)	Singapore (ACRA)
Registration	Delegation allowed (with oversight)	Delegation allowed (with oversight)	Delegated to Recognised Supervisory Bodies (RSB) with oversight	Oversight body	Oversight body	Oversight body	Oversight body
Inspection	Delegation allowed (but oversight body must retain right to inspect)	 PIEs – cannot be delegated Non-PIEs – can be delegated 	 PIEs – oversight body Non-PIEs – delegated to RSBs with oversight 	Oversight body	 Reporting issuers oversight body Non-publicly listed – delegated to CICA with oversight 	Oversight body	 PIEs – oversight body Non-PIEs – oversight body with ICPAS
Investigation	Delegation allowed (but oversight body must retain right to investigate)	 PIEs – cannot be delegated Non-PIEs – can be delegated 	 PIEs – oversight body Non-PIEs - delegated to RSBs with oversight 	Oversight body plus SEC	Oversight body	Oversight body	Oversight body
Enforcement	Delegation allowed (but oversight body must retain right to take action)	 PIEs – cannot be delegated Non-PIEs – can be delegated 	 PIEs – oversight body Non-PIEs - delegated to RSBs with oversight 	Oversight body plus SEC	Oversight body	Oversight body and independent board	Oversight body
Standard setting	Delegation allowed (with oversight)	N/A	Oversight body	 Auditing and assurance – oversight body (public companies)/AICPA (non- public companies) Financial reporting – Financial Accounting Standards Board/SEC Ethics – oversight body/AICPA 	Delegated to Public Trust Committee (PTC), Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and Accounting Standards Board (AcSB) with oversight	Standards are set by independent bodies (audit and accounting – Government; ethical – independent board established by the professional bodies)	 Accounting - separate independent body Audit – delegated to professional body with oversight Ethics - oversight body
CPE	Delegation allowed (with oversight)	N/A	Delegated to RSBs with oversight	Oversight body plus state boards of accountancy	Oversight body	Professional bodies	Oversight body

Deloitte.

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited ("DTTL"), a UK private company limited by guarantee, and its network of member firms, each of which is a legally separate and independent entity. Please see www.deloitte.co.uk/about for a detailed description of the legal structure of DTTL and its member firms.

Deloitte LLP is the United Kingdom member firm of DTTL.

This publication has been written in general terms and therefore cannot be relied on to cover specific situations; application of the principles set out will depend upon the particular circumstances involved and we recommend that you obtain professional advice before acting or refraining from acting on any of the contents of this publication. Deloitte LLP would be pleased to advise readers on how to apply the principles set out in this publication to their specific circumstances. Deloitte LLP accepts no duty of care or liability for any loss occasioned to any person acting or refraining from action as a result of any material in this publication.

Deloitte LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC303675 and its registered office at 2 New Street Square, London EC4A 3BZ, United Kingdom. Tel: +44 (0) 20 7936 3000 Fax: +44 (0) 20 7583 1198.

© 2013 Deloitte LLP. All rights reserved.

Public Interest

(including investing public)

Selfregulation <u>Hong Kong's Auditors</u> <u>Regulatory Regime</u> - Independent -- Transparent -- Robust -- EC equivalence -- IFIAR membership -

www.frc.org.hk

