

Draft Survey on the IESBA's Future Strategy and Work Plan**About the IESBA**

The [International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants](#) (IESBA) is an independent global standard-setting board. The IESBA's mission is to serve the public interest by setting ethics standards, including auditor independence requirements, which seek to raise the bar for ethical conduct and practice for all professional accountants through a robust, globally operable [International Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants \(including International Independence Standards\)](#) (the Code).

The IESBA believes a single set of high-quality ethics standards enhances the quality and consistency of services provided by professional accountants, thus contributing to public trust and confidence in the accountancy profession. The IESBA sets its standards in the public interest with advice from the IESBA Consultative Advisory Group (CAG) and under the oversight of the Public Interest Oversight Board (PIOB).

About the Survey

This survey seeks views from stakeholders on key environmental trends, developments or issues the IESBA should consider as it begins the process of developing its next Strategy and Work Plan (SWP) for the period 2024 – 2027.

This survey comprises three sections:


Section A – Demographic information about the respondents

Section B – Strategic direction and priorities

Section C – Possible future standards-related projects or initiatives

Respondents are asked to provide views or suggestions in response to the questions in Sections B and C. If a respondent has no response to a particular question, the respondent may skip that question. Respondents' submissions will be made available on the IESBA's website after the close of the survey.

This survey is the first step in the IESBA seeking input from its stakeholders as part of the due process for developing its SWP. Following a full review of the input received, the IESBA will develop a consultation paper on its SWP 2024-2027, including its proposed strategic themes, priorities and work plan.



The IESBA anticipates approving the SWP consultation paper for public comment in Q1 2023. Respondents will have an opportunity to comment on a full description of the IESBA's proposed strategic direction and future work plan when it issues its SWP consultation paper.

Section A: Demographic Information

Personal and organizational information

Your name:

Your Organization (if applicable):

Your role:

Email address:

Stakeholder Group

Please specify the stakeholder you/your organization represents

- Academia
- Accounting/Audit firm or network
- Audit oversight body
- IFAC member body or other professional accountancy organization
- Investor or analyst
- National standard setter
- Other users of financial statements/Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) information (e.g., customer, creditor/supplier, lender), please specify: _____
- Preparer of financial statements/ESG information
- Firm (other than an accounting/audit firm) that provides assurance on ESG information
- Public sector
- Regulator
- Those charged with governance
- Other, please specify: _____

Geographical location

Please specify the geographical region where you or your organization is based:

- Global
- Africa-Middle East
- Asia
- Oceania
- Europe
- Latin America
- North America

Section B: Strategic Direction and Priorities

BACKGROUND

In the aftermath of the global financial crisis of 2008-2009, public expectations rose significantly for more robust regulatory supervision and oversight of, and a higher bar of ethical behavior for, financial and corporate professionals alike.

In response to those heightened expectations, the IESBA took steps to significantly strengthen the Code through the release of the revised and restructured Code in 2018. The revisions, amongst other matters, enhanced the conceptual framework for identifying, evaluating and addressing threats to compliance with the fundamental ethical principles and, where applicable, to independence, including the safeguards-related provisions of the Code; strengthened the provisions relating to inducements; introduced a new standard on addressing pressure to breach the fundamental principles; strengthened the independence standard addressing long association of audit firm personnel with an audit client; and introduced a new standard on responding to non-compliance with laws and regulations (NOCLAR). At the same time, the IESBA took decisive action to restructure the Code to enhance its usability and accessibility.

With the newly revised and restructured Code in place, the IESBA released its current [SWP](#) (2019-2023) in April 2019, setting out three strategic themes:

IESBA SWP 2019-2023 STRATEGIC THEMES

Advancing the Code's Relevance and Impact through (i) maintaining a global Code fit for purpose in the evolving environment; and (ii) further raising the bar on ethics

Deepening and Expanding the Code's Influence through increasing global adoption and effective implementation of the Code

Expanding the IESBA's Perspectives and Inputs through proactively engaging and seeking cooperative avenues with stakeholders

Working to advance these three strategic themes, the IESBA continued to place a high priority on strengthening the International Independence Standards. So far within this strategy period, the IESBA has issued revised standards containing strengthened provisions addressing the permissibility of [non-assurance services](#) (NAS) to audit clients, and [fee-related matters](#). These enhanced provisions focus particularly on public interest entities (PIEs) in light of stakeholders' heightened expectations regarding independence with respect to the audits of financial statements of these entities. At the same time, responding to stakeholder concerns about the need to ensure that the appropriate entities are scoped in as PIEs and working closely with the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB), the IESBA also recently finalized an expanded definition of a PIE to include more mandatory categories of entities as PIEs. These projects were supported by the vast majority of stakeholders, recognizing that they addressed a number of important issues in the public interest.

Since the release of the restructured Code in 2018, the IESBA has also worked closely with the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC) to promote adoption and implementation of the Code through various activities including publication of awareness-raising materials, global webinars and outreach to stakeholders. To coincide with the effective date of the restructured Code and to make the Code even more accessible and easier to navigate, the IESBA launched the eCode in 2019 in collaboration with IFAC. The eCode is now part of the electronic International Standards ([eIS](#)) platform developed by IFAC.

As the IESBA begins to contemplate its strategic direction for the new SWP and develops the next cycle's work plan, it will take into account the new organizational structure, governance and processes that will be implemented for both the IESBA and the IAASB over the next few years as a result of the Monitoring Group's (MG) July 2020 recommendations, [Strengthening the International Audit and Ethics Standard-Setting System](#). The MG recommendations aim to support and enhance the development of high-quality auditing and ethics standards by the two Standard Setting Boards (SSBs) through the achievement of a multi-stakeholder structure, reinforcement of public interest considerations within the standards development process, and enhanced responsiveness to an accelerating pace of change.

The MG recommendations also reinforce the importance of close coordination between the IESBA and the IAASB on topics within their respective strategic work plan that are of mutual interest. With this in mind, the IESBA is proposing to align the period of its next SWP with that of the IAASB's next SWP, i.e., the four-year period 2024-2027. Within their agreed framework of coordination, the two SSBs will also work closely to identify future projects or work streams that address topics or issues that overlap their standard-setting remits. Such coordination will enable the IESBA and the IAASB to deliver global standards that are consistent with each other and interoperable.

POTENTIAL STRATEGIC FOCUS AREAS

The IESBA will prioritize a range of longer-term and shorter-term projects or initiatives that it believes would best support the strategic themes for its next SWP, balancing factors such as the benefits to the public interest, the pervasiveness of the particular matters, global operability and relevance, the degree of urgency and resources available. During the strategy period, the IESBA will also consider whether any new developments in the external environment, or issues arising from existing work streams or identified by the Public Interest Oversight Board (PIOB) or stakeholders, call for a reassessment of its strategic priorities.

For purposes of this survey, the IESBA is seeking stakeholders' views on the following four broad strategic focus areas that may help guide the IESBA in setting the direction and priorities for its new SWP 2024-2027:

1. Enhancing independence standards for assurance engagements on ESG information
2. Strengthening independence standards for audit engagements
3. Raising the bar of ethical behavior for professional accountants in business
4. Promoting timely adoption and effective implementation of the Code

1. Enhancing independence standards for assurance engagements on Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) information

In January 2020, the IESBA issued revisions to Part 4B of the Code to align its provisions with the revised assurance terms and concepts in the IAASB's International Standards on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000 (Revised).¹ Part 4B of the Code addresses independence for assurance engagements other than audits and reviews of financial statements.

Since then, capital markets have seen an accelerated growth in the disclosure of ESG (including sustainability) information driven largely by investors' demand, with an increasing call also for assurance

¹ ISAE 3000 (Revised), *Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information*

on such information. Regulators in a number of major jurisdictions are prioritizing as a matter of urgency the development of new regulations governing ESG disclosures and assurance thereon. Further, in November 2021, the IFRS Foundation established the new International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) to develop IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards. These developments respond to a major shift in investor focus on how companies deal with ESG issues, including risks relating to sustainability such as climate change. They also respond to a rapidly evolving landscape where there is a high degree of fragmentation and inconsistency in terms of frameworks and standards for ESG reporting, levels of assurance provided and who is engaged to provide such assurance.² As market demand for ESG information continues to expand rapidly, there is a pressing public interest need to ensure that such information is reliable and comparable, and therefore subject to assurance.

The accountancy profession stands to play a major role in the provision of assurance on ESG information given its professional competencies in the field of assurance and, importantly, the robust ethics standards by which it must abide. In particular, the Code (including the IIS contained in Part 4B) already applies to accounting firms that perform assurance engagements in accordance with ISAE 3000 (Revised). However, the IESBA acknowledges that the rapid developments in the field of ESG reporting have raised a number of questions regarding the robustness and sufficiency of Part 4B of the Code in safeguarding the independence of professional accountants (PAs) in public practice (PAPPs) when engaged to provide assurance on such information. Some of these questions include, for example, whether there is a need to revisit the definition of a PIE (or consider the relevance of the PIE concept) as it applies to assurance engagements related to ESG disclosures, independence provisions that should apply to network firms and other firms participating in such engagements, the meaning of materiality in relation to qualitative ESG disclosures, and independence provisions that should apply to external experts involved in the assurance engagements.

Anticipating the need to be prepared to act promptly, the IESBA has established a working group that has begun fact finding work on the ESG developments with a view to advising the IESBA on the potential topics or issues that may need to be addressed from a standard-setting perspective. The IESBA is also engaged in ongoing dialogue with the International Organization of Securities Commissions' (IOSCO) Sustainable Finance Task Force alongside the IAASB and expects to coordinate any standard-setting action closely with the IAASB. The IESBA expects to also engage with relevant bodies in major jurisdictions, including the EU and major G20 countries, that are actively involved in responding to the ESG developments.

Whilst the IESBA expects that PAPPs will play a major role in providing assurance on ESG information, it also acknowledges that there is already a significant body of other professional firms that are providing such assurance services. Whilst ISAE 3000 (Revised) is designed to support the performance of assurance engagements by practitioners other than PAPPs, there are currently no globally accepted standards that govern the ethical conduct or independence of such assurance providers.³ Accordingly, there is an open question as to whether the public interest will be better served if the scope of the Code were to be enlarged to cover assurance providers that are not PAPPs. In this regard, the IESBA observes that some regulators are considering the need for independence requirements on providers of assurance services irrespective of their professional qualification. This is part of a broader trend away from a provider-centered regulatory

² See [The State of Play in Sustainability Assurance](#), a global benchmarking study published in June 2021 by IFAC, AICPA and CIMA.

³ ISAE 3000 (Revised), paragraph 20, requires the practitioner to comply with the provisions of the IESBA Code related to assurance engagements, or other professional requirements, or requirements imposed by law or regulation, that are at least as demanding. However, the Code currently applies only to PAs.

approach towards a service-centered one. If it were to go down the path of broadening the scope of the Code to cover assurance providers other than PAPPs, one key question for the IESBA would be how to achieve the authority of binding standards for non-PAs, given that it has no authority to mandate the adoption, application and enforcement of its standards. In this regard, the IESBA recognizes that it would need the support of, and complementary action by, the regulatory community and other stakeholders.

1. How important do you believe the IESBA should focus on strengthening the IIS and expanding their relevance for PAPPs performing assurance engagements on ESG information as a strategic priority in its next strategy period (2024-2027)? Please be as specific as possible and explain your reasoning.

2. Do you believe the IESBA should explore the concept of expanding the scope of the Code to cover assurance providers other than PAPPs? What public interest benefits and potential challenges or drawbacks do you foresee if the IIS were scoped to the nature of the assurance services provided as opposed to who is providing the assurance services?

3. Are there other matters the IESBA should consider with regards to this strategic focus area?

2. Strengthening independence standards for audit engagements

Recurring headlines about collapses of large public companies due to fraud as well as other financial scandals across the globe have continued to draw much public attention on the role of auditors as corporate guardians of public trust and confidence in entities' financial statements. Some of these events have called into question not only the quality of the audits but also the independence of the auditors. As a result, there continues to be heightened regulatory scrutiny not only on aspects of the performance of an audit such as the exercise of professional skepticism and professional judgment, but also on broader considerations relating to auditor independence and the audit firm multi-disciplinary business model.

As highlighted in the Background subsection above, the IESBA has continued to dedicate strategic effort to addressing aspects of the issues in the current strategy period through its three major inter-related independence-focused projects on NAS, fees, and the definitions of listed entity and PIE. In this regard, the IESBA believes that the revisions to the Code as a result of the [NAS](#) and [Fees](#) projects represent a major public interest contribution towards addressing some of the concerns about the business model of firms.

Within the current strategy period, the IESBA also continues to place high priority on projects that will further enhance auditor independence. These include the [Engagement Team – Group Audits Independence](#) and [Technology](#) projects. These two projects are ongoing, with Exposure Drafts issued in February 2022. In addition, as a result of its [PIE project](#), the IESBA has committed to undertaking a holistic review of collective investment vehicles and other “non-corporate” legal structures such as mutual funds, private equity funds, pension funds and trusts to assess whether the independence provisions in the Code appropriately cover audits of such vehicles or structures, or whether they need to be clarified and expanded.

The IESBA will also consider the findings of Phase 1 of its [Benchmarking](#) initiative to determine whether there are independence matters that would warrant specific attention from a standard-setting perspective. Phase 1, which was completed in March 2022, compared the IIS as applicable to PIEs to the relevant independence requirements of the US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and the US Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB).

Section C also sets out a number of specific topics that the IESBA has identified from previous or current work streams, or which were otherwise brought to its attention. Subject to stakeholder input to this survey, the IESBA may consider prioritizing some of these topics from the perspective of further strengthening the IIS relative to auditor independence.

4. Do you believe the IESBA should continue to dedicate strategic focus on strengthening the IIS for audit engagements in its next strategy period (2024-2027)? If so, what specific developments or issues do you believe the IESBA should focus on beyond the matters outlined above and in Section C. Please be as specific as possible and explain your reasoning.

3. Raising the bar of ethical behavior for professional accountants in business

Over half of the world’s PAs are professional accountants in business (PAIBs) working on their own or in organizations other than public accounting practices. PAIBs are a very diverse constituency, and can work as employees or consultants in commerce, industry, education, and the public and not-for-profit sectors. Many are in a position of strategic or functional leadership, or are otherwise well-placed to collaborate with colleagues in other disciplines to help their organizations toward long-term sustainable success.

Given that many PAIBs play a fundamental role in the financial reporting supply chain and facilitate effective governance in organizations, it is in the public interest that the provisions of the Code applicable to PAIBs are appropriate and robust. During the previous strategy period, the IESBA completed a two-phase project that significantly enhanced the Code’s provisions relating to the ethical behavior of PAIBs. The enhancements included revisions to the provisions on inducements and the preparation and presentation of information, as well as a new standard on dealing with pressure to breach the fundamental principles.

As part of the current strategy period, the IESBA has introduced new provisions in the Code that promote the role, mindset and behavioral characteristics expected of all PAs when performing their professional activities. The IESBA has also issued for exposure [proposed technology-related revisions](#) to Part 2 of the Code which applies to PAIBs. In addition, the IESBA has a separate [working group](#) that is carrying out fact finding to further understand the broader technology environment, including the ethical implications for PAs of developments such as blockchain, cybersecurity and cloud-based services.

As mentioned above, given the major trends and developments in the area of ESG reporting, the IESBA will gather a greater understanding of the role and responsibilities of PAIBs in ESG reporting in order to assess whether Part 2 of the Code continues to be robust and appropriate. This recognizes not only that PAIBs are well placed to play an important role in the ESG information supply-chain given their professional competencies in the preparation and presentation of information, but also that the Code generally has a greater focus on PAs' involvement with financial information than non-financial information. In this regard, it is notable that an issue that has given rise to public interest concerns is the reporting of information that gives a false or misleading impression about how well a business or investment aligns with its sustainability goals ("greenwashing").

5. Do you believe the IESBA should dedicate strategic focus on further raising the bar of ethical behavior for PAIBs in its next strategy period (2024-2027)? In particular, how important do you believe the IESBA should focus attention on PAIBs' role and involvement in the preparation and presentation of ESG information. Please be as specific as possible and explain your reasoning.

6. What other trends, developments or issues do you believe the IESBA should consider with respect to raising the bar of ethical behavior for PAIBs? Please be as specific as possible and explain your reasoning.

4. Promoting timely adoption and effective implementation of the Code

Prior to the release of the restructured Code in 2018, the Code had been adopted or had been used as a basis for national ethics standards or the ethical codes of professional accountancy organizations (PAOs) in over 120 jurisdictions around the world, including 16 among the G-20. As of January 2022, over 85 jurisdictions have adopted, or committed to adopt, the restructured Code. In addition, the 31 largest international networks of firms that comprise the [Forum of Firms](#) have also aligned their policies and methodologies to conform to the restructured Code for transnational audits.

The IESBA dedicates significant effort to promoting the adoption and effective implementation of the Code, including new revisions to the Code, through various initiatives and activities, an important part of which is stakeholder outreach. Beyond these, the IESBA considers it a high priority to conduct post-implementation reviews (PIRs) of significant revisions to the Code to assess how effectively the implementation of those revisions is meeting the original objectives of the revisions. So far within this current strategy period, the IESBA has completed Phase 1 of the Long Association PIR. The IESBA plans to initiate the PIRs of the restructured Code and the NOCLAR provisions as well as Phase 2 of the Long Association PIR in the remaining two years of the current strategy period (2022-2023).

As part of the new strategy period, the IESBA expects to prioritize PIRs of the revisions to the Code relating to the NAS, Fees and PIE projects.

7. Do you believe the IESBA should devote strategic focus on promoting timely adoption and effective implementation of the Code in its next strategy period (2024-2027)? Please be as specific as possible and explain your reasoning.

8. Are there specific operability issues or concerns with respect to the Code you believe the IESBA should be made aware of?

OTHER KEY ENVIRONMENTAL TRENDS OR DEVELOPMENTS

9. Are there key environmental trends or developments, beyond those already noted above, you believe the IESBA should focus on in its next strategy period (2024-2027)? Please be as specific as possible and explain your reasoning.

Section C: Possible Future Standards-Related Projects or Initiatives

The following table lists topics that the IESBA may consider as potential future projects or initiatives in the 2024-2027 strategy period. The IESBA has identified these topics through various means including ongoing and recently completed work streams, and the previous strategy consultation process.

When the IESBA reviews these topics as part of the development of the SWP consultation paper, the IESBA will take into account:

- Respondents' input on the strategic direction and priorities for the next strategy period (Section B).
- The level of importance of each topic based on a number of factors.
- Input received from respondents to this Section (Section C).

Please note that this section provides only a high-level overview of each topic noted in the table below. Respondents will have an opportunity to comment on a full description of the IESBA's proposed strategic work plan when it issues the consultation paper in due course.

Topic	
INDEPENDENCE TOPICS – PAPPs	
1.	Independence of external experts
2.	Audit firm – audit client relationship
3.	Business relationships
4.	Business, employment and financial relationships
5.	Definition of “audit client” for PIEs
6.	Inducements – Alignment of Parts 4A and 4B with Part 3 of the Code
7.	Use of an audit client's internal auditors on the external audit
8.	Matters arising from Quality Management (QM)-related conforming amendments to the Code
PAIB-SPECIFIC TOPICS	
9.	Familiarity threat in relation to Part 2
TOPICS ADDRESSING PAs MORE BROADLY	
10.	Fiduciary services
11.	Professional appointments
12.	Breaches of the Code
13.	Definitions and descriptions of terms
OTHER TOPICS	
14.	Scope of the Code
15.	Non-authoritative material

The IESBA is seeking respondents' assessment of the level of importance of each of these topics (on a scale of 1-5) and a brief rationale for those that have been assessed as high importance (Rating: 4-5).

Factors for Rating the Topics

When assessing the level of importance, respondents are asked to consider the following factors:

- Public interest benefits
 - The level of public interest in undertaking the project or initiative.
 - The extent to which the action will enhance public trust in the Code and the profession.
 - The extent to which the action will raise the bar on ethical behavior for PAs.
- Relevance
 - Pervasiveness of the matter or issue to the global profession.
 - Relevance of the topic at a global level.
 - Relevance of the topic to the ethical behavior of PAs or independence.
- Urgency
 - The degree of urgency in addressing the issue(s) identified.
 - The extent of the impact on the public interest and the profession if action is not taken or is delayed.
- Achievability
 - Feasibility of achieving an effective outcome within a reasonable timeframe, taking into account the resources required.

Please rate each topic listed below on its level of importance as a priority for the IESBA's SWP 2024-2027 on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = lowest level of importance). Please refer to the factors for rating the topics above when assessing each topic.

For those topics that you rated either a 4 or 5 (i.e., the highest levels of importance), please provide a brief explanation for your rating.

Independence of External Experts

Under the Code's and the IAASB's definitions of "engagement team," an auditor's external expert is not a member of the engagement team for an audit or other assurance engagement. As such, they are not scoped in for the purposes of the IIS. They are, however, subject to objectivity requirements under ISA 620⁴ in the context of an audit of financial statements.

A potential project on this topic would consider whether external experts used on audit and other assurance engagements should be subject to specific independence requirements under the Code, especially given

⁴ International Standard on Auditing (ISA) 620, *Using the Work of an Auditor's Expert*

the expected increase in involvement of external experts under ISA 540 (Revised)⁵ and sustainability assurance standards. This matter arose during the IESBA's and IESBA Consultative Advisory Group's (CAG) discussions on the [Engagement Team – Group Audits Independence](#) project.

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

Audit Firm – Audit Client Relationship

As part of its [Fees](#) project, the IESBA concluded that the Code should recognize the inherent self-interest threat in the audit client payer model whereby the party responsible for the subject of an examination directly pays the examiner. The IESBA, however, agreed that the inherent risk related to the audit client payer model is part of a broader issue of the “audit firm–audit client” relationship, which was outside the scope of the Fees project.

A potential project on this topic would therefore consider whether the Code should address the inherent threats arising from the client relationship more broadly. It may also address a related matter which is whether it continues to remain appropriate for the Code to use the term “audit client” as opposed to the “audited entity” or “entity subject to audit.” This recognizes that the ultimate beneficial client is not the entity itself but the entity’s owners or shareholders.

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

Business Relationships

Section 520 of the Code addresses threats to independence arising from business relationships between an audit firm and an audit client or its management, with the provisions focused on “close business relationships.”

The Code does not define or describe the term “business relationship.” Whilst the concept of “close business relationship” in Section 520 focuses on a “mutuality of interests” such as joint ventures and combining services or products with those of an audit client, there is a view that “business relationship” is a broader concept, i.e., consisting of any commercial arrangement.

A potential project on this topic would therefore consider revisiting Section 520 more comprehensively to deal with threats to independence from a broader business relationship context. This matter was identified as part of the current Technology project but is deemed to be outside the scope of that project.

⁵ ISA 540, *Auditing Accounting Estimates and Related Disclosures*

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

Business, Employment and Financial Relationships

As part of the previous strategy consultation, there was a suggestion for the IESBA to consider further prohibitions on business, employment and financial relationships between auditors and their audit clients. In particular, the IESBA was asked to consider the following with respect to employment with an audit client:

- Whether the 12-month cooling off period for former key audit partners or the former senior or managing partner of a firm before they join an audit client that is a PIE should be extended to 2 years (paragraphs R524.6 and R524.7 of the Code).
- Whether there should be a 5-year cooling off period before a former partner of the firm can become an officer or director of an audit client, when another former partner of the firm at the time when the firm audited the client is an officer or director of the client

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

Definition of Audit Client for PIEs

The extant Code contains only one reference to “listed entity” in the IIS that is separate from its treatment as a PIE. This reference, in extant paragraph R400.20, specifies which related entities are included in the definition of an audit client depending on whether the audit client is a listed entity or not.⁶

As part of the [PIE](#) project, the IESBA agreed to replace the reference to listed entity in extant paragraph R400.20 with the new term “publicly traded entity.” As part of its deliberations, the IESBA also considered whether to replace the reference to listed entity in paragraph R400.20 with PIE, thereby enlarging the scope of the related entities included with the audit client when it is a PIE. However, the IESBA agreed that addressing the relevant issues such as the corporate structures of private equity complexes and sovereign wealth funds as well as the flow of information within those structures were beyond the scope of the PIE project.

A potential work stream on this topic would undertake further research to gain a better understanding of the ramifications of extending the whole universe of related entities for listed entities in extant paragraph R400.20 to apply to all PIE audit clients.

⁶ Extant paragraph R400.20 states: “As defined, an audit client that is a listed entity includes all of its related entities. For all other entities, references to an audit client in this Part include related entities over which the client has direct or indirect control.”

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

Inducements – Alignment of Parts 4A and 4B with Part 3 of the Code

In early 2013, the IESBA approved the [Review of Part C of the Code Project](#) to strengthen extant Part C of the Code (Part 2 of the restructured Code) to better promote ethical behavior by PAIBs. Phase 2 of this project involved a review of the provisions relating to inducements. In April 2018, the IESBA finalized its revisions in the Code relating to the offering and accepting of inducements, including gifts and hospitality.

The IESBA agreed to align the provisions relating to inducements for PAPPs in Part 3 of the Code with the revised provisions for PAIBs (Part 2 of the Code). However, with regards to the IIS, the IESBA agreed that only limited conforming amendments be made to Sections 420 and 906 that address gifts and hospitality from an independence perspective. The IESBA concluded at the time that additional revisions to Parts 4A and 4B to fully align with the changes in Section 340⁷ would require further deliberation beyond the scope of the Inducements project.

A potential project on this topic would therefore consider substantive enhancements to the IIS to align them more fully with the Inducements provisions in Section 340. In particular, consideration would be given to whether the scope of the independence provisions should be expanded to cover all inducements, the offering of inducements as well as the involvement of immediate or close family members, instead of being limited currently to the acceptance of gifts and hospitality by the firm, network firm, or a member of the audit or assurance team.

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

Use of an Audit Client’s Internal Auditors on the External Audit

As part of the previous strategy consultation, there was a suggestion for the IESBA to consider how internal auditors of an audit client might provide direct assistance on the external audit. There was a view that notwithstanding an external auditor’s review of the internal auditors’ work and other safeguards in place, internal auditors should not be part of the external audit process as they are employees of the entity.

⁷ Section 340, *Inducements, Including Gifts and Hospitality*

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

Matters Arising from Quality Management (QM)-Related Conforming Amendments to the Code

There were a number of substantive matters of alignment that arose during the project to develop the [limited conforming amendments to the Code](#) as a result of the finalization of the IAASB’s QM projects. These matters were beyond the scope of the conforming amendments project. This limited scope project, which was finalized in December 2021, focused on the relevant provisions of the Code that refer to ISQM 1⁸ or ISQM 2,⁹ or terms and concepts used or defined in those two QM standards.

The matters raised include:

- Whether networks can be defined by common requirements or services as opposed to common policies and procedures.
- Whether references to network firm in the Code, including in the definition of “audit team,” should be extended to include “the network,” given that ISQM 1 contemplates that there is the network, other firms in the network, and other structures or organizations within the network.

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

Familiarity Threat in Relation to Part 2 of the Code

During the Long Association project, there was consideration of a potential revision of the definition of a “familiarity threat” in relation to the issue of over-familiarity with client information in an audit context. It was noted that the extant definition contains a reference to “employer.” However, the Code has only a few examples of familiarity threats with respect to PAIBs in the context of their employing organizations.

Currently, extant paragraph 200.6 A1(d) provides two general examples of familiarity threats for a PAIB when undertaking a professional activity; and paragraph 250.11 A3 provides one example of a familiarity threat that might be created when an inducement is being offered or accepted even if the PAIB has concluded there is no actual or perceived intent to improperly influence behavior.

⁸ International Standard on Quality Management (ISQM) 1, *Quality Management for Firms that Perform Audits or Reviews of Financial Statements, or Other Assurance or Related Services Engagements*

⁹ ISQM 2, *Engagement Quality Reviews*

A potential work stream on this topic would consider whether there is a need to provide additional guidance in the Code or in non-authoritative material regarding how PAIBs should address familiarity threats in the context of their work for employing organizations.

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

Fiduciary Services

From the responses to the previous strategy survey, there was a suggestion for IESBA to clarify the application of the Code when fiduciary services are undertaken by a firm, an entity associated with the firm or under common control, or by a PA who is employed by a fiduciary services provider.

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

Professional Appointments

In the context of a change in professional appointment, paragraph R320.6 of the Code requires a proposed PA to take other reasonable steps to obtain information about any possible threats if the PA is unable to communicate with the existing or predecessor accountant. Paragraph 320.5 A1 provides that a proposed PA will usually need the client's permission to initiate discussions with the existing or predecessor accountant.

Paragraph R320.8 deals particularly with changes in audit or review appointment. It provides that if a client fails or refuses to grant the existing or predecessor accountant permission to discuss the client's affairs with the proposed accountant, the existing or predecessor accountant shall disclose this fact to the proposed accountant, who shall carefully consider such failure or refusal when determining whether to accept the appointment.

A potential project on this topic would consider whether the Code should require a proposed PA to decline an appointment if the client fails or refuses to give permission to the existing or predecessor PA to communicate with the proposed PA, unless there are certain exceptional circumstances.

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

Breaches of the Code

Extant paragraphs R400.80 to R400.89 and R900.50 to R900.55 of the Code address a breach of a requirement in Parts 4A and 4B, respectively. These provisions require a firm to take certain actions upon concluding that a breach has occurred, such as addressing the consequences of the breach, determining whether to end the audit or assurance engagement, and communicating with those charged with governance. These provisions also provide guidance on matters such as actions a firm might consider to address a breach satisfactorily.

Extant paragraphs R100.4 – 100.4 A1 currently provide a requirement and application guidance to address a breach of any other provisions of the Code. A potential project on this topic would consider other matters some stakeholders have raised, such as:

- In addition to requiring a PA to address the consequences of the breach and determine whether to report it to the relevant parties (paragraph R100.4), whether the Code should address actions to stop the activity that caused the breach.
- Whether there should be any optionality in reporting a breach under paragraph R100.4 (b).
- Whether the conceptual framework in Section 120 should specifically address the disclosure required when a breach occurred and when the professional accountant is unable to end a service.

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

Definitions and Descriptions of Terms

There are certain differences between the definitions of some terms in the Code and the definitions of the same terms in the IAASB standards. These terms include: financial statements; firm; independence; review engagement; and special purpose financial statements.

In addition, during the Structure of the Code project, the IESBA received a number of suggestions from respondents to reconsider how certain terms are currently defined in the Code, including:

- Audit team – Whether the definition of “audit team” should be broadened to include individuals within the firm who may be in a position to influence the conduct or outcome of an audit by removing

references to individuals in a position to '**directly** influence' the outcome of an engagement. It was argued that such a broadening of the term would better reflect the complexity of organization and influence within audit firms. There was also a view that the change would address the risk that an ability to influence is seen purely as a structural consideration (related to the position of an individual in a firm), instead of driving the assessment through a consideration that captures all those who have the ability to influence and are relevant to the engagement.

- Employee – Whether the term “employee” should include individuals who may act in the capacity of an employee such as a contractor of an audit client, instead of only covering actual employees of an audit client.
- Engagement Period – Whether it remains appropriate to limit the concept of “engagement period” to the date the audit report is issued as the auditor has further responsibilities under auditing standards, such as addressing the effect on the opinion of matters that come to the auditors’ attention after the conclusion of the audit.
- Financial Interest – Whether the definition of “financial interest” should be updated to include, for instance, interests in a trust.
- Firm – Whether the term “firm” is too narrowly defined and whether a firm could have non-member employees, as well as clarifying the responsibility of PAs for employees other than PAs.
- Network Firm – Whether the concept of a “network firm” should place more focus on the exercise of judgement instead of being circumscribed by a list of examples of situations that might indicate the existence of a network. There is also a view that borders between associations and networks are increasingly diffuse, and there is therefore a need to consider any potential Code implications that might impact the definition of a network firm. It has also been noted that while the definition of “network firm” is sufficiently broad in the Code, the definition of “firm” is potentially narrow in its references to structures known to exist today and that this might become limiting for the future.
- Professional Accountant – Whether the definition of “professional accountant” should include retired or inactive professional PAs.

The IESBA’s Applicability project addressed the applicability of Part 2 of the Code to PAPPs. As part of this project, there were suggestions as to whether the definitions of a PAPP and a PAIB should be revised. The Code defines a PAPP to be a PA, irrespective of functional classification, in a firm that provides professional services. It has been brought to the IESBA’s attention that there is no clear limitation in the definition of a PAPP to those who actually provide professional services. The extant definition, however, appears to include any PA in a firm that provides professional services. This could be interpreted to include PAs in roles other than providing professional services, such as in finance or IT.

Conversely, the Code defines a PAIB to include any PA employed or engaged in a variety of areas including service. If it is intended that a firm providing professional services is in a “service” industry, then prima facie any PA working in that service organization, including those providing professional services, is also a PAIB.

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

Scope of the Code

From the responses to the previous strategy survey, there was a suggestion for IESBA to consider whether the scope of application of the Code should be expanded from PAs who are members of IFAC members bodies to include students of those bodies.

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

Non-Authoritative Material (NAM)

Potential work streams would consider developing NAM in relation to the following topics:

Part 4B of the Code

Several respondents to the *Alignment of Part 4B of the Code with ISAE 3000 (Revised)* Exposure Draft suggested that users of the Code would benefit from more practical examples of how Part 4B is to be applied, such as:

- Graphical illustrations of the different independence requirements as between a direct and an attestation engagement, in particular where more than one responsible party or party responsible for the subject matter information is involved.
- Practical guidance on determining the nature of the data that represents the underlying subject matter of the assurance engagement
- Practical guidance or case studies on identifying the parties from which independence is required, particularly in new and emerging areas that will assist practitioners to better evaluate and comply with the independence obligations.

In finalizing the [revisions to Part 4B](#), the IESBA also agreed that non-authoritative guidance material to illustrate the application of Part 4B in different situations according to the various parties involved and by type of assurance engagement should be developed in due course.

Relationship Between the Concepts of “Inquiring Mind” and “Professional Skepticism”

As part of the [Role and Mindset](#) project, the IESBA introduced the concept of “having an inquiring mind” as a new element of applying the conceptual framework in the Code. It also provided guidance on what it means to have an inquiring mind. In considering the relationship between having an inquiring mind and exercising professional skepticism in the context of an audit or other assurance engagement, the IESBA made clear that, in addition to having an inquiring mind (which is required for all professional activities), PAs undertaking engagements to which auditing, review and other assurance standards apply are also required to exercise professional skepticism, which includes a critical assessment of evidence.

The IESBA also concluded that further explanation of the relationship and differences between these two concepts should be addressed through NAM rather than in the Code.

Types of Biases

As part of the Role and Mindset project, the IESBA also introduced new application material in the Code to illustrate eight common forms of bias that a PA might encounter, such as availability bias, automation bias, confirmation bias and groupthink. Given the principles-based nature of the Code, there was only a brief description of each type of bias.

There was a suggestion from some respondents to the Exposure Draft as well as from the IESBA discussions that the IESBA should consider developing NAM that provides expanded explanation of those examples of bias as well as other types of biases that may also be relevant to the exercise of professional judgment. There would also be consideration of exploring through NAM how biases affect a PA's professional judgment and the application of the conceptual framework.

How would you rate this topic as a strategic priority on a scale of 1 – 5?

If you rate this topic as either 4 or 5 (i.e., high priority), please provide your reasons including any specific areas of focus as well as other relevant information.

10. *Are there specific ethics or independence-related topics not otherwise covered in this Section or this survey that you believe should be given a high priority by the IESBA?* If so, please explain and be as specific as possible.