

**Draft Minutes of the 97th Meeting of the
INTERNATIONAL ETHICS STANDARDS BOARD FOR ACCOUNTANTS**

Held on June 8 – 11, 2026 in New York, USA

Voting Members

Present: Gabriela Figueiredo Dias (Chair)
Channa Wijesinghe (Vice Chair)
Saadiya Adam
Mark Babington
Vania Borgerth
Tomoyo Imura
Sung-Nam Kim
Héctor Lehuedé
Rania Uwaydah Mardini
Christelle Martin
Nancy Miller
Luigi Nisoli
Obichukwu Nwazota
Amarjeet Singh
Jon Walters
David Wray

Technical Advisors

Deepa Agarwal (Mr. Singh)
Keith Billing (Mr. Babington)
Ellen Gorla (Ms. Miller)
Marta Kramerius (Mr. Nisoli)
Ki-Tae Park (Mr. Kim)
Andrew Pinkney (Mr. Walters)
Natashia Soopal (Ms. Adam)
Bruno Tesnière (Ms. Martin)
Atsushi Tomono (Mss. Borgerth and Imura)
Belinda Zohrab (Mr. Wijesinghe)

Non-Voting Observer

Present: Yohei Ito, Japanese Financial Services Agency (FSA)

Public Interest Oversight Board (PIOB) Observer

Present: Phillippe Christelle

IESBA and IFAC Staff

Present: James Gunn (Managing Director, Professional Standards), Ken Siong (Program and Senior Director), Rui Peres Jorge (Director, Strategy and Communications), Geoff Kwan (Director), Kam Leung (Director), Jon Reid (Director) Laura Leal, Szilvia Sramko, Carla Vijian, Jeanne Viljoen, Joanne Holt, Raquel Melo, Greg Walters, Elaine Cahoon (IESBA Staff Fellow), Astu Tilahun, Diana Vasquez
Zsolt Bobis (Communications Department, International Federation of Accountants (IFAC))

1. Opening Remarks

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Dias welcomed all participants and public observers to the second meeting of 2026. She extended a special welcome to former IESBA Technical Advisors Denise Canavan and Jens Engelhardt, both observing in person; and former IESBA members Mr. Rich Huesken and Ms. Liesbet Haustermans, both observing virtually. Mr. Siong introduced the new IESBA Senior Manager, Raquel Melo; and the IESBA Intern, Felicity Ong.

Ms. Dias then updated the Board on the activities of the Planning Committee during the quarter, including consideration of updates on various workstreams, including the Firm Culture and Governance (FCG) project, the workstreams on Role of Chief Financial Officers (CFOs), Technology and Private Equity Investment in Firms (PEI), an update on the International Foundation for Ethics and Audit (IFEA)-PIOB Structure and Governance Review, and an update on recent and upcoming outreach.

Ms. Dias also briefed the Board on the highlights of the Stakeholder Advisory Council (SAC) held in April and the IESBA-Jurisdictional Standard Setters (JSS) meetings held in April-May 2026.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The IESBA approved the minutes of the March 2026 public session as amended.

2. Firm Culture & Governance

REPORT BACK FROM FCG DIALOGUES AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

The IESBA considered the Project Team (PT)'s analysis of key stakeholder feedback gathered through the FCG dialogue series and other outreach activities since March 2026, an update on recent coordination with the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB), highlights from the PIOB's April 2026 memorandum on public interest issues on the project, and the findings from two "simulation" exercises relating to the IESBA's FCG Viewpoints (Viewpoints). The findings from the simulation exercises were presented by Dr. Christine Shaefer and Mr. Enrique Martínez-González, two human behavior experts who facilitated the exercises.

The IESBA was reminded of the background to the FCG project, including the identification of FCG as a "burning platform" issue during the consultation on the 2024-2027 Strategy and Work Plan and the approximately two and a half years of information gathering, including extensive stakeholder engagement. In this regard, Ms. Leung highlighted that the FCG dialogues included in-depth discussions with representatives from four targeted stakeholder groups. She noted that the feedback presented to the Board reflected an analysis of the key themes that emerged from the FCG dialogues and that it was not intended to be a quantitative assessment of the level of support for particular positions across different stakeholder groups.

IESBA members acknowledged the richness and diversity of the feedback gathered through the FCG dialogues and the broad stakeholder recognition of the importance of ethical culture in firms. It was noted that the key question was not whether further work on FCG would be warranted, but what the most appropriate way forward would be. It was also noted that there was broad stakeholder support for practical non-authoritative material (NAM), as well as a range of views on the location and related authority of a future FCG framework.

Among other matters, IESBA members raised the following:

- Proportionality and scalability of the FCG framework are important.

Ms. Leung responded that proportionality and scalability would be reflected in the future framework and that NAM could be tailored to small and medium practices (SMPs) on that basis. Ms. Dias added that the framework is intended to be principles-based to accommodate the differing circumstances of firms.

- Enforceability of the FCG framework across all of a firm's service lines would be important.

Ms. Dias and Mr. Wijesinghe, Board Advisor to the PT, referred to examples of jurisdictions in which certain non-audit service lines are subject to regulatory oversight. Ms. Leung further noted that Part 3 of the extant Code already applies to a firm as a whole.

- Feedback from the representatives of firms in the FCG dialogues appeared to focus more on concerns than on possible solutions for the way forward or the potential benefits of a future FCG framework.

Ms. Leung noted that stakeholders had expressed strong support for the development of NAM. Feedback from the focus group meetings with regulatory and firm representatives had also identified possible approaches if the FCG framework were to be in the Code, including hybrid, phased, and threshold-based approaches as explained in the agenda material.

- There was a suggestion that distilling the Viewpoints into higher-level enduring principles could address the feedback that some Viewpoints were too detailed or operational.

Ms. Leung noted that the PT had already begun work on developing potential enduring principles, as illustrated in the strawman of the framework in the agenda material. Ms. Dias added that drafting considerations would be addressed once the Board decides on the way forward.

- There is a need for clear communications on:
 - The objective of the project. In particular, care should be taken not to suggest that firms have inherently deficient ethical cultures. Instead, the FCG framework is intended to support firms in building and strengthening their ethical culture.
 - How any future FCG framework would complement, rather than duplicate, ISQM 1,¹ including how firms could leverage work already undertaken in implementing ISQM 1 when implementing the FCG framework.
 - The Board's decision on the way forward regarding the FCG framework.

PRESENTATION ON SIMULATION EXERCISES

Dr. Shaefer and Mr. Martínez-González from the firm Live Both And presented the findings from the two simulation exercises they facilitated on the Viewpoints. They noted broad support from participants for the concept of FCG. Among other matters, they also highlighted the following:

- A caution from participants to avoid a rigid, compliance-oriented checklist approach. Rather, it would be more impactful to provide a simple, clear, principles-based framework that could be adapted to

¹ ISQM 1, *Quality Management for Firms that Perform Audits or Reviews of Financial Statements, or Other Assurance or Related Services Engagements*

firms at different levels of ethical maturity. Such a framework could also support ongoing firm reflection and development.

- While the firms participating in the simulation exercises already had several FCG elements in place, there was not a sufficiently consistent pattern observed across the two simulations to conclude whether these elements were operating in a robust manner.
- Human and organizational pressures can contribute to the gap between written and lived culture. These pressures can also make it more difficult for people to speak up or hold others accountable, even when there is a general desire to act ethically.
- The FCG element of incentives and disincentives is important in supporting, rather than undermining, ethical behavior.
- It is important to use clear language and terminology within the Viewpoints since there is a differing understanding of the Code across service lines within firms. Further, generational, regional, and cultural differences can also affect how the concepts in the Viewpoints will be understood.

IESBA members welcomed the report. Among other matters, they raised comments or questions about the findings, including how a future FCG framework might be used or operate in practice based on the findings. In response, Dr. Shaefer and Mr. Martínez-González responded that a future FCG framework could:

- Potentially serve as a “scaffold” to strengthen firms’ existing ethical infrastructure. In addition, simple, clear materials and visual representations can help communicate the relationships among the FCG elements and make the framework easier to use in practice.
- Be anchored in principles while related guidance is created in collaboration with firms.
- Potentially serve as a tool for reflection to help firms assess their ethical maturity and as a community-building tool to help firms compare themselves to others and reflect on their FCG journey.

Ms. Dias thanked Dr. Shaefer and Mr. Martínez-González for their efforts and contributions in facilitating the simulation exercises and for their final report and recommendations, which the Board will further consider in developing the FCG framework and related NAM.

OPTIONS AND WAY FORWARD FOR AN FCG FRAMEWORK

The IESBA considered the PT’s proposed options and recommendation on how best to approach the development of an FCG framework in the public interest. The majority of IESBA members expressed support for the development of the FCG framework within the Code together with the development of practical NAM. Among other matters, IESBA members raised the following key comments:

- On the options relating to the development of an FCG framework outside the Code, some IESBA members preferred this approach for the following reasons:
 - The results from the simulation exercises indicate a need to allow stakeholders more time to engage with the FCG concepts before the development of a standard on FCG. Accordingly, NAM would be an appropriate starting point because it offers more flexibility for adoption and better addresses proportionality considerations.
 - The fundamental principles were considered sufficient.
 - By incorporating the FCG framework into the Code, the Code would be asking for certain outcomes within firms when it generally does not impose outcomes.

- On the options relating to developing an FCG framework within the Code:
 - The majority of IESBA members supported including a high level overarching requirement on FCG in the Code to provide an enduring, consistent global baseline for all firms. Having provisions addressing FCG in the Code would also provide an anchor for the development of future NAM. In contrast, placing the FCG framework outside the Code would result in fragmentation of application, thereby not achieving a global baseline for FCG.
 - Some IESBA members preferred the overarching provision to be in application material, noting the challenge of enforcing a requirement on FCG. In this regard, a few IESBA members noted that the responsibility for enforcement of FCG provisions in the Code would vary according to jurisdictional legal and regulatory frameworks. In some jurisdictions, enforcement of the Code may not only be a matter for regulators but could also fall within the remit of professional accountancy organizations (PAOs) that have the responsibility to investigate and discipline members who fail to adhere to professional standards.
 - A few IESBA members supported a detailed FCG framework within a separate section in the Code.
- The term “ethical culture” as used in the illustrative example for the PT’s recommendation was considered unclear, as determining what constitutes an ethical culture is inherently subjective. Therefore, it was suggested that the term should be defined if the FCG framework is to be developed within the Code to mitigate the risk of inconsistent interpretation and application.
- It would be important to develop the FCG framework using simple and clear language, avoiding it becoming a compliance exercise. In this regard, there was a suggestion to consider, to the extent relevant, the findings of a future post-implementation review (PIR) on ISQM 1.

On balance, after considering the feedback from the FCG dialogues, the insights from the simulation exercises, the PT’s analysis and recommendation, and the views expressed by IESBA members, the majority of the IESBA agreed to develop a single, high-level, overarching requirement and related application material in the Code to anchor the FCG framework in the Code, accompanied by practical NAM to support implementation of the framework.

Subject to agreeing the articulation of the proposed overarching requirement and related application material, the Board agreed to target approval of an exposure draft by December 2026.

PIOB OBSERVER’S REMARKS

Mr. Christelle appreciated the informed discussion and commended the IESBA for its careful consideration of the range of views expressed in reaching a way forward that serves the public interest. He also noted the importance of raising awareness on the topic of FCG. He added that many players in the ecosystem – firms, regulators, clients – play a role in that regard.

WAY FORWARD

The IESBA will consider a first-read draft of the proposed provisions in the Code addressing FCG as well as a draft NAM action plan at its September 2026 meeting.

3. Private Equity Investments in Accounting Firms

The Project Team provided an update on developments relating to private equity investment and external investments (PE&OEI) in accounting firms since the March 2026 meeting. The update included feedback from stakeholder outreach activities and the proposed Terms of Reference for the information-gathering workstream.

STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH

The Project Team summarized feedback received from various outreach activities conducted during the quarter.

Stakeholders generally expressed strong support for the IESBA's information-gathering initiative and acknowledged the growing significance of PEI in accounting firms globally. Stakeholders observed that PEI presents both opportunities and risks. Potential benefits identified included increased access to capital, investment in technology and innovation, enhanced capabilities, improved competitiveness, and opportunities for growth. At the same time, stakeholders highlighted concerns relating to auditor independence, confidentiality, conflicts of interest, investor influence, firm culture and governance, financial incentives, audit quality, and investor exit strategies.

Stakeholders emphasized the importance of maintaining a principles-based and substance-over-form approach. They encouraged close coordination with the FCG workstream and the IAASB. Several stakeholders also highlighted the importance of understanding investor motivations, evolving ownership arrangements, and regulatory responses across jurisdictions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

IESBA members expressed strong support for the information-gathering initiative and the proposed Terms of Reference. Among other matters, IESBA members raised the following:

- The pace of developments in this area is rapid, creating a need for the Board to be agile and responsive while ensuring that any future actions are supported by a robust evidence base.
- The focus should be on understanding the underlying characteristics, governance arrangements, incentives, and economic realities of PEI arrangements rather than the specific legal structures.
- Further consideration should be given to whether existing concepts and definitions in the Code remain sufficiently robust in light of evolving ownership models.
- The Project Team was encouraged to consider the impact of PEI arrangements on firm culture and governance, incentives, and professional behavior.
- It would be important to understand investor motivations, governance rights, and exit strategies, as well as confidentiality risks arising throughout the investment lifecycle.
- Consideration should be given to engaging directly with PE investors, firms that have received external investment, users of financial statements, and clients of PEI-backed firms.
- There should be close coordination with the FCG workstream. In addition, consideration should be given to whether interim NAM might be beneficial while the information-gathering work is ongoing.
- There is the potential to use AI and other technological tools to support information gathering and analysis.

After considering the comments and suggested refinements arising from the discussion, the IESBA approved the Terms of Reference for the PE&OEI information-gathering workstream.

PIOB OBSERVER'S REMARKS

Mr. Christelle noted the PIOB's support for the workstream and emphasized the importance of understanding the implications of PEI for audit quality and the public interest. He encouraged the IESBA to continue examining investor motivations, governance arrangements, and the potential impact of PEI on firm culture. He also highlighted the interaction between PEI developments and the FCG workstream.

WAY FORWARD

The IESBA will receive an update on the workstream's information gathering activities at its September 2026 meeting.

4. Technology

Ms. Dias introduced the session, emphasizing the importance of moving forward with the development of non-authoritative guidance on technology, noting that it is a fast-moving area that receives significant attention.

EDUCATIONAL PRESENTATION

The IESBA first received an educational presentation from Mr. Greg Walters on the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) as it applies to PAs. The presentation provided a brief overview of AI's history, international AI policies, ethical risks arising from AI, and the IESBA's response to technology developments across three mutually reinforcing fronts, namely developing a Code fit for purpose in the age of digitalization, continuous horizon scanning, and supporting awareness, adoption and implementation of the Code.

IESBA members welcomed the presentation and, among others matters, raised the following:

- Technology, particularly AI, has become a central strategic issue and should be treated as a top priority for standard-setting and guidance development.
- Regulators are increasingly focused on risks such as AI-enabled fraud and autonomous systems, requiring stronger oversight and ethical frameworks.
- AI adoption is accelerating faster than governance frameworks can adapt, creating a gap that increases risk exposure.
- The growing use of agentic AI systems and end-to-end automation have implications for professional judgment and accountability.
- There are key risks emerging from developments such as shadow AI, cybersecurity threats, and the complexities of digital assets and future technologies like quantum computing.
- Professional competence requirements are evolving, with a greater need to understand systems rather than just outputs.
- Most AI-related failures stem from human behavior, including over-reliance and lack of professional skepticism. In that regard, a concern raised was about 'cognitive surrender,' where professionals may defer judgment to AI tools due to their perceived reliability.

- In relation to the concept of human oversight, traditional 'human in the loop' models may need to evolve with more autonomous AI systems.
- Ethics is a human attribute. In that regard, the Code acts as a guide to human conduct rather than directly regulating AI systems.
- The existing Code remains fundamentally sound but requires additional supporting guidance.

OTHER UPDATES

The IESBA also considered updates from the Project Team on its activities since the March 2026 meeting, including stakeholder engagement and feedback from the Technology Experts Group (TEG) with respect to the TEG's environmental scanning.

DRAFT OVERARCHING NON-AUTHORITATIVE MATERIAL

The IESBA reviewed the draft overarching NAM on emerging technologies that the Project Team developed with input from the TEG. The Project Team suggested that the overarching NAM be finalized and published soon after the Board meeting, while a subsequent NAM focusing only on Artificial Intelligence would be targeted for finalization in the latter half of the year.

IESBA members supported the approach linking technology characteristics to ethical threats in the overarching NAM. In addition to drafting suggestions, they raised the following, among others:

- -The draft NAM should more clearly distinguish between individual and organizational responsibilities.
- Consideration should be given to whether the guidance places excessive responsibility on PAs, given organizational systems and controls.
- It is important to address data quality and bias, given that risks often arise from data rather than the technology itself.
- Consideration should be given to adding practical examples, improving the usability of the guidance, and ensuring clarity for users with varying levels of familiarity with the Code.

PIOB OBSERVER'S REMARKS

Mr. Christelle expressed great interest in the discussion and encouraged additional work from the Board on AI. He cautioned about avoiding extremes with the use of AI: either over-confidence with relying on it or complete rejection. He stressed the importance of keeping the human element ~~in~~ at the center of all decisions and not relying entirely on technology. He suggested that future AI guidance should emphasize data quality, including the avoidance of bias in data and data security.

WAY FORWARD

The IESBA agreed that technology should be a strategic priority but noted the need to balance priorities with available resources.

The IESBA will consider further updates from the TWG at its September 2026 meeting.

5. Trends and Risks Committee (TRC)

The Staff Insights Group supporting the Trends and Risks Committee (TRC) presented an update on the proposed structure and content of the TRC's biannual report, together with the key information to be

captured in a supporting database to facilitate the Committee's ongoing monitoring and analysis of emerging trends, risks, and opportunities.

During the presentation, Ms. Sramko invited IESBA members to support the development of a comprehensive and dynamic trends database by providing regular updates from their outreach activities and stakeholder engagements. She explained that the database was intended to serve as a key source of intelligence for the TRC's future work and the preparation of its biannual reports.

IESBA members broadly supported the proposed operating approach and the TRC's 2026 work plan. They raised, among others, the following matters:

- Future TRC reports should highlight not only emerging risks but also opportunities relevant to the IESBA's strategic objectives.
- The TRC should continue not only identifying trends, risks, and opportunities but also educating the Board on emerging developments, similar to the role previously performed by the Emerging Issues and Outreach Committee.
- In relation to the proposed database, how staff would access relevant studies and publications that are not publicly available and whether the use of such materials could raise copyright considerations.

Mr. Peres Jorge explained that the TRC's reports would aim to synthesize and analyze developments identified across a range of sources rather than present proposals based on individual articles or publications.

- A suggestion that the TRC explore subscribing to AI-enabled research databases to support the identification, compilation, and analysis of relevant information.

Ms. Dias emphasized the strategic importance of the TRC's work in providing evidence-based insights to inform the IESBA's future priorities and standard-setting agenda. She added that systematic horizon scanning and trend monitoring are essential functions of an international standard-setting organization.

WAY FORWARD

The TRC will present its first report on trends, risks and opportunities for the IESBA's consideration at its December 2026 meeting.

6. Strategy & Work Plan 2028-2031

Mr. Kwan and Ms. Sramko provided a high-level briefing on the responses to the joint IAASB and IESBA stakeholder survey to inform the Boards' 2028-2031 Strategies and Work Plans (SWPs).

IESBA members discussed the preliminary findings from the joint survey and shared observations on the survey results, stakeholder participation, and implications for future strategic planning. They raised, among others, the following:

- The Board should retain flexibility and resource capacity throughout the SWP period to respond to emerging issues. It is important that the IESBA remain agile in implementing the SWP and adapt its activities and responses as circumstances evolve.
- The responses and the ranking of the external trends were broadly in line with expectations. However, there is a need for caution against overinterpreting the survey rankings, given that priorities may differ between the IAASB and the IESBA. In addition, the Boards' strategic priorities should drive resource allocation.

- The relatively low participation from preparers and those charged with governance is notable. It was suggested that consideration be given to additional outreach to these stakeholder groups.

Ms. Dias and Mr. Siong noted that the Boards' strategic planning process is dynamic. They highlighted that there were several examples demonstrating the Boards' ability to adapt their work plans in response to emerging developments.

IESBA members also commented on the approach used for the joint survey. They generally supported the joint approach, noting that it reduced duplication for stakeholders. However, an IESBA member observed that responding to a survey covering both Boards' remits may have been challenging for some stakeholders. Another IESBA member suggested that the analysis of the responses should distinguish between respondents who completed only the IAASB or only the IESBA sections of the survey.

PIOB OBSERVER'S REMARKS

Mr. Christelle welcomed the preliminary survey analysis and considered the results encouraging. He also noted that PIOB approval of the SWP should not be viewed as limiting the Boards' ability to make modifications. Rather, he emphasized that any decisions to amend the work plan should be supported by clear rationales and appropriately communicated.

WAY FORWARD

At its September 2026 meeting, the IESBA will consider

- The full review and analysis of the responses to the joint survey; and
- A preliminary set of strategic drivers and objectives to inform the development of the consultation paper for the IESBA's 2028-2031 SWP.

7. Adoption & Implementation (A&I)

Mr. Singh, Chair of the Adoption & Implementation Working Group (A&I WG), provided a high-level update on the A&I WG's activities since March 2026.

Mr. Reid provided an update on stakeholder engagement and coordination activities, including with IFAC staff regarding adoption status reporting for the IESBA Code and IFAC's current project to revamp its adoption data collection activities and Statements of Membership Obligations (SMOs) compliance program. He also highlighted jurisdictional outreach activities (including feedback sought from IESBA members/Technical Advisors on proposed tailored correspondence with the 17 initial prioritized jurisdictions), quarterly updates and publication of the adoption status of the IESSA,² and ongoing development of jurisdictional profiles.

Ms. Cahoon then provided an update on the IESBA's *Partnership Framework for Promoting Adoption and Implementation of IESBA's Standards* ([Partnership Framework](#)). She highlighted the rigorous assessment and identification of prospective partners from key stakeholder groups using the WG's partnership criteria. Mr. Singh highlighted key feedback from the SAC meeting on [April 27, 2026](#) on the Partnership Framework, including the need to safeguard the independence of the IESBA's standard-setting work, whether the use of "partnerships" implies too close a relationship, and considerations relating to the operationalization of the

² International Ethics Standards for Sustainability Assurance (including International Independence Standards)

framework. He also outlined proposed next steps for the Partnership Framework, including a phased approach commencing with engagement with the initial eight prospective partners.

IESBA members raised the following queries or comments, among others:

- Whether IFAC's current reporting of the adoption status for the IESBA Code appropriately reflects jurisdictional realities and provides sufficient transparency of the extent of A&I. Comments raised included:
 - Jurisdictional specificities for adoption can be complex and nuanced due to various circumstances, including where non-IFAC member bodies might not adopt the Code, time is required for due process and translation activities, and jurisdiction-specific modifications are made to align with the local legal and regulatory framework.
 - The importance of reliable evidence supporting transparency, not only on adoption status but also on implementation, monitoring and enforcement. It was noted that the current reporting may not always fully reflect the extent of adoption and use of the Code.
 - The above issues contribute to an incomplete understanding of the IESBA Code's global influence, potentially affecting perceptions of its relevance and impact. These perceptions have, in turn, been reflected in narratives depicted by various stakeholders in different fora.
 - What the expected timeframe is regarding IFAC's revamp project, including on adoption of the IESBA Code.

Mr. Reid noted many of these concerns have been raised with IFAC staff and discussions are ongoing regarding adoption status definitions. Mr. Singh added there is a need for the IESBA to balance standard setting and implementation support.

Mr. Siong noted that regulators, including the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) Committee 1, and the Forum of Firms have requested better information on the IESBA Code adoption status. He requested IESBA staff to continue close coordination with IFAC staff, to provide an update on IFAC's timeline at the September 2026 IESBA meeting, and to request IFAC staff to present an update on IFAC's revamp project at the December 2026 IESBA meeting.

- Publishing more granular jurisdictional information on adoption regimes and related nuances for the IESSA and the IESBA Code may support transparency and stakeholders' understanding of adoption progress and implementation. This information would also inform targeted A&I outreach and other activities.

Mr. Singh noted that the A&I WG is considering how jurisdictional profiles and related information may be published and leveraged more broadly in the future. Mr. Reid observed that jurisdictional profiles, beyond the current focus on the IESSA, are being considered as part of the future SMART initiative on the "*Adoption Plan*."

With respect to the proposed operationalization of the Partnership Framework, including terminology, prioritization, and resource implications, there was:

- Broad agreement that using "partnership" would not hinder the IESBA's independence. However, there were suggestions to use alternative terminology or a qualifier to allow flexibility for the IESBA and partners, such as "Implementation Partner," for the A&I WG's consideration.
- Broad support for a phased approach beginning with the initial eight prospective partners. However,

consideration should be given to the fact that different partnerships will have different resource implications.

Mr. Singh emphasized that the Partnership Framework is intended to provide a structured and scalable approach to supporting A&I activities while maintaining appropriate safeguards to protect the IESBA's independence. He noted that the proposed partnerships would be with global and regional bodies having broad remits. The partnerships would focus on A&I of existing standards and would not extend to the IESBA's standard-setting work.

PIOB OBSERVER'S REMARKS

Mr. Christelle suggested greater consideration could be given to regulators as prospective partners under the Partnership Framework due to their influence on adoption. He specifically referred to the International Forum of Independent Audit Regulators (IFIAR).

Mr. Singh noted that regulators are an important stakeholder group and will also be considered in future phases of the Partnership Framework, including with respect to IFIAR.

WAY FORWARD

The IESBA supported the A&I WG's next steps, including progressing correspondence with prioritized jurisdictions and assessing A&I support requests, further developing jurisdictional profiles, continued quarterly publication of IESSA adoption status, and initiating a phased approach under the Partnership Framework.

A further update on A&I activities will be provided at the September 2026 IESBA meeting.

8. Role of CFOs

The IESBA considered an update on the academic research and literature review, feedback from outreach activities, the results of the extended surveys, the application of the IESBA SMART framework to the workstream, preliminary implications for the IESBA and the broader ecosystem, and proposed next steps towards the September 2026 Board meeting.

ACADEMIC RESEARCH AND LITERATURE REVIEW

[Dr. Mukesh Garg](#), Associate Professor, Department of Accounting, Monash University, Melbourne, presented the results of his academic research and literature review. He outlined the relevance of the fraud triangle, earnings management literature, governance-related research, CFO-specific academic literature, and the potential impacts of pressure, opportunity, and rationalization on CFOs' ethical decision-making.

IESBA members raised the following comments and suggestions, among other matters:

- A caution to avoid framing the workstream around any assumed increase in fraud or earnings management without a stronger evidential basis and to consider data on jurisdictional enforcement, settlement, or prosecution trends where available.

Dr. Garg noted while his research does not suggest an increase in fraud or earnings management, it indicates an increase in pressure, potential opportunities, and means of rationalization. Mr. Wray added that the research demonstrates the velocity and magnitude of changes and pressures affecting CFOs, that outreach suggests many pressure points are not recognized by CFOs, and that the fraud triangle applies to ethical issues beyond fraud.

- Global complexity has increased the complexity of the CFO role. While governance fails when it is weak, ill-defined, or shared resulting in a lack of clarity over responsibility, the Code cannot solve governance issues or determine how organizations and boards should function. Complexity alone does not necessarily indicate a gap in the Code and consideration should be given to explaining in the final report the distinctive ethical dimension of the evolving CFO role and what the IESBA can address within its remit. Another perspective was that the current global environment will likely increase corporate governance failures.

Mr. Wray noted that governance failures can increase the pressure on CFOs and the ethical response to such pressures is important to the IESBA.

- Whether corporate governance reforms and regulatory developments, including those following Sarbanes-Oxley and Dodd-Frank in the U.S. and similar frameworks in other jurisdictions, have improved, worsened, or changed the environment in which CFOs operate.

Dr. Garg noted that the literature indicates that the introduction of such frameworks from 2002 has resulted in a reduction of reported fraud and earnings and accruals management.

- Whether issues identified arise from technical competence gaps rather than lapses in ethical judgment. It was suggested that consideration be given in the final report to distinguishing technical issues from pressure and other ethical dimensions.

Dr. Garg noted that while the Code has very clear requirements with respect to professional competence and due care, awareness raising with CFOs on such requirements is critically important.

- With respect to CFOs who are either professional accountants in business (PAIBs) or not PAs:
 - A caution to avoid creating a perceived accountability gap as non-PA CFOs may be subject to other professional or company codes, regulatory requirements, certification obligations, and/or governance frameworks.
 - Whether the activities to date indicate whether PAIB CFOs are better equipped to address ethical challenges compared to non-PA CFOs.
 - There may be means for the IESBA to create impact indirectly beyond PAIBs in the public interest, for example via NAM.
 - An encouragement to consider whether there are jurisdictional definitions of CFOs or equivalent senior finance roles in law, regulation or governance frameworks, whether there are requirements for CFOs to be PAIBs, and to engage with relevant regulators.

Mr. Wray noted that the Project Team is looking at the CFO role in general, the respective ethical requirements for PA and non-PA CFOs, and any impacts of differences, while remaining mindful of the IESBA's mandate.

- With respect to whether the Code remains fit-for-purpose for the expanded CFO role:
 - The importance of assessing whether Part 2 of the Code continues to appropriately apply to the expanded role as changes to Part 2 have been consequential in nature since 2016.
 - A request to consider whether the scope of activities covered by the Code addresses CFOs' broader responsibilities, including strategy, technology, sustainability, risk, and operations.

- Whether issues identified indicate gaps in the Code, awareness and accessibility of the Code, practical application of the Code, or broader education support needs, and how the IESBA can address these matters.
- Whether the pressures CFOs face are temporary or structural in nature. In this regard, it was noted that while individual pressure points may change over time, the speed, complexity and concentration of pressures will likely remain.

Dr. Garg agreed that there is a difference. However, he noted that the limited academic literature on CFOs compared to that on boards, governance and CEOs, highlights the importance of the Project Team's stakeholder outreach, surveys, and jurisdictional research to supplement academic evidence.

STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH AND PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

The Project Team summarized key findings from outreach activities, including among other matters, that:

- CFOs remain responsible for core financial stewardship, reporting and controls. However, these responsibilities now sit alongside wider responsibilities for strategy, enterprise risk, sustainability, technology, data, stakeholder engagement, organizational culture and ethical leadership.
- The ethical issues identified are not generally new, but the speed, complexity and concentration of pressures make it harder to identify and address them in real time. CFOs often encounter difficult situations where the ethical dimension may not be recognized immediately or where conduct may be rationalized in terms of commercial or organizational pressures.
- CFOs may face multiple and sometimes conflicting expectations from CEOs, boards, shareholders, founders, governments, regulators, auditors, and other stakeholders.
- Role concentration, particularly CFOs also performing CEO, COO, technology, sustainability or risk-related functions, may weaken safeguards such as segregation of duties, independent challenge, or specialist review.
- Governance, tone at the top, ownership structures, incentives, escalation mechanisms and organizational culture can either support or weaken CFOs' ethical decision-making.
- The Code's principles-based framework continues to be viewed as relevant. However, many CFOs do not use it as a live reference for ethical issues. Instead, CFOs often refer to internal policies, company codes, local or PAO codes, peers, and personal judgment.
- Participants consistently identified case studies, concise guidance, digital tools, scenario-based learning, and peer-learning opportunities as potentially useful forms of additional support.

IESBA members raised the following comments and suggestions, among other matters:

- A recent UK report on FTSE companies indicates that the average tenure of CFOs is 3.7 years and that CFO roles often lead to CEO roles. There was a question as to whether such short tenure and short-term focus on profits versus long term sustainability exacerbates some of the issues identified.

Mr. Reid noted similar feedback from the Latin American roundtable on short tenure and whether a potential reason for this is the pressures CFOs face. Mr. Wray added that CFOs of listed companies generally have previous experience as CFOs in SMEs and the pressures faced in listed companies compared to SMEs could impact tenure.

- Whether greater granularity could be provided with respect to CFOs' sources of ethical guidance outside of the Code, the proportion of CFOs who may lack awareness of the Code and revisions therein, and the extent of use of the Code to address ethical issues in real time.

Ms. Dias and Mr. Siong shared insights from stakeholder outreach, including that other ethical guidance may not be as robust as the Code and/or have different objectives than the public interest, and that CFOs often act on instinct, especially when grounded in the Code. Mr. Siong noted that CFOs often face difficulties when company interests do not align with the Code's expectations of the PAIB CFO. He added that the circumstances in which the CFO operates impact ethical decision making, such as in highly regulated industries.

EXTENDED SURVEY RESULTS, SMART APPLICATION, PRELIMINARY IMPLICATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Ms. Vijian summarized the extended survey results for CFOs and other stakeholders. The extended surveys broadened the response base from the earlier CFO pulse survey but remained indicative rather than globally representative. She highlighted some limitations, including jurisdictional weighting, possible overlap between survey populations, and differences between CFO and other stakeholder responses.

Ms. Vijian also explained the Project Team's application of the IESBA's SMART Framework to the workstream, including tailored stakeholder identification, use of multiple outreach channels, preparation of targeted outreach materials, post-event summaries, and follow-up activities to address evidence gaps. She noted that given the nature of the information gathering phase of this initiative, the adoption pillar is being considered through a stakeholder responsiveness and engagement lens rather than adoption of a standard.

Mr. Reid highlighted the Project Team's assessment of preliminary implications for the IESBA and the broader ecosystem, including PAOs, JSS, regulators, and IFAC with respect to awareness of the Code, continuing professional development (CPD), professional ethical requirements, practical support, and potential NAM. He also outlined the Project Team's planned next steps towards the final report.

IESBA members raised the following comments and suggestions, among other matters:

- The final report should identify survey limitations, whether responses were submitted by individuals or on behalf of organizations, and the relative weight to be placed on the earlier CFO pulse survey.
- While the practical support to CFOs highlighted could be useful, consideration should be given to whether the IESBA has the capability and resources to deliver such outputs, and with respect to any leadership-oriented, collaborative approach, whether the IESBA will need to leverage relationships with IFAC, PAOs, regulators, CFO networks or other organizations.
- Some matters identified may be relevant to other IESBA workstreams, namely A&I, Technology, FCG, restructured Code and NOCLAR PIRs, and Code simplification.
- There was an encouragement for the planned further outreach, including the Africa roundtable.

IESBA members also supported the application of the SMART Framework to the workstream and complimented the Project Team on the tailored outreach and mobilization achieved.

WAY FORWARD

The Project Team will present its final report and recommendations at the September 2026 IESBA.

PIOB OBSERVER'S REMARKS

Mr. Christelle encouraged the Project Team to clarify in the final report what the IESBA aims to achieve with this workstream, to address any stakeholder confusion about its purpose. He added that consideration should be given to whether the aim is to reinforce ethical responsibilities with respect to CFOs' traditional role and financial reporting, or to address new ethical issues arising from the evolved and expanded role within the IESBA's remit. He also observed that the CFO role is not static and varies across organizations and jurisdictions.

Ms. Dias indicated that the Project Team will address this question in the final report and develop recommendations aligned to the IESBA's mandate. She added that while some stakeholders have recently raised skepticism about whether this workstream falls within the IESBA's mandate, there was broad support to undertake this work via the IESBA SWP 2024-2027.

9. Part 4B Sustainability

Mss. Sramko and Cahoon presented the Project Team's final report on its information-gathering activities relating to sustainability assurance engagements (SAEs) outside the scope of the International Independence Standards (IIS) in the IESSA. They summarized the objectives of the information-gathering exercise, the outreach undertaken with JSS, practitioners, the IESSA Implementation Monitoring Advisory Group (IIMAG), regional PAOs and other stakeholders, and the analysis of information obtained from IFAC's State of Play research. They also presented the Project Team's conclusions.

The Project Team noted that the information gathered indicates that the market for such SAEs remains relatively limited and continues to evolve. Most respondents considered it too early to determine whether additional independence provisions would be needed beyond Part 4B of the Code. While a small number of respondents identified possible areas where future guidance may be helpful, no significant or pervasive gaps in the Code were identified. The Project Team therefore recommended that the IESBA not initiate a standard-setting project at this time and instead continue monitoring market developments and implementation experience with respect to the IESSA.

In accepting the Project Team's final report recommendation, IESBA members raised the following comments and observations, among others:

- A significant amount of outreach had been undertaken despite the limited availability of relevant information.
- Given the current state of the market and the absence of compelling evidence of independence issues outside the scope of the IIS in the IESSA, initiating a standard-setting project at this stage would be premature.
- The Board should continue monitoring the implementation of the IESSA and developments in sustainability assurance markets before reconsidering whether further action may be warranted.
- The regulatory and market landscape for sustainability assurance has changed significantly since the IESBA commenced the project to develop the IESSA, including slower-than-anticipated expansion of mandatory sustainability reporting and assurance across jurisdictions. Further regulatory and market developments should inform the Board's future prioritization decisions.
- While a limited number of respondents had identified possible areas where implementation support or guidance could be beneficial, including matters relating to the application of Part 4B to SAEs outside the scope of the IIS in the IESSA, the matters these respondents raised did not presently

justify amendments to the Code.

- There should be continued engagement with regulators, practitioners, the IIMAG, PAOs and other stakeholders so that the Board remains responsive should market conditions or public interest considerations change.

Mss. Sramko and Cahoon indicated that the implementation experience with respect to the IESSA over the coming years would likely provide a stronger evidence base for any future assessment of the need to revise Part 4B.

PIOB OBSERVER'S REMARKS

Mr. Christelle commended the Board for reaching its decision based on available evidence and having considered whether there was a demonstrated need for a standard-setting project.

WAY FORWARD

The Board noted that developments in the sustainability assurance landscape would continue to be monitored through the IIMAG and other stakeholder feedback channels. The Board also noted that relevant market developments could be identified through the Board's Trends and Risks Committee for future consideration.

10. IESSA Implementation Monitoring Advisory Group

Mr. Nisoli, Chair of the IIMAG, and Ms. Sramko, IIMAG Staff Lead, provided an overview of the implementation matters identified by the IIMAG since the December 2025 Board meeting. They also briefed the IESBA on the IIMAG's proposed actions to address those matters, including the development of additional questions and answers (Q&A's) and ongoing coordination with the IAASB to promote consistent implementation of the IESSA and ISSA 5000.³

IESBA members supported the development of additional Q&As that respond to common implementation questions. Among others, IESBA members raised the following queries or comments:

- In developing the Q&As, care should be taken to avoid interpretations that could inadvertently change the requirements of the Code.
- It is important to maintain close coordination with the IAASB so that implementation materials are aligned and consistent where common issues arise.
- There was an encouragement to continue monitoring implementation experience and emerging practice issues through the IIMAG and other implementation channels as jurisdictions begin applying the IESSA.

Mr. Nisoli and Ms. Sramko explained that the proposed Q&As would be developed in coordination with the IAASB and, where appropriate, include joint Q&As. They also noted that additional implementation questions would continue to be monitored as jurisdictions gain further experience implementing the IESSA.

³ International Standard on Sustainability Assurance (ISSA) 5000, *General Requirements for Sustainability Assurance Engagements*

PIOB OBSERVER'S REMARKS

Mr. Christelle acknowledged the importance of the initiative and welcomed the close coordination with the IAASB throughout the development of the implementation support materials.

WAY FORWARD

A further update on IIMAG activities will be provided in due course.

11. IESBA SMART

Ms. Dias introduced the session by noting the importance of continuing to operationalize the SMART Framework and embed it in the IESBA's projects, processes, and ways of working. Mr. Peres Jorge noted that SMART is about changing the way the IESBA thinks and works in developing its projects, including through initiatives that promote SMART and strengthen the IESBA's organizational capacity.

EMBEDDING SMART IN CURRENT INITIATIVES

Ms. Vijian and Mr. Kwan provided an update on the application of SMART to current projects, including the Role of CFOs workstream and the PIR workstreams. Ms. Vijian noted that the pilots helped the project teams apply SMART in practice and consider how the SMART pillars guide stakeholder engagement, evidence gathering, communications and Board reporting.

IESBA members welcomed the progress made in applying SMART to current initiatives. Among other matters, IESBA members raised the following:

- SMART is already contributing to simplification and improved communication and is making Board materials easier to read and use.
- In response to a question about areas of improvement, Ms. Vijian noted that the application of SMART to the Role of CFOs workstream has helped the Project Team be more intentional in stakeholder outreach and in how messages are framed for different audiences.
- Consideration should be given to whether the SMART Framework can be applied across the Board's work, rather than only at the individual project level, to avoid overlapping activities.
- The adoption pillar should be considered across project lifecycle stages. Projects may provide opportunities to understand how the Code has been implemented, adopted, and applied in practice, including in relation to PAIBs and the Code's structure.

STREAM 2 INSTITUTIONAL CAPABILITY TOOLS AND PROCESSES

Ms. Vijian noted that Stream 2 is focused on building the tools, templates and internal infrastructure needed to make SMART easier to apply consistently across the IESBA's work. She emphasized that this work involves the broader staff team and is intended to provide practical tools that can be adapted by project type, initiative type and lifecycle stage.

Ms. Cahoon presented the Implementation Aid Kit Checklist initiative. She explained that the checklist is intended to help project teams consider the range of implementation support options relevant to a project or initiative. The checklist would allow teams to consider available alternatives and select what is needed, recognizing that not every project will require the same implementation support.

Ms. Sramko presented the Mobilization Analytics Dashboard initiative. She explained that the dashboard is intended to help project teams and the Board better understand stakeholder engagement at the project level. She noted that although outreach information is already reported to the Board, there is currently no tool that provides a project-level snapshot of these activities.

Mr. Reid provided an update on the A&I-related initiatives, including the partnership plan, jurisdictional and stakeholder matrix, and adoption plan. He noted that the partnership plan has completed the first part of the process and will move to onboarding, with an updated 2027 plan expected by December 2026. He also noted that the jurisdictional and stakeholder matrix will support prioritization, and that the adoption plan will build on the jurisdictional profiles being developed with respect to the IESBA's sustainability-related standards. He emphasized that these three initiatives are interrelated: the jurisdictional and stakeholder matrix will shape the adoption and partnership plans, and information from those plans will also shape the matrix.

Mr. Peres Jorge provided an update on other SMART priority initiatives. He noted that the Key Messaging Repository is already updated with information on three projects. This is in addition to the development of snapshots, which explain the IESBA's work in simple language. He also highlighted that the Staff Insights Group, which supports the Trends and Risks Committee, the high-level communications and stakeholder engagement plan, and the updated communications procedures and style guides were already in place supporting the IESBA's activities.

Mr. Peres Jorge also noted that further initiatives would commence in the second half of 2026.

The IESBA welcomed the update and expressed strong support for the efforts made. Among other matters, IESBA members raised the following:

- SMART had helped make Board materials more readable, accessible and useful. The initiative to develop more visibility around mobilization was welcomed.
- The development of methodology and supporting tools is important to promote efficiency, effectiveness and consistency across the IESBA's work. A consolidated repository of information serves as a single source of Board information and helps ensure consistency in external messaging.
- Consideration should be given to the horizontal dimension of the work, including how the mobilization database, IFAC customer relationship management (CRM) developments and related processes can operate coherently across projects, with easy entry points and automation where possible.
- Website and stakeholder communications should continue to become more accessible, timely and user-friendly, including through search functionality that better reflects non-technical terms, shorter and more visual content, and more proactive communications to alert stakeholders in advance when the Board will be discussing significant matters.
- Staff should feel empowered to reduce background and historical recap material in Board presentations, particularly where members have already read the papers, so that Board discussion can focus on the key issues requiring input or direction.
- The rollout of SMART should be staggered and proportionate, considering resource constraints and the need for stakeholders to adjust to new ways of receiving and using information. Staff should consider what is being well received by the market and what is not, so that future communication and engagement activities can be informed by stakeholder needs.

Suggestions were also provided for staff to consider how to increase the visibility of its work, such as changes to the website and new staff publications such as the proportionality document.

Ms. Dias emphasized the focus on strategic communication brought about by the SMART initiatives, helping to bring the IESBA's work closer to stakeholders, making it more accessible, creating more awareness, and supporting dialogue.

WAY FORWARD

The IESBA will consider further updates from staff at its September 2026 meeting.

12. Strategic Priorities

Ms. Dias commenced the session by explaining that the purpose of the session was not to make decisions, but to obtain the Board's views on strategic priorities, resource allocation and future direction. She also emphasized that priorities should be revisited regularly because needs, circumstances and available resources change over time.

STRATEGIC PRIORITIZATION

IESBA members expressed support for a more disciplined approach to workstream prioritization and emphasized that this would require the Board to make choices rather than attempt to advance all workstreams at the same time. Other comments or observations raised included the following:

- Continuing to add new workstreams to the work plan without removing others would create an ongoing backlog.
- Whether the Board can realistically pursue all workstreams and precommitments in the current SWP period, given resource constraints. There was a suggestion that precommitments not yet commenced may be deferred, reprioritized or removed from the work plan so that resources can be focused on the highest priority activities.
- The degree of urgency should also be considered when assessing the level of priority, as illustrated by the PEI and sustainability workstreams.

IESBA members also raised the following comments about specific workstreams:

- **Technology:** While there was broad recognition of its importance, stakeholder expectations regarding the areas of focus remain unclear. Also, further information gathering and analysis may be needed to determine the most appropriate response.
- **PEI in Accounting Firms:** Given the pace of market developments, the PEI workstream may warrant greater priority and additional resources. External support for research and information-gathering activities was also raised as a possible way to reduce demand on staff capacity.
- **FCG:** This workstream is in active development and should not be delayed.
- **A&I:** There was a suggestion to place greater emphasis on supporting adoption and implementation vs. standard setting, including awareness-raising and the development of NAM and other practical implementation support.
- **PIRs:** While PIRs play an important role in assessing the effectiveness of standards and informing possible further actions, there is a need to avoid "PIR fatigue" through appropriate sequencing.

- **Other workstreams:** The Part 4B Sustainability and CIVs workstreams are examples of the Board pausing or slowing down a workstream. In this regard, there was a suggestion for the CIVs workstream to be discontinued rather than remain in a holding pattern.

PRIORITIZATION APPROACH

IESBA members discussed a number of approaches that may assist prioritization and resource allocation. These include the use of scoring methodologies and visual tools such as heat maps or traffic-light approaches. In addition, there was also a suggestion to consider the concept of a minimum viable product, focusing on the minimum outcome required for success before pursuing additional work over time.

IESBA members also considered different factors that could be used as criteria for determining workstream priorities, including:

- The level of public interest as the primary consideration when determining priorities and allocating resources across workstreams and activities.
- The extent to which a workstream delivers value, addresses stakeholder needs and contributes to protecting the public interest.
- The level of risk associated with an issue and whether it may warrant a faster or more significant Board response.
- The effort and resources required to undertake a workstream.

CAPACITY AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

IESBA members agreed that identified priorities should be advanced based on a realistic assessment of the available staff capacity, taking into account that staff resources are also deployed to support a variety of other IESBA activities such as stakeholder outreach, coordination with the IAASB, quarterly engagements with the PIOB, Planning Committee meetings, production of the IESBA handbook and annual report, etc. In addition, staff time needs to be set aside for annual leave and learning and development activities. It was acknowledged that the Board needs a clearer understanding of the available capacity before determining how many new workstreams can realistically be initiated.

Other comments raised included the following:

- It may be helpful to rank the workstreams so that the highest priority workstreams are resourced first before other workstreams. However, it was noted that the Board should also set aside some spare capacity to be able to respond timely to any unplanned developments.
- The current work plan should not be compared directly to earlier work plans without recognizing the shift to a staff-driven operating model.
- Investments in AI, project management tools and CRM systems may help improve capacity and efficiency over time. However, these initiatives would themselves require resources and training. They should therefore be considered alongside other priorities when allocating resources.

IESBA members also suggested that capacity could be supplemented through the use of partnerships and external experts for the co-creation of NAMs, other outputs as well as for research. The use of staff fellows was also raised as a means to supplement existing staff resources. However, it was cautioned that partnerships and external experts are not cost-free as they may require significant effort to manage and oversee.

WAY FORWARD

The IESBA leadership and staff will present a more structured proposal on prioritization and resource allocation at the September 2026 meeting.

13. PIOB Observer's Remarks

Reflecting on his first observation of an IESBA meeting, Mr. Christelle expressed a very positive impression of the Board and its work. He commended the Board on the quality of the discussions and the strong involvement, commitment, and attention demonstrated by IESBA members throughout the meeting.

Mr. Christelle acknowledged the challenges of reaching consensus among a diverse Board. He complimented IESBA members for their dedication in navigating different perspectives and finding a path forward.

Mr. Christelle also recognized the IESBA Chair's leadership and the support of IESBA staff. He acknowledged the progress being made by the Board in advancing its work in the public interest.

14. Closing Remarks

Ms. Dias thanked Mr. Christelle for his remarks and emphasized the importance of the PIOB's continued support as the Board advances its work.

Ms. Dias recognized Mr. Ito's role as an IESBA participant on the occasion of his final meeting as the Japanese FSA Observer. She thanked him for his contributions to the Board's work and for helping to strengthen the relationship between the IESBA and the JFSA. She conveyed the Board best wishes for the future to Mr. Ito.

Ms. Dias then thanked all IESBA members for their strong engagement, commitment, and preparation throughout the meeting. She highlighted the open and constructive discussions and the Board's continued ability to work through different perspectives to reach a collective way forward. She also noted the importance of the meeting's decisions and strategic discussions in informing the Board's future work.

Ms. Dias also thanked IESBA staff for their hard work in preparing for and supporting the meeting. Finally, she thanked IFAC for hosting the meeting.

15. Next Meeting

The next IESBA meeting is scheduled for September 14-18, 2026, to be held in person in Madrid, Spain.