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**Summary of Peer Review Programs**

**Overview of Society of Louisiana CPAs Peer Review Program**

The Society of Louisiana CPAs Peer Review Program was formed in 1989, to administer the AICPA Peer Review Program. Society of Louisiana CPA member firms are enrolled in the AICPA Peer Review Program.

The Society of Louisiana CPAs serves as the administering entity for the AICPA Peer Review Program in Louisiana.

The Louisiana State Board of Accountancy (BOA) requires all firms permitted in Louisiana, who provide attestation services, be enrolled in a practice monitoring program. The BOA has designated the Society of Louisiana CPAs Peer Review Committee (LCPA PRC) as an authorized report acceptance body to approve peer review reports issued for firms enrolled in the peer review program.

The Society of Louisiana CPAs agrees to follow the AICPA “Standards for Performing and Reporting on Peer Reviews” and related guidance when administering the AICPA Peer Review Program in Louisiana.

**Oversight of Peer Reviews and Reviewers**

**Oversight Selection**

The Society of Louisiana CPAs Peer Review Committee established Oversight Policies for the selection of peer reviews and reviewers for oversight based on the criterion as outlined in Chapter 2 of the AICPA Peer Review Program Oversight Handbook.

Both firms and peer reviewers are subject to oversight. Oversight on system reviews may include visiting the firm as part of the peer review process (on-site oversight) or reviewing specific engagement(s) (engagement oversight). Engagement oversight is generally performed after a system review is complete. Oversight on engagement reviews includes a review of the reports and financial statements as well as certain workpapers and is generally performed after the review is complete.

Firms may be selected for oversight based on several factors including but not limited to the types of peer review reports previously received, a member of the firm performs multiple peer reviews, high risk engagements performed by the firm, or the fact that it’s the firm’s first peer review.

Reviewers may be selected randomly or due to other factors including but not limited to frequent submission of pass reports, conducting reviews for firms with audits in high-risk industries, performance of their first peer review, or performing high volumes of reviews. Oversight of a reviewer can also occur due to performance deficiencies such as issuance of an inappropriate peer review report or failure to properly reach the appropriate conclusion during a review.

**Oversight Process**

A member of the Society of Louisiana CPAs Peer Review Committee or other approved qualified individual will perform the oversight. For system reviews and must-­select engagement oversights, the individual must meet the requirements for serving as a team captain and have the appropriate industry experience.

The AICPA Peer Review Program Oversight Checklists are utilized on all oversight engagements. Oversight reports are tracked and maintained in an electronic file in the AICPA Peer Review Information Application (PRIMA). The reviewer is expected to respond to the oversight comments within 14 days of receiving the report via PRIMA.

**Minimum Requirements**

At a minimum, the Society of Louisiana CPAs Peer Review Program is required to conduct oversight on 2% of all reviews performed in a twelve-­month period, and within the 2% selected, there must be at least two of each type of peer reviews evaluated (system and engagement reviews).

Also, at least two system reviews must be conducted on--site and include a review of the complete peer review process, including attendance at the exit conference. An engagement oversight (performed either off-­site or on-­site) is the review of all peer reviewer workpapers and the reviewed firm’s financial statements and working papers on the engagement. Oversight of engagement reviews includes a review of the selected financial statements and engagement working papers prepared by the reviewed firm that the review captain previously reviewed, as well as the peer review report and complete reviewer’s working papers.

**Annual Verification of Reviewers’ Resumes**

To qualify as a reviewer, an individual must be an AICPA member and have at least five years of recent experience in the practice of public accounting in accounting or auditing functions. The firm that the member is associated with must have received a pass report on either its most recent system or engagement review. The reviewer should obtain at least 48 hours of continuing professional education in subjects related to accounting, auditing, and quality control every three years, with a minimum of 8 hours each year. All team and review captains must meet the ongoing training requirements including applicable must-select engagements’ peer review update training. All reviewers with governmental or employee benefit plan industries included on their resume must also be a member of the requisite Audit Quality Center of the AICPA.

A reviewer of an engagement in a high-­risk industry should possess not only current knowledge of professional standards but also current knowledge of the accounting practices specific to that industry. In addition, the reviewer of an engagement in a high-­risk industry should have current practice experience in that industry. If a reviewer does not have such experience, the reviewer may be called upon to justify why he or she should be permitted to review engagements in that industry. The Society of Louisiana CPAs Peer Review Committee has the authority to decide whether a reviewer’s or review team’s experience is sufficient to perform a particular review.

Ensuring that reviewers’ resumes are updated annually and are accurate is a critical element in determining if the reviewer or review team has the appropriate knowledge and experience to perform a specific peer review. In accordance with AICPA Oversight Handbook, Chapter 2, the Society of Louisiana CPAs Peer Review Program must verify information within a sample of reviewers’ resumes on an annual basis.

Verification procedures include:

* The reviewer providing specific information such as the type and number of engagements they are specifically involved with and in what capacity. The information is compared with the information on the reviewer resume located in PRIMA and to the reviewer firm’s most recent background information to determine if the reviewer’s firm performed those engagements during its last peer review period.
* Determining the reviewers’ qualifications and experience related to engagements performed under GAGAS (including single audits), audits of employee benefit plan under ERISA, audits of insured depository institutions subject to the FDICIA of 1991, audits of broker-dealers, and examinations of service organizations (Service Organization Control SOC 1 and 2 engagements).
* Inquiring which state(s) the reviewer has a license to practice as a certified public accountant (this may include requesting copies of their license.
* Obtaining a list of continuing professional education (CPE) courses completed over a three-­year period, to document the required 48 CPE hour credits related to accounting, auditing, and quality control are obtained every three years with at least 8 hours each year, including CPE from a qualified peer reviewer training course; annual peer review update course; annual must select training and to document qualifications to perform Yellow Book audits, if applicable. Reviewers may be requested to also provide CPE certificates of completion.
* Determining whether the reviewer is a partner or manager in a firm enrolled in a practice monitoring program.
* Determine if the reviewer’s firm is a member of the applicable AICPA’s audit quality center(s) if governmental or employee benefit plans are included on the reviewer’s resume.
* Verifying that the reviewer’s firm received a pass report on its most recently completed peer review.
1. Number of Enrolled Firms by Number of Professionals\*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Number of Professionals** | **PRIMA Firm Listing Report**  |
| Sole Practitioners |  127 |
| 2 – 5 |  174 |
| 6- 10 |  60 |
| 11- 19 |  37 |
| 20 - 49 | 12 |
| 50 – 99 |  03 |
| 100 + |  01 |
| **Total of Enrolled Firms** |  **414** |

PRIMA Firm Listing Report

\* Professionals are considered all personnel who perform professional services, for which the firm is responsible, whether or not they are CPAs.

 2. Results of Peer Reviews Performed

a. Results by Type of Peer Review and Report Issued

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **PRIMA Results** |
| **System Reviews:** |  |
| Pass | 39 |
| Pass with deficiency(ies) | 02 |
| Fail | 00 |
| **Subtotal –System** | 41 |
|  |  |
| **Engagement Reviews:** |  |
| Pass | 52 |
| Pass with deficiency(ies) | 05 |
| Fail | 01  |
| **Subtotal – Engagement** | 58 |
|  |  |
| **Total** | **99** |

**Results of Peer Reviews Performed During Year**

b. Number and Reasons for Report Modifications

The following lists the reasons for report modifications (that is, pass with deficiency(ies) or fail reports) from system reviews performed for the period covered summarized by elements of quality control as defined by QC section 10. A system review includes determining whether the firm’s system of quality control for its accounting and auditing practice is designed and complied with to provide the firm with reasonable assurance of performing and reporting in conformity with applicable professional standards, including QC section 10, in all material respects. QC section 10 states that the quality control policies and procedures applicable to a professional service provided by the firm should encompass the following elements: leadership responsibilities for quality within the firm (“the tone at the top”); relevant ethical requirements; acceptance and continuance of client relationships and specific engagements; human resources; engagement performance; and monitoring. Because pass with deficiency(ies) or fail reports can have multiple reasons identified, the numbers contained in this exhibit will exceed the number of pass with deficiency(ies) or fail system reviews listed in other areas of the report.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reasons for Report Modifications** | **PRIMA Results** |
| Engagement Performance | 02 |
| Relevant ethical requirements | 00 |
| Human Resources | 00 |
| Acceptance & Continuance of Clients & Engagements | 00 |
| Monitoring | 00 |
| Leadership Responsibilities for Quality | 00 |
| **Total** | **02** |

c. Number of Engagements Not Performed or Reported on in Accordance with Professional Standards

The following shows the total number of engagements reviewed (system reviews and engagement reviews) and the number identified as Not Performed in Accordance with Professional Standards in all material respects. The Standards state that an engagement is ordinarily considered not performed or reported in accordance with applicable professional standards in all material respects when issues, individually or in aggregate, exist that are material to understanding the report or the financial statements accompanying the report, or represents omission of a critical accounting, auditing, or attestation procedure required by professional standards.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of Non- Conforming Engagements** |  **PRIMA Results** |
| **Level of Service** | **# Reviewed**  | **# Non-Conforming**  |
| Agreed-upon Procedures Engagements | 10 | 00 |
| Agreed-upon Procedures Engagements (SSAE) | 00 | 00 |
| All others subject to GAS | 30 | 06 |
| Attestation Engagements (Examination, Review, or Agreed-upon Procedures under GAS) | 38 | 01 |
| Compilations Omit Disclosures (Engagement Reviews) | 101 | 04 |
| Compilations with Disclosures (Engagement Reviews) | 06 | 00 |
| Compilations of Prospective Financial Statements | 01 | 00 |
| Compilations Omit Disclosures (System Reviews) | 55 | 01 |
| Compilations with Disclosures (System Reviews) | 24 | 00 |
| Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA): Defined Benefit Plans | 02 | 00 |
| Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA): Defined Contribution Plans (403(b) plans only) | 01 | 01 |
| Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA): Defined Contribution Plans (excluding 403(b) plans) | 17 | 03 |
| Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA): Employee Stock Ownership Plans (ESOP) | 01 | 00 |
| Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA): Health and Welfare | 04 | 02 |
| Examination Engagements | 01 | 00 |
| Examination of Service Organization Control Reports (SOC Reports):SOC 1 | 00 | 00 |
| FDICIA Audits of Federally Insured Depository Institutions (with more than $500 million or greater, but not more than $1 billion in beginning total assets) | 01 | 00 |
| OMB Single Audit Engagements | 27 | 08 |
| Other Audits Under Statements on Auditing Standards | 26 | 02 |
| Preparation Engagements Omit Disclosures | 08 | 00 |
| Preparation Engagements with Disclosures | 01 | 00 |
| Preparation of financial statements that omit substantially all Disclosures (with or without disclaimer reports) | 02 | 00 |
| Reviews of financial statements (System Reviews) | 38 | 00 |
| Reviews of financial statements (Engagement Reviews) | 09 | 02 |
| **Totals** | **411** | **31** |

d) Summary of Required Follow-­up Actions

The Peer Review Committee is authorized by the Standards to decide on the need for and nature of any additional follow-­up actions required as a condition of acceptance of the firm’s peer review. During the report acceptance process, the peer review committee evaluates the need for follow-­up actions based on the nature, significance, pattern, and pervasiveness of engagement deficiencies. The peer review committee also considers the comments noted by the reviewer and the firm’s response thereto. If the firm’s response contains remedial actions

which are comprehensive, genuine, and feasible, then the committee may decide to not recommend further follow-­up actions. Follow-­up actions are remedial and educational in nature and are imposed in an attempt to strengthen the performance of the firm. A review can have multiple follow-­up actions. For 2020, the following represents the type of follow-­up actions required.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Follow-up Action** |  **PRIMA** **Results** |
| Agree to Pre-issuance Review by TC/Outside Party | 04 |
| Join EBPAQC | 00 |
| Join GAQC | 01 |
| Other | 00 |
| Submit Copy of Inspection Report to Committee | 01 |
| Submit Inspection Report to TC/Outside Party for Review | 01 |
| Submit Monitoring Report to Committee | 00 |
| Submit Proof of Certain CPE Taken | 21 |
| Submit to TC/Outside Party Post-issuance Review of Subsequent Engagements w/ wp's | 02 |
| TC/Outside Party Review Correction of Non-Conforming Engagements | 03 |
| **Total** | **33** |

Summary of Required Follow Up Actions Reports

(TC=Team Captain; FFC= Finding for Further Consideration)

**III. Oversight Results**

1. Peer reviews

AICPA Member Firms

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of PeerReview(SYS, ENG)** | **Total Number ofOversightsPerformed** | **OversightIncluded Must SelectEngagement(ERISA, GAGAS, FDICA) NONE)** |
| System | **2** | **1** |
| Engagement | **2** |  |

1. Verification of reviewer’s resumes

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Number of PeerReviewers** | **Total Number ofResumes Verified forYear** | **% of Total Verified** |
| **38** | **11** | **29%** |

1. Administrative oversights

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date of Last On-­site Oversight Performed by the AICPA Oversight Task Force (covers only the AICPA Peer Review Program) | **August 24-25, 2021** |