Parliamentary Joint Committee on Corporations and Financial Services Regulation of Auditing

Answers to questions on notice from 7 February 2020 Accounting Professional and Ethical Standards Board

4. QUESTION – Monitoring & Enforcement (From page 7 of the Hansard)

Senator O'NEILL: You argue that the code of ethics has the force of law—the APES 110—and it's a mandatory requirement by the three accounting body members. Has it ever been tested in an Australian court of law or by the professional bodies in a disciplinary manner? And do you have any evidence that the professional accounting bodies have applied the codes to the big four, especially covering audit firms of the ASX 200 entities in Australia?

Mr Wijesinghe: The professional bodies do report to us about quality-control matters, and we can ask them for some information on that. As Nancy said in opening, we don't do monitoring and enforcement. That's not part of our role. Our role is a narrow role of setting the standards.

Senator O'NEILL: The standards are only of value if there is monitoring and enforcement. My questions are to that end. Has monitoring and enforcement action been taken? Has it ever been tested in an Australian court of law or by the professional bodies in a disciplinary manner?

Senator WHISH-WILSON: I asked a similar question earlier.

CHAIR: Maybe they could take it on notice.

Mr Wijesinghe: I mean, I am aware of some of the professional standards being tested in courts, like the valuation services standard, which has been tested in the New South Wales courts. But I cannot recall specific instances off the top of my head.

Senator O'NEILL: So there has been no action in the courts on conduct and ethics standards to your knowledge, Mr Wijesinghe?

CHAIR: I think the witnesses have agreed to take that on notice, and I'm sure that, if there's any further information, you'll provide it to the committee.

ANSWER: As we noted in our submission (submission number 42) and evidence to the PJC, APESB's role is to set the professional and ethical standards for all professional accountants, including auditors.

APESB does not have a role in monitoring and enforcement. The three professional accounting bodies and regulatory authorities (i.e., ASIC, APRA & ATO) are responsible for monitoring and enforcing compliance of professional accountants, including conducting disciplinary actions for breaches of APESB standards.

We refer to the responses provided by ASIC to these questions on notice (in particular QoN 81 as listed on the PJC website as of 25 February 2020) on the number of breaches of the Independence requirements in APES 110, as it is ASIC who is responsible for enforcement of these provisions for registered company auditors.

We note that ASIC and APRA are empowered by section 1292 of the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) to apply for a registered auditor to be dealt with by the Companies Auditors Disciplinary Board (CADB). The matters that are referred to the CADB include circumstances where the conduct of an auditor contravenes accounting, auditing, and professional & ethical standards.

We also note that decisions of the CADB can be appealed to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal and, on matters of law, to the Federal Court of Australia.

In March 2019, the Financial Reporting Council released a report <u>Auditor Disciplinary Processes: Review</u>, which describes the processes of each of the professional bodies and contains information on the matters on which ASIC and the professional bodies have undertaken court action or disciplinary matters for auditors.

In addition, we note that on PJC's website QoN 13 (as of 25 Feb 2020) relates to responses provided by CA ANZ. In CA ANZ's response to QoN 6, they address breaches of the Code of Ethics by their members. In respect of CPA Australia, we are aware that a similar QoN was put to them on the 7th of February 2020 and refer the Committee to their response as we do not have access to that information.

Professional Body Disciplinary Cases

Additionally, we refer the PJC to the following information available from each of the three accounting bodies in respect of their disciplinary cases/actions against members for non-compliance. These cases address a range of matters including non-compliance with the Code and Professional Standards:


Professional Body	Weblink to Member Disciplinary Outcomes	Comments
CA ANZ – Decisions Register	https://www.charteredaccountantsanz.com/about- us/complaints/decisions-register	Includes information on cases since 2006
CPA Australia – Outcome of Disciplinary Hearings	https://www.cpaaustralia.com.au/about-us/member- conduct-and-discipline/outcome-of-disciplinary-hearings	Includes information on cases since 2005
IPA – Tribunal Hearings/Decisions	https://www.publicaccountants.org.au/about/complaint-investigation/tribunal-hearings-decisions	Includes information on cases since 2008

Legal cases

We have performed searches on the website jade.io and identified various legal cases where APESB's pronouncements are referred to and attach references to those cases in **Appendix B** for your information.

Summary

The information provided above in respect of Professional Body Disciplinary Cases of each of the three accounting bodies and legal cases clearly demonstrates that APESB standards have been considered in various courts and tribunals.



[2013] AATA 141 (14 March 2013) (Senior Member C R Walsh)			
92 ATR 701	Excerpt	Summary	Miniviewe
his / her professional body and in particular APES 110. If in breach the acco	ountant would	have to	
[P] PTY LTD & LANDIS			
[2010] FMCAfam 1303 (25 November 2010) (Cassidy FM)	Excerpt	Summary	Miniviewe
the definitions section at page 90 of "Compiled APES 110 Code of Ethics for	r Professiona	I Accountar	nts
Re CONFIDENTIAL And COMMISSIONER OF TAXATION			
[2011] AATA 403 (13 June 2011) (C Walsh, Senior Member)			
84 ATR 282	Excerpt	Summary	Miniviewe
Mark Hackelton T/as Hackeltons Accountants and Advisers v			
Mark Hackelton T/as Hackeltons Accountants and Advisers v Manbead Pty Ltd & Another			
	Excerpt	Summary	Miniviewe
Manbead Pty Ltd & Another	npetent and p	rudent N	1r Price's
Manbead Pty Ltd & Another [2019] NSWDC 147 (17 April 2019) (Hatzistergos DCJ) body. Specifically, he considers that APES 110, 220 and 305 represent "com	npetent and p	rudent N	1r Price's
Manbead Pty Ltd & Another [2019] NSWDC 147 (17 April 2019) (Hatzistergos DCJ) body. Specifically, he considers that APES 110, 220 and 305 represent "comopinion is that APES 110, 220 and 305 are mandatory only to members of	npetent and p	rudent N	1r Price's r Goodyer
Manbead Pty Ltd & Another [2019] NSWDC 147 (17 April 2019) (Hatzistergos DCJ) body. Specifically, he considers that APES 110, 220 and 305 represent "componing opinion is that APES 110, 220 and 305 are mandatory only to members of Storai v Cordaro (Civil Claims)	npetent and p	orudent M nis report M	Ir Price's r Goodyer Miniviewe
Manbead Pty Ltd & Another [2019] NSWDC 147 (17 April 2019) (Hatzistergos DCJ) body. Specifically, he considers that APES 110, 220 and 305 represent "componing or state APES 110, 220 and 305 are mandatory only to members of Storai v Cordaro (Civil Claims) [2014] VCAT 1496 (17 September 2014) (Deputy President I. Lulham)	npetent and p	orudent M nis report M	r Goodyer Miniviewe
Manbead Pty Ltd & Another [2019] NSWDC 147 (17 April 2019) (Hatzistergos DCJ) body. Specifically, he considers that APES 110, 220 and 305 represent "componing or state APES 110, 220 and 305 are mandatory only to members of Storai v Cordaro (Civil Claims) [2014] VCAT 1496 (17 September 2014) (Deputy President I. Lulham)	npetent and p	orudent M nis report M	Ir Price's r Goodyer Miniviewe

