

Engagement Team – Group Audits Independence Issues and Task Force Proposals

I. Definition of Engagement Team

Implications of Revised Definition of Engagement Team in ISA 220 (Revised)¹

1. The definition of engagement team (ET) in the Code was developed based on the ET definition in extant International Standard on Auditing (ISA) 220.² The International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB) intended to change the definition in ISA 220 for quality management purposes in revising ISA 220. However, the inclusion of component auditors and service providers in the revised definition raises a number of questions with respect to compliance by these individuals with the International Independence Standards (IIS) in the context of a group audit. There is therefore a need to confirm or develop independence requirements applicable to those individuals covered by the extended definition, considering their roles in the audit engagement and the specific facts and circumstances.
2. The IAASB has revised the ET definition to clarify that it includes all individuals performing audit procedures on the audit engagement so that, regardless of where they are located or how they are related to the firm, they are appropriately directed and supervised and their work reviewed in accordance with ISA 220 (Revised).

Alignment of Term “Engagement Team” in the Code with Revised Definition in ISA 220 (Revised)

3. At the [September-October 2020](#) Board meeting, the Task Force presented its preliminary thinking on an approach to align the definition of ET in the Code with the revised definition of ET in ISA 220 (Revised). This approach recognized that the extant definition of ET in the Code applies to both audit and other assurance engagements whereas the definition of ET in ISA 220 (Revised) applies only to audit engagements. It also recognized that the term ET is used in both definitions of the terms “audit team” and “assurance team” in the Code. Therefore, for the term “engagement team,” simply substituting the definition in the Code with the revised definition in ISA 220 (Revised) would not be appropriate. The Task Force came to the preliminary view that it would be necessary to “bifurcate” the term ET into two different terms to target, on the one hand, audit engagements, and on the other hand, other assurance engagements. The term ET would then be withdrawn, with the word “team” used generically to denote a team of individuals who perform an engagement.
4. Given that the Code also uses³ or refers⁴ to the term “review team” and defines that term with reference to the ET for the review engagement, the Task Force also tentatively proposed that a third term, “review engagement team,” be introduced and defined. The Task Force proposed that these three terms be defined as follows, with the definition of “audit engagement team” fully aligned with the definition of ET in ISA 220 (Revised):

¹ ISA 220 (Revised), *Quality Management for an Audit of Financial Statements*

² ISA 220, *Quality Control for an Audit of Financial Statements*

³ Paragraph 900.13

⁴ Paragraph 400.2

Term	Proposed Definition
Audit engagement team	<p>All partners and staff performing the audit engagement, and any other individuals who perform audit procedures on the engagement, excluding an auditor’s external expert and internal auditors who provide direct assistance on an engagement.</p> <p>Engagement teams include personnel and might also include other individuals who perform audit procedures who are from:</p> <p>(a) A network firm; or</p> <p>(b) A firm that is not a network firm, or another service provider.</p> <p>For example, an individual from another firm might perform audit procedures on the financial information of a component in a group audit engagement, attend a physical inventory count or inspect physical fixed assets at a remote location.</p>
Assurance engagement team	<p>All partners and staff performing the assurance engagement, and any individuals engaged by the firm or a network firm who perform assurance procedures on the engagement. This excludes external experts engaged by the firm or by a network firm.</p>
Review engagement team	<p>All partners and staff performing the review engagement, and any individuals engaged by the firm or a network firm who perform review procedures on the engagement. This excludes external experts engaged by the firm or by a network firm.</p>

5. One effect of aligning the proposed definition of “audit engagement team” with the definition of ET in ISA 220 (Revised) would be to make it explicit that the IIS apply to individuals from *service providers* who perform audit procedures on the engagement. In substance, however, this would not represent a change in practice because the extant Code already defines individuals engaged by the firm or a network firm to perform audit procedures on the engagement to be part of the ET.

Feedback at the September-October 2020 IESBA and IESBA October CAG Meeting

6. During the [September-October 2020](#) IESBA meeting, Board members raised a few specific matters for clarification regarding the revised definition of ET in ISA 220 (Revised):
- Whether the Task Force had inadvertently extended the definition of audit ET compared to the definition proposed in ISA 220 (Revised) by including the related application material in ISA 220 (Revised) as part of the defined term in the Code.
 - Why the review ET would not include the same individuals as the audit ET, especially given that interim reviews feed into the audit and are often performed by the same individuals who perform the audit.

7. At the IESBA CAG meeting held on [October 13](#), the Task Force Chair presented the same proposals in respect of which the following observations were shared or questions raised by CAG representatives:
- Most were supportive of the new terms as proposed by Task Force. A few queried the exclusion of external experts from the independence requirements. This was discussed per [agenda item 9A](#) presented at the [September-October 2020](#) IESBA meeting.
 - A CAG representative was supportive of the Task Force's proposal to align the ET definition in the Code with the definition of engagement team in ISA 220 (Revised). However, the Representative queried whether there was really a need to bifurcate the term into different terms to cater for the different types of engagements given that the distinction for review ET and assurance ET was fairly minimal.

Revised Task Force Proposal on the Definition of “Engagement Team”

8. To further inform its deliberations and as part of ongoing coordination with the IAASB, the Task Force reached out to staff of the ISA 220 and ISA 600⁵ projects to share the above observations from the IESBA and CAG meetings. In particular, the Task Force sought further clarification from the IAASB staff team on the following matters:
- Whether the term “review engagement team” is used in the IAASB standards and, if so, how such term is defined. IAASB staff indicated that at present, the relevant standards for review engagements, ISRE 2400⁶ and ISRE 2410,⁷ do not contain defined terms for engagement teams performing review engagements. IAASB staff indicated that it is unlikely that the IAASB will revise its ISREs in the foreseeable future given other priorities on its work plan.
 - How ISQM 1⁸ addresses engagement teams for engagements other than audits. IAASB staff confirmed that the term “engagement team” as defined in ISQM 1 applies to any team performing procedures on an engagement within the scope of ISQM 1 (i.e. an audit, review, other assurance or related services engagement). In ISQM 1, the IAASB has a more generic definition of ET which refers to the performance of procedures on an engagement:
All partners and staff performing the engagement, and any other individuals who perform procedures on the engagement, excluding an external expert and internal auditors who provide direct assistance on an engagement.
9. In the light of the discussion with IAASB staff, and taking into the account the feedback received from IESBA members and IESBA CAG representatives, the Task Force has reconsidered its proposal to bifurcate the term ET into three separate terms for audits, reviews and other assurance engagements. For simplicity, the Task Force proposes a revised approach as follows:
- Use the generic term “team” to denote a team of individuals who perform an engagement; and

⁵ Proposed ISA 600 (Revised), *Special Considerations—Audits of Group Financial Statements (Including the Work of Component Auditors)*

⁶ International Standard on Review Engagements (ISRE) 2400 (Revised), *Engagements to Review Historical Financial Statements*

⁷ ISRE 2410, *Review of Interim Financial Information Performed by the Independent Auditor of the Entity*

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*

- Revise the definition of ET per the extant Code to align with the definition of ET per ISQM 1, with additional guidance to clarify the nature of the various teams in reference to the different Parts of the Code.

10. Below is a summary of the Task Force’s revised proposal for IESBA consideration.

Term	Proposed Definition
Engagement team	<p>All partners and staff performing the engagement, and any other individuals who perform procedures on the engagement, excluding an external expert and internal auditors who provide direct assistance on an engagement.</p> <p><i>In Part 4A, the term “engagement team” refers to individuals performing the audit or review procedures on the audit or review engagement.</i></p> <p><i>For further guidance on the definition of engagement team in the context of an audit of financial statements, see ISA 220 (Revised) issued by International Auditing and Assurance standards Board.</i></p> <p><i>In Part 4B, the term “engagement team” refers to individuals performing the assurance procedures on the assurance engagement.</i></p>

For reference only, [Appendix 3](#) details the differences between the revised approach and that in the extant Code and in the [September-October 2020](#) proposal.

11. To illustrate how the Task Force’s proposals regarding the terms “team” and “engagement team” might be used in the Code based on the proposed revised definition of ET, the Task Force has prepared the draft text in **Agenda Item 6-B**.

<p>Matters for IESBA Consideration</p> <p>1. Do IESBA members support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The Task Force’s revised proposal regarding the definition of “Engagement Team;” and (b) The use of the proposed terms “team” and “engagement team” as presented in Agenda Item 6-B?
--

II. Independence Consideration for Engagement Quality Reviewers

12. At the [September-October 2020](#) meeting, the Task Force noted to the Board a matter which required further consideration relating to the independence considerations for engagement quality reviewers (EQRs) sourced from outside the firm and the network.⁹ The Task Force had noted that the extant definitions of the terms “audit team,” “review team” and “assurance team” (see [Appendix 1](#)) scope in only EQRs within the firm or the network.

⁹ ISQM 2, *Engagement Quality Reviews*, defines an EQR as “a partner, other individual in the firm, or an external individual, appointed by the firm to perform the engagement quality review.” (The definition of “engagement quality control reviewer” in extant ISQC 1 also scopes in an external individual.)

13. In reviewing the extant definitions of “audit team,” “review team” and “assurance team,” the Task Force agreed that EQRs are technically individuals appointed by the firm to perform EQ reviews, and such individuals can be sourced from within or outside the firm or its network. The Task Force believes that EQRs, whose independence play an important role in promoting audit quality, should be subject to the same independence requirements regardless of whether they come from within or outside the firm or a network firm. As such, the Task Force proposes revised definitions for “audit team,” “review team” and “assurance team” to include such individuals as per below:

(b) All others within the a firm, or engaged by the firm, who can directly influence the outcome of the audit engagement, including:

(See definitions of audit team, review team and assurance team in [Appendix 3](#))

Matter for IESBA Consideration

2. Do IESBA members support the Task Force’s proposal to revise the definitions of “audit team,” “review team” and “assurance team” to reflect EQRs from outside of the firm or its network?

III. Independence in a Group Audit Context

14. In thinking through independence in a group audit context, the Task Force approached this matter from two different perspectives:

- (a) Independence principles for individuals involved in the group audit engagement; and
- (b) Independence principles for firms involved in the group audit engagement.

These were explained at the [September-October 2020](#) meeting and a summary of the principles as proposed by the Task Force is detailed in [Appendix 2](#).

15. The Task Force has developed a strawman of a proposed new Section 405 (Group Audits) reflecting these principles (see **Agenda Item 6-C**). The Task Force would welcome any high-level comments or observations from the Board on the direction of this new section, including its structure.
16. Subject to the Board’s input, the Task Force will further develop the strawman.
17. The Task Force acknowledges that some matters were raised during the October Board meeting session that will require further Task Force deliberation, This includes the personal independence requirements that should apply with respect to components that are not legal entities (e.g., inventory), and independence at the firm level with respect to the provision of non-assurance services (NAS). Some of these matters will depend on the evolution of the ISA 600 project.

Matter for IESBA Consideration

3. IESBA members are asked for directional feedback on the new Section 405 as presented in **Agenda Item 6-C**.

IV. Coordination with ISA 600 Task Force

18. Since the September-October 2020 IESBA meeting, IESBA staff has liaised with the IAASB’s ISA 600 staff on the proposed revisions to ISA 600.

19. In reviewing the nature and extent of responses received on the Exposure Draft (ED) of ISA 600, the ISA 600 Task Force has determined that it will need additional time to finalize the project. Accordingly, it will be proposing to the IAASB an extension for the project timeline to December 2021 from September 2021 as previously indicated in its project plan.
20. Given that the ET-GA project is so closely linked to the ISA 600 project, the ET-GA Task Force believes that it would be sensible to extend the timeline for an ED on this project by a quarter to September 2021. This will enable the firming up of proposals based on group audit concepts (such as “component”) that are sufficiently well settled in the proposed ISA 600 (Revised). It will be important that changes to the independence requirements are not released to the market for comment if they are not firmly grounded from the conceptual standpoint.

Matter for IESBA Consideration

4. IESBA members are asked if they have any concerns with the Task Force’s proposal to extend the timeline for release of the ED to September 2021?

V. Matters for Further Task Force Consideration

21. Matters that the Task Force will further consider include:
 - Where resources have been obtained from a service provider (other than a non-network component auditor) for the performance of audit procedures on the group audit, the independence principles that should apply at the service provider level.
 - The independence implications of how components are now conceptualized in proposed ISA 600 (Revised) based on the feedback received on the ISA 600 (Revised) [exposure draft](#).
 - A review of full or limited scope audits and their impact on the independence requirements for related entities of a component. Depending on the progression of ISA 600 (Revised), there may be implications based on the type of work performed, for example, on inventory when there is no self-review.
 - A review of the NAS provisions in the context of group audits, subject to finalization of the NAS project.
 - A review of the breaches provisions when there is a breach of independence at a non-network component auditor firm.

VI. Next Steps

22. Ongoing coordination is planned with IAASB staff and the ISA 600 Task Force as the ET-GA Task Force continues to develop independence proposals relating to the revised definition of ET and group audits.
23. Subject to the Board’s feedback on the Task Force’s views and proposals, the Task Force will present a progressed draft of the proposed changes to the Code for the Board’s consideration at the March 2021 IESBA meeting.

APPENDIX 1

Definitions of “Assurance Team,” “Audit Team,” and “Review Team” in Extant Code

- Assurance team
- (a) All members of the engagement team for the assurance engagement;
 - (b) All others within a firm who can directly influence the outcome of the assurance engagement, including:
 - (i) Those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the assurance engagement partner in connection with the performance of the assurance engagement;
 - (ii) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry specific issues, transactions or events for the assurance engagement; and
 - (iii) Those who provide quality control for the assurance engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the assurance engagement.
- Audit team
- (a) All members of the engagement team for the audit engagement;
 - (b) All others within a firm who can directly influence the outcome of the audit engagement, including:
 - (i) Those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the engagement partner in connection with the performance of the audit engagement, including those at all successively senior levels above the engagement partner through to the individual who is the firm’s Senior or Managing Partner (Chief Executive or equivalent);
 - (ii) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry-specific issues, transactions or events for the engagement; and
 - (iii) Those who provide quality control for the engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the engagement; and
 - (c) All those within a network firm who can directly influence the outcome of the audit engagement.

In Part 4A, the term “audit team” applies equally to “review team.”

- Review team
- (a) All members of the engagement team for the review engagement; and
 - (b) All others within a firm who can directly influence the outcome of the review engagement, including:
 - (i) Those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the engagement partner in connection with the performance of the review engagement, including those at all successively senior levels above the engagement partner through to the individual who is the firm's Senior or Managing Partner (Chief Executive or equivalent);
 - (ii) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry specific issues, transactions or events for the engagement; and
 - (iii) Those who provide quality control for the engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the engagement; and
 - (c) All those within a network firm who can directly influence the outcome of the review engagement.

Summary of Proposed Independence Principles for Individuals and Firms

(Note: Group Audit Client means the audit client whose group financial statements are subject to audit)

A. Independence Principles for Individuals

Which Individuals		Group Audit Client Listed	Group Audit Client Not Listed
Group engagement team		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independence required of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The group audit client and all its related entities ○ Any other components scoped in under ISA 600 (Revised) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independence required of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Group audit client, controlled related entities and other components scoped in under ISA 600 (Revised) ○ Parent only in relation to financial investments (if group audit client is material to parent) • Other related entities: apply conceptual framework
Component auditors:	Inside the network	As above	As above
	Outside the network		

B. Independence Principles for Firms

Which Firm	Group Audit Client PIE Component PIE	Group Audit Client PIE Component Non-PIE	Group Audit Client Non-PIE Component PIE	Group Audit Client Non-PIE Component Non-PIE
Group Auditor Firm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PIE requirements applicable to group audit client Independence required of any other components scoped in under ISA 600 (Revised) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-PIE requirements applicable to group audit client Independence required of any other components scoped in under ISA 600 (Revised) 	
Component Auditor Firm within the Group Auditor Firm's Network	As above	As above	For Component Auditor Firm and Network Firms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independence required of the component and its controlled related entities to the non-PIE standard set out in the Code Apply conceptual framework for all other REs of the component 	
	(If acting as the statutory auditor of the component, PIE requirements and any relevant jurisdictional requirements apply)	(If acting as the statutory auditor of the component, non-PIE requirements and any relevant jurisdictional requirements apply)	(If acting as the statutory auditor of the component, PIE requirements and any relevant jurisdictional requirements apply)	(If acting as the statutory auditor of the component, non-PIE requirements and any relevant jurisdictional requirements apply)
Component Auditor Firm outside the Group Auditor Firm's Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Component Auditor Firm: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independence required of the component and its controlled related entities to the PIE standard relevant to the group audit Apply conceptual framework with respect to all other related entities of the component 		For Component Auditor Firm: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independence required of the component and its controlled related entities to the non-PIE standard set out in the Code Apply conceptual framework for all other REs of the component 	

Which Firm	Group Audit Client PIE Component PIE	Group Audit Client PIE Component Non-PIE	Group Audit Client Non- PIE Component PIE	Group Audit Client Non- PIE Component Non-PIE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Apply conceptual framework if component auditor firm knows, or has reason to believe, that threats to its independence are created by interests or relationships of a firm within its network with the component audit client • For Component Auditor Firm only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No financial interests in the group audit client 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply conceptual framework if component auditor firm knows, or has reason to believe, that threats to its independence are created by interests or relationships of a firm within its network with the component audit client 	
	(If acting as the statutory auditor of the component, PIE requirements and any relevant jurisdictional requirements apply)	(If acting as the statutory auditor of the component, non-PIE requirements and any relevant jurisdictional requirements apply)	(If acting as the statutory auditor of the component, PIE requirements and any relevant jurisdictional requirements apply)	(If acting as the statutory auditor of the component, non-PIE requirements and any relevant jurisdictional requirements apply)

APPENDIX 3

Summary of Differences between the Described Terms – Extant Code, September and December 2020 Meetings
 (Marked Up)

Terminology	Extant Code Described Terms	Proposed Definitions September 2020 Meeting	Proposed Definitions – December 2020 Meeting
<p>Engagement team</p> <p>Applicable to all types of engagements</p>	<p>All partners and staff performing the engagement, and any individuals engaged by the firm or a network firm who perform assurance procedures on the engagement. This excludes external experts engaged by the firm or by a network firm.</p> <p>The term “engagement team” also excludes individuals within the client’s internal audit function who provide direct assistance on an audit engagement when the external auditor complies with the requirements of ISA 610 (Revised 2013), <i>Using the Work of Internal Auditors</i>.</p>	<p>Now will be updated in the extant Code where relevant to “the team providing professional services”</p>	<p><u>All partners and staff performing the engagement, and any other individuals who perform procedures on the engagement, excluding an external expert and internal auditors who provide direct assistance on an engagement.</u></p> <p><u>In Part 4A, the term “engagement team” refers to individuals performing the audit or review procedures on the audit or review engagement.</u></p> <p><u>For further guidance on the definition of engagement team in the context of an audit of financial statements, see ISA 220 (Revised) issued by International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board.</u></p>
<p>Audit Engagement Team</p>	<p>Not defined</p>	<p>As defined in ISA 220 (Revised):</p> <p><u>All partners and staff performing the audit engagement, and any other individuals who perform audit procedures on the engagement, excluding an auditor’s external expert and internal auditors who provide direct assistance on an engagement.</u></p> <p><u>A17 Engagement teams include personnel and may also include other individuals who perform audit procedures who are from:</u></p> <p><u>a) A network firm</u></p>	<p><u>In Part 4B, the term “engagement team” refers to individuals performing the assurance procedures on the assurance engagement.</u></p>

Terminology	Extant Code Described Terms	Proposed Definitions September 2020 Meeting	Proposed Definitions – December 2020 Meeting
		<p><u>b) A firm that is not a network firm, or another service provider</u></p> <p><u>For example, an individual from another firm may perform audit procedures on the financial information of a component in a group audit engagement, attend a physical inventory count or inspect physical fixed assets at a remote location.</u></p>	
Review Engagement Team	Not defined	<p>As per existing term defined in Extant Code for “Engagement Team”</p> <p><u>All partners and staff performing the review engagement, and any individuals engaged by the firm or a network firm who perform review procedures on the engagement. This excludes external experts engaged by the firm or by a network firm.</u></p>	
Assurance Engagement Team	Not defined	<p>Definition of “engagement team” in the extant Code</p> <p>All partners and staff performing the <u>assurance</u> engagement, and any individuals engaged by the firm or a network firm who perform assurance procedures on the engagement. This excludes external experts engaged by the firm or by a network firm.</p> <p><u>The term “engagement team” also excludes individuals within the client’s internal audit function who provide direct assistance on an audit engagement when the external auditor complies with the requirements of ISA 610 (Revised 2013), Using the Work of Internal Auditors.</u></p>	

Terminology	Extant Code Described Terms	Proposed Definitions September 2020 Meeting	Proposed Definitions – December 2020 Meeting
Audit Team	<p>(a) All members of the engagement team for the audit engagement;</p> <p>(b) All others within a firm who can directly influence the outcome of the audit engagement, including:</p> <p>(i) Those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the engagement partner in connection with the performance of the audit engagement, including those at all successively senior levels above the engagement partner through to the individual who is the firm's Senior or Managing Partner (Chief Executive or equivalent);</p> <p>(ii) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry-specific issues, transactions or events for the engagement; and</p> <p>(iii) Those who provide quality control for the engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality</p>	<p>(a) All members of the <u>audit</u> engagement team for the audit engagement;</p> <p>(b) All others within a firm who can directly influence the outcome of the audit engagement, including:</p> <p>(i) Those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the engagement partner in connection with the performance of the audit engagement, including those at all successively senior levels above the engagement partner through to the individual who is the firm's Senior or Managing Partner (Chief Executive or equivalent);</p> <p>(ii) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry-specific issues, transactions or events for the engagement; and</p> <p>(iii) Those who provide quality control for the engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the engagement; and</p> <p>(c) All those within a network firm who can directly influence the outcome of the audit engagement.</p>	<p>(a) All members of the engagement team for the audit engagement;</p> <p>(b) All others within <u>the a firm, or engaged by the firm</u>, who can directly influence the outcome of the audit engagement, including:</p> <p>(i) Those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the engagement partner in connection with the performance of the audit engagement, including those at all successively senior levels above the engagement partner through to the individual who is the firm's Senior or Managing Partner (Chief Executive or equivalent);</p> <p>(ii) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry-specific issues, transactions or events for the engagement; and</p> <p>(iii) Those who <u>are involved in providing</u> quality</p>

Terminology	Extant Code Described Terms	Proposed Definitions September 2020 Meeting	Proposed Definitions – December 2020 Meeting
	<p>control review for the engagement; and</p> <p>(c) All those within a network firm who can directly influence the outcome of the audit engagement.</p> <p><i>In Part 4A, the term “audit team” applies equally to “review team.”</i></p>	<p><i>In Part 4A, the term “audit team” applies equally to “review team.”</i></p>	<p>management control for the engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the engagement; and</p> <p>(c) All those within a network firm who can directly influence the outcome of the audit engagement.</p> <p><i>In Part 4A, the term “audit team” applies equally to “review team.”</i></p>
Assurance Team	<p>(a) All members of the engagement team for the assurance engagement;</p> <p>(b) All others within a firm who can directly influence the outcome of the assurance engagement, including:</p> <p>(i) Those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the assurance engagement partner in connection with the performance of the assurance engagement;</p>	<p>(a) All members of the assurance engagement team for the assurance engagement;</p> <p>(b) All others within a firm who can directly influence the outcome of the assurance engagement, including:</p> <p>(i) Those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the assurance engagement partner in connection with the performance of the assurance engagement;</p> <p>(ii) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry specific issues, transactions or</p>	<p>(a) All members of the engagement team for the assurance engagement;</p> <p>(b) All others within the-a firm, or engaged by the firm, who can directly influence the outcome of the assurance engagement, including:</p> <p>(i) Those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the assurance engagement partner in connection with the</p>

Terminology	Extant Code Described Terms	Proposed Definitions September 2020 Meeting	Proposed Definitions – December 2020 Meeting
	<p>(ii) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry specific issues, transactions or events for the assurance engagement; and</p> <p>(iii) Those who provide quality control for the assurance engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the assurance engagement.</p>	<p>events for the assurance engagement; and</p> <p>(iii) Those who provide quality control for the assurance engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the assurance engagement.</p>	<p>performance of the assurance engagement;</p> <p>(ii) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry specific issues, transactions or events for the assurance engagement; and</p> <p>(iii) Those who <u>are involved in providing</u> quality <u>control/management</u> for the assurance engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the assurance engagement.</p>
Review Team	<p>(a) All members of the engagement team for the review engagement; and</p> <p>(b) All others within a firm who can directly influence the outcome of the review engagement, including:</p> <p>(i) Those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the engagement partner in connection with the performance of the review engagement, including those at all successively senior levels above the engagement</p>	<p>(a) All members of the <u>review</u> engagement team for the review engagement; and</p> <p>(b) All others within a firm who can directly influence the outcome of the review engagement, including:</p> <p>(i) Those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the engagement partner in connection with the performance of the review engagement, including those at all successively senior levels above the engagement partner through to the individual who is the firm's</p>	<p>(a) All members of the engagement team for the review engagement; and</p> <p>(b) All others within <u>the a firm, or engaged by the firm</u>, who can directly influence the outcome of the review engagement, including:</p> <p>(i) Those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the engagement partner in connection with the performance of the review</p>

Terminology	Extant Code Described Terms	Proposed Definitions September 2020 Meeting	Proposed Definitions – December 2020 Meeting
	<p>partner through to the individual who is the firm's Senior or Managing Partner (Chief Executive or equivalent);</p> <p>(ii) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry specific issues, transactions or events for the engagement; and</p> <p>(iii) Those who provide quality control for the engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the engagement; and</p> <p>(c) All those within a network firm who can directly influence the outcome of the review engagement.</p>	<p>Senior or Managing Partner (Chief Executive or equivalent);</p> <p>(ii) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry specific issues, transactions or events for the engagement; and</p> <p>(iii) Those who provide quality control for the engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the engagement; and</p> <p>(c) All those within a network firm who can directly influence the outcome of the review engagement.</p>	<p>engagement, including those at all successively senior levels above the engagement partner through to the individual who is the firm's Senior or Managing Partner (Chief Executive or equivalent);</p> <p>(ii) Those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry specific issues, transactions or events for the engagement; and</p> <p>(iii) Those who <u>are involved in providing</u> quality <u>management control</u> for the engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the engagement; and</p> <p>(c) All those within a network firm who can directly influence the outcome of the review engagement.</p>