

JURISDICTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS

Compilation of Pre-Meeting Input from NSS Participants

1. Significant National Developments or Issues

Please use the template below to describe any significant ethics and independence related developments or issues (whether pertaining to standard setting, convergence, or emerging issues) on your national agenda since the May 2020 IESBA-NSS meeting that may be of international relevance.

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
AUSTRALIA - Accounting Professional and Ethical Standards Board (APESB)				
1.	<p>Amendments to APES 110 Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants (including Independence Standards) (APES 110)</p> <p>To ensure APES 110 continues to align with the International Code of Ethics, APESB has issued the following documents which will amend APES 110:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amending Standard: <i>Amendments to Part 4B of APES 110 Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants (including Independence Standards)</i> • Exposure Draft: <i>Amendments to Promote</i> 	<p>APESB have adopted the international provisions with minor modifications to reflect the Australian environment (refer to Table 2 below for further details).</p>	<p>APESB issued the Part 4B Amending Standard in September 2020.</p> <p>APESB issued the exposure draft relating to Role and Mindset in October 2020. Based on the proposed comment period for the exposure draft, the Amending Standard for Role and Mindset will not be issued until Mar-Apr 2020.</p>	<p>The Part 4B Amending Standard becomes effective from 1 July 2020.</p> <p>Key outputs were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amending Standard • Technical Update <p>The Exposure Draft on Role and Mindset is open for public comments until 1 February 2021.</p> <p>Key outputs were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exposure Draft • Technical Alert

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
	<i>the Role and Mindset Expected of Professional Accountants.</i>			
2.	<p>Resources relating to APES 110</p> <p>During 2020, APESB has been focused on providing resources to assist professional accountants to effectively implement the new restructured APES 110. The resources issued include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Independence Guide - 5th Edition; • APES 110 Prohibitions for Audit and Review Engagements; • Applying the Code's Conceptual Framework in COVID-19 circumstances (in conjunction with the IESBA and the IESBA NSS Working Group); and • Applying APESB pronouncements in COVID-19 circumstances. 	<p>These non-authoritative documents have been progressively released across 2020 and have been well received by the Australian professional accounting bodies and professional accountants.</p> <p>APESB is also currently developing a Technical Staff Q&A document relating to Whistleblowing and Confidentiality. The Q&As will focus on new whistleblower protection laws in Australia and how key provisions in APES 110, such as confidentiality and NOCLAR, apply in these circumstances.</p>	<p>APESB have issued four guidance publications so far in 2020.</p> <p>The whistleblowing publication is expected to be released by the end of 2020. It will be available on the APESB website.</p>	<p>The <i>Independence Guide - 5th edition</i> was issued in May 2020. Key outputs were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independence Guide • Technical Alert <p>The <i>APES 110 Prohibitions summary</i> was released in August 2020. Key outputs were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APES 110 Prohibitions Summary • Technical Alert <p><i>Applying the Code's Conceptual Framework in COVID-19 circumstances: scenarios involving taxation and valuation services</i> was released in August 2020. Key outputs were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint IESBA/APESB publication • Technical Alert <p><i>Applying APESB pronouncements in COVID-19 circumstances</i> was released</p>

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
				16 October 2020. Key outputs were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APESB publication • Technical Alert.
3.	Project to update APESB pronouncements to reflect the restructured Code	<p>Over 2019 and the first three months of 2020, APESB completed a major project to update its other 20 pronouncements to reflect the restructured APES 110. As part of this project, revisions were also made to address matters noted by stakeholders including strengthening auditor independence requirements in APES 220 <i>Taxation Services</i> and addressing legislative changes relating to APES 330 <i>Insolvency Services</i>.</p> <p>All standards were effective from 1 January 2020, apart from APES 230 <i>Financial Planning Services</i> which became effective from 1 July 2020.</p> <p>The six guidance notes became effective when issued, which ranged across January to March 2020.</p>	This project was completed by the end of March 2020.	The revised and refreshed pronouncements are available on the APESB website at the Current pronouncements page.

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
4.	<p>Financial Planning Services</p> <p>In Australia, a new authority has been created for financial advisers which is the <i>Financial Adviser Standards and Ethics Authority</i> (FASEA), who are responsible for establishing ethical and educational standards for financial planners, released a Code of Ethics for Financial Advisers in February 2019.</p> <p>Financial planners that are also Members of a professional accounting body will need to comply with the FASEA Code and current APESB pronouncements (i.e. APES 110 and APES 230 <i>Financial Planning Services</i>.)</p> <p>In addition, there has been a Royal Commission held in Australia on misconduct in the Banking, Superannuation and Financial Services Industry. The final report of the Royal Commission was released in February 2019 which included 76 recommendations for the financial services industry and the relevant regulators. The</p>	<p>APESB has commenced a project to review APES 230, which will consider the outcomes of the Royal Commission and the new Code of Ethics for Financial Advisers issued by FASEA.</p> <p>The aim of the project is to revise and refresh APES 230 to suit the changing regulatory landscape.</p>	<p>This project is underway.</p> <p>APESB issued a consultation paper in December 2019 to ascertain stakeholder's views on the extant APES 230 and the proposed legislative changes.</p> <p>APESB is currently working through the issues identified as part of this consultation project.</p>	<p>The Board is considering the issues identified from the consultation process.</p> <p>Any proposed changes to APES 230 will be issued in an exposure draft in late 2021. It will be available on the APESB website: www.apesb.org.au.</p>

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
	<p>Australian government is currently working on these recommendations and determining how to adopt the recommendations.</p>			
5.	<p>Project on Artificial Intelligence and Digital Technologies</p>	<p>APESB has commenced a project to consider how artificial intelligence and digital technologies are affecting commercial entities, and whether there is a need to update APESB pronouncements to address these developments.</p>	<p>The project is underway and is still in the information gathering phase.</p>	<p>Expected outputs for this project are not yet known. However, developments in this project will be recorded on the APESB Website on the relevant project page.</p>
6.	<p>Project on Outsourcing</p>	<p>APESB commenced a project in to review its guidance note APES GN 30 <i>Outsourced Services</i>, to determine whether or not the guidance note should be upgraded to a standard.</p> <p>From undertaking this project, the APESB considers that while the guidance note is appropriate in its current form, Professional Accountants should be required to communicate with their clients about the use of outsourced services. To enact this change,</p>	<p>This project is underway and is expected to be completed in mid-2021.</p>	<p>The Exposure Draft on APES 305 is open for public comments until 15 October 2020.</p> <p>Key outputs were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exposure Draft • Technical Alert

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
		<p>APESB is currently reviewing APES 305 <i>Terms of Engagement</i> with the objective of including this requirement in the standard. APESB released an exposure draft on APES 305 in July 2020.</p> <p>Once APES 305 is revised, APESB will review APES GN 30 to ensure the guidance aligns with the newly revised standard.</p>		
CANADA - CPA Canada Public Trust Committee				
1.	N/A			
GERMANY - Wirtschaftsprüferkammer (WPK)				
1.	Translation of the Code of Ethics 2018 into German completed, applicable in Germany, Austria and Switzerland (predecessor version Code 2014).	Release on WPK's homepage.	Released on WPK's homepage on November 22, 2019.	
2.	Development of further guidance pertaining to IESBA NOCLAR.	Inclusion of additional specific application material in WPK's Professional Charter (a by-law).	Completed.	

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
3.	<p>Due to the Wirecard scandal in Germany, various potential issues for a new audit reform are being discussed currently, such as:</p> <p>1. Proposals of the WPK:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designation of competent authorities for the investigation of irregularities: According to the EU Regulation (537/2014, Art. 7 + 12), the auditor is required to report certain suspected irregularities, including fraud, to competent authorities as designated by the European Member States. However, the German legislator has not designated such an authority to date. • Lifting of the principle of confidentiality for the <i>WPK</i> and the <i>Auditor Oversight Body (AOB)</i>: The mentioned institutions should be allowed to publicly designate the 	<p>The WPK actively participates in the discussion, reaches out to the legislator as well as other important stakeholders and organizes virtual jour fixes.</p>	<p>Currently under discussion. It remains to be seen which proposals will be further pursued and become law.</p>	<p>December 2020</p>

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
	<p>name of the individual/firm faced with disciplinary proceedings if there is a legitimate public interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lifting of the principle of confidentiality for <i>auditors</i>: Auditors of PIEs should be allowed to publicly name the individual engagement and to comment on allegations of professional misconduct if they have a legitimate interest. <p>2. Key issues paper of Federal Ministries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit and non-audit/non-assurance services should be separated more clearly. • Tightening the rules for external rotation: Introducing a maximum period of 10 years. • Increasing the existing liability caps of 1 (audit of non-PIEs) and 4 Mio. EUR (audit of PIEs) in Germany. Exclusion of gross negligence from the aforementioned liability caps, i. e. unlimited liability 			

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
	in case of gross negligence.			
HONG KONG - Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants (HKICPA)				
1.	On 1 October 2019, Financial Reporting Council (FRC) became a comprehensive and independent oversight body regulating auditors of listed entities, and is responsible for the inspection, investigation and disciplinary functions with regard to these auditors.	Under the new regime, the Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants will continue to perform the statutory functions of registration, setting requirements for continuing professional development, and also setting standards on professional ethics, auditing and assurance in respect of relevant auditors, subject to oversight by the FRC. The HKICPA continues as the standard setter for the professional standards, including the auditing and assurance related standards.	Effective since 1 Oct 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Sept 2019, HKICPA issued an Alert on “Practice review scope and selection after audit regulatory reform”
2.	The Alert sets out some of the matters which the Practice Review Committee ("PRC") will take into account when determining whether the non-compliance matters identified warrant a complaint being raised	Issued an alert to remind practices of the initiatives and measures introduced in the practice review programme to strengthen actions to uphold audit quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alert issued in May 2019 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May 2019

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
3.	Between November 2019 and January 2020, HKICPA conducted an ethics survey to understand the ethical issues faced by professional accountants in Hong Kong.	The survey results indicated that the respondents agreed that ethics is very important in the profession.	NA	NA
INDIA – Institute of Chartered Accountants of India (ICAI)				
1.	The Code of Ethics has been divided in three volumes – Volume I (already issued in 2019 on lines of IESBA Code of Ethics,2018), Volume II (based on domestic provision governing Chartered Accountants in India) and Volume III (being Case Law Reference , based on disciplinary cases of ICAI)	Three volumes of revised Code of Ethics have been issued and are applicable already.	The revised Code of Ethics (comprising of three Volumes) is effective from 1st July,2020, with the exception of certain provisions. The details in this regard are contained in the following link:- https://www.icai.org/post/applicability-revised-edition-code-of-ethics	As mentioned in the preceding column.
2.	Developing and making available material on professional ethics for the Professional Accountants on the digital platform of ICAI, with the objective of expediting ethical learning and	To bring awareness of the provisions of the revised Code of Ethics among the professional accountants	Effective	NA

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
	compliance through E-mode in the time of COVID-19.			
JAPAN - Financial Services Agency (FSA), and the Japanese Institute of Certified Public Accountants (JICPA)				
1.	Implementation of the revised and restructured Code (released in 2018). Please see the section 2 below.			
NEW ZEALAND - New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (NZAuASB)				
1.	The NZAuASB issued the revised and restructured Code in New Zealand in December 2018. We have been looking at ways to make the Code for interactive/easier to navigate.	Initial plans included creating an interactive PDF with hyperlinks to move back and forth between references.	On hold pending outcome of discussions to use the eCode or similar as a base.	On hold
2.	The XRB has the legal mandate to issue ethical standards only for assurance practitioners. That mandate was amended in 2019 to include agreed-upon procedures engagements. Historically, Part 2 of the IESBA Code has always been	Incorporate Part 2 of the IESBA Code into Professional and Ethical Standard 1.	Completed	Exposure draft April 2020 Final standard October 2020

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
	<p>excluded from the Code issued by the NZAuASB. However, with the revised and restructured Code being more integrated, including the applicability section in Part 3 referencing to Part 2 of the Code, and the challenge of how we refer to the Code in the revised quality management which now reference the entire IESBA Code, the NZAuASB determined it appropriate to include the Part 2 in Professional and Ethical Standard 1.</p>			
3.	<p>The level of non-assurance services to audit clients that are public interest entities continues to be of concern to the FMA (the audit regulator in New Zealand). Of significant concern is the issue performing NAS to independence in appearance creates. The Auditor-General has issued revised independence standards in 2020 limiting the work practitioners can do for their</p>	<p>Meeting with stakeholders to further consider whether we need to have a strengthened application of the self review threat prohibition for NAS to PIEs in New Zealand.</p>	In process	ED April 2021

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
	audit clients to work of an assurance nature. In our submission to the IESBA on the NAS proposals the NZAuASB was of the view that to effect a change in perception, the provision of NAS to audit clients that are public interest entities should be prohibited, not just those non assurance services that create a self-review threat.			
SOUTH AFRICA - Independent Regulatory Board for Auditors (IRBA)				
1.	Second Opinions	Final Amendments to the IRBA Code of Professional Conduct for Registered Auditors in respect of Second Opinions	Project completed and the amendments are now effective	Effective for engagements commencing on or after 15 January 2020 https://www.irba.co.za/guidance-for-ras/ethics:-the-rules-and-the-code/the-irba-code-revised-2018
2.	IRBA Rules Regarding Improper Conduct (Revised 2019)	The IRBA Rules Regarding Improper Conduct (Revised 2019) repeal and replace the IRBA Rules Regarding Improper Conduct issued in June 2010, referred to in	The amendments have been issued	Effective from 1 January 2020 https://www.irba.co.za/guidance-to-ras/technical-guidance-for-auditors/ethics:-the-rules-and-the-code/the-rules-and-the-code

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
		Section 10(1) read with Section 21(2) of the Act.		
3.	Final Amendments to the IRBA Code of Professional Conduct for Registered Auditors (Revised November 2018) relating to Registered Candidate Auditors	<p>Amendments to the Auditing Profession Act (Act 26 of 2005) resulted in the additional regulation of registered candidate auditors¹. At the commencement of the Audit Development Programme, registered candidate auditors acknowledge their obligation to comply with the IRBA Code.</p> <p>The IRBA Code addresses the definition and role of a registered auditor, and this includes both the individual and the firm. It, however, does not specifically address the role and definition of a registered candidate auditor.</p> <p>Therefore, these amendments will provide clarity on the application of the IRBA Code to registered candidate auditors.</p>	The amendments have been finalised and issued	<p>Effective on or after 1 November 2020</p> <p>https://www.irba.co.za/guidance-for-ras/ethics:-the-rules-and-the-code/the-irba-code-revised-2018</p>

¹ An individual who has obtained a professional accountant designation from an accredited professional body, who is registered as a candidate auditor with the Regulatory Board and who is serving under the supervision of a registered auditor.

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
4.	Electronic signatures	<p>The IRBA Code of Professional Conduct includes local requirements on the signing of audit and assurance reports. This project was to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) If advanced electronic signatures should be mandatory for audit reports, where they are signed electronically; b) If the IRBA Code requirements on the use of electronic signatures will apply equally to other reports and certificates discussed in Subsection 115 of the IRBA Code; and c) Application material to assist the registered auditor with safeguards against the potential unauthorised access to and use of the electronic signature. 	<p>An Exposure draft was issued, and the comment period closed on 21 September 2020.</p>	<p>Final amendments expected to be issued in early 2021.</p> <p>https://www.irba.co.za/guidance-e-to-ras/technical-guidance-for-auditors/exposure-drafts-and-comment-letters</p>

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
5.	Public inspections report 2019	The IRBA's most recent Public Inspections Report, issued in March 2020	The report is available here: https://www.irba.co.za/guidance-to-ras/inspections/reports	Annual
6.	Feedback Report: Audit Quality Indicators 2019	The IRBA has launched its Feedback Report on Audit Quality Indicators. This report provides feedback on a set of measures that audit firms reported on to the regulator, as well as provides audit committees with insights relevant to the appointment, performance, independence and appointment of the auditor.	The report is available here: https://www.irba.co.za/guidance-for-ras/technical-guidance-for-ras/transparency-reporting-and-audit-quality-indicators-aqis	
UNITED KINGDOM – Financial Reporting Council (FRC)				
1.	Pronouncement: Revised Ethical Standard 2019. (Please see May 2019 return for Post Implementation Review and Consultation Activities).	Key changes include, but are not limited to: Third party test - The definition of objective, reasonable and informed third party now focusses on the perspective of an informed investor, shareholder or other stakeholder.	The Revised Ethical Standard 2019 became effective on 15 March 2020. Implementation Guidance issued May 2020 (transitional arrangements and OEPI)	N/A

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
		<p>Loan staff assignments - Loan staff assignments will generally be prohibited.</p> <p>Removal of contingent fees - Contingent fees will no longer be permitted for non-audit / additional services.</p> <p>Internal audit services - Firms will no longer be able to provide internal audit services to audited entities or their significant affiliates.</p> <p>Non audit services for public interest entities (PIEs) - Rather than providing a blacklist of non-audit services which must not be provided to PIEs (their parents or worldwide controlled undertakings), the Revised Ethical Standard 2019 now provides a whitelist of services which may be provided. If the service is not on the list, it must not be provided. (see also OEPIs below)</p> <p>Gifts and hospitality - The requirement to establish</p>		

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
		<p>policies on the nature and value of gifts, favours and hospitality that may be accepted from and offered to other entities has been extended to apply to those entities which are likely to subsequently become audited entities. Guidance is available in our Gifts and hospitality</p> <p>Other entities of public interest (OEPs) - A new term, other entity of public interest (OEPI) is introduced. This is defined as an entity which does not meet the definition of a PIE, but nevertheless is of significant public interest to stakeholders. The most recent version of the FRC's Glossary of Terms – Ethics and Auditing explains in detail which entities are in scope of this definition. OEPIs will be subject to the same restrictions on non-audit / additional services as PIEs for periods commencing on or after 15 December 2020, although will not be subject to</p>		

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
		<p>the 70% non-audit services cap.</p> <p>SME listed entities - SME listed entities were not previously subject to many of the prohibitions applied to listed entities more generally – this is no longer the case.</p>		
2.	<p>Significant Initiatives to Support Auditors Related to Issues Arising from the Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the Audit and Emerging Matters (including in relation to both audit and ethical matters):</p>	<p>1. The FRC has issued guidance to auditors intended to provide practical help.</p> <p>2. Further measures to that have been agreed jointly with the FRC, the FCA and the PRA allow both companies and auditors, to focus on the delivery of information to investors and the capital. Some measures offer relief in respect of ethical provisions, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postponement of auditor tenders. Companies are encouraged to consider delaying planned tenders for new auditors, even when mandatory rotation is due. The FRC has legislative power to 	<p>Guidance issued.</p> <p>Web page</p>	Current

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
		<p>extend certain mandates, where the initial appointment commenced after 17 June 1994, by up to 2 years in exceptional circumstances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postponement of audit partner rotation – Key audit partners are required to rotate every five years. However, where there are good reasons, for example to maintain audit quality in current circumstances, the rotation can be extended (to no more than seven years). This needs to be agreed with the audit committee of any affected entity but does not need to be cleared with or approved by the FRC or other regulators. • The FRC have also granted NAS fee waivers, using the powers we have in law to assist companies in recapitalizing or taking steps to improve their financial stability. 		

No.	Nature of Development / Issue	Actual / Planned Response	Current Status	Timing of Any Outputs
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FRC have clarified that auditors can assist their clients in applying for help under government support schemes, where they had assessed that in doing so would not undermine their independence. 		
UNITED STATES - American Institute of Certified Public Accountant, Professional Ethics Executive Committee (AICPA PEEC)				
1.	Staff Augmentation Arrangements	Re-exposed September 8, 2020	Comments due December 8, 2020	February 2021 – Task Force recommendations to PEEC based on comment letter feedback
2.	Non-Compliance with Laws and Regulations (NOCLAR)	Re-exposure estimated for February 2021	Ongoing task force meetings	August 2021 – Task Force recommendations to PEEC based on comment letter feedback
3.	Records Requests	Revised Interpretation	Comment letter analysis	November 2020 – Task Force recommendations to PEEC based on comment letter feedback
4.	Strategy & Work Plan	Issuance	Last stages of finalization for presentation to PEEC	November 2020

2. Status of Plans to Adopt or Converge with the IESBA Restructured Code

Please provide an update regarding plans or actions in your country or jurisdiction to adopt the IESBA Code or converge national ethics standards, including independence requirements, with the IESBA Code.

AUSTRALIA (APESB)

Status of Plans to Adopt or Converge with the IESBA Revised and Restructured Code

In November 2018, APESB issued a restructured APES 110 *Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants (including Independence Standards)* (APES 110) which incorporates the IESBA's 2018 Restructured Code (including the restructured Inducements provisions). The effective date of the restructured APES 110 is 1 January 2020.

The restructured APES 110 is largely consistent with the IESBA Code – approximately 98% compliant. Differences are primarily intended to comply with Australian legal or regulatory requirements. Notable differences include:

- Requirements being set in **bold font**, consistent with APESB's other Standards;
- Stronger requirements regarding referral fees and commissions;
- The definition of Engagement Team in APES 110 does not exclude individuals within the client's internal audit function who provide direct assistance on an Audit Engagement;
- More flexibility for a Member in Business when reporting on financial statements as they may not be in the position to ultimately approve the financial statements;
- APESB drafting conventions (e.g. Use of 'Member' instead of 'Professional Accountant', capitalisation of defined terms) – these are not substantive;
- The abbreviation of Non-Compliance with Laws and Regulations is NOCLAR rather than the term 'non-compliance' used in the IESBA restructured Code; and
- The *Guide to the Code* has been updated to include a section on APESB pronouncements.

In September 2020, the APESB issued an [Amending Standard](#): *Amendments to Part 4B of APES 110 Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants (including Independence Standards)*. These amendments align Part 4B of APES 110 with the international requirements issued by IESBA ,apart from a minor change to the definition of Assurance Engagement (whereby the definition in APES 110 retains the reference

to the Framework for Assurance Engagements rather than referring to ISAE 3000 (Revised)) . The amendments become effective from 1 July 2021.

In October 2020, APESB commenced the due process to exposure amendments to APES 110 relating to the Role and Mindset Expected of Professional Accountants. The exposure draft is based on the final pronouncement issued by the IESBA in early October 2020, with the APESB proposing the changes to become effective from 1 January 2022. The comment period for the exposure draft closes 1 February 2021.

CANADA (CPA CANADA PUBLIC TRUST COMMITTEE)

The Canadian provincial CPA bodies maintain codes of conduct that are largely harmonized and reflective of any jurisdictional differences. The provincial rules of professional conduct have been developed to be as stringent as the IESBA requirements unless there is a legal, regulatory, public interest or protection of the public reason not to do so. Consequently, the Canadian CPA profession is intensely interested in developments affecting the IESBA Code and it significantly invests in Exposure Draft consultation and responses to provide input. In consideration of adopting a more-principles based code for the profession, such as the IESBA Code, a mapping project has been completed to review the revised and restructured IESBA Code in comparison to the provincial CPA codes of conduct. The mapping project output will be reviewed in detail to enhance decision making about the next phase of the provincial CPA codes to become more principles-based. A new Independence Standards Committee (ISC) will soon launch and it will consider future changes to Canadian independence standards based first upon changes made to the IESBA independence standards whilst maintaining Canadian standards that are more stringent or where differences have been determined to be in the public interest. An oversight protocol in respect of the ISC has been finalized with the independent Auditing and Assurance Standards Oversight Council (AASOC)

GERMANY (WPK)

Comparison between CoE-requirements and national regulations was conducted and finalized mainly in 2012 and 2013. A renewed assessment was conducted in 2015 in order to address the additional changes which the CoE had undergone in the meantime. The result of the aforementioned assessment was that the majority of 2014 CoE-provisions were covered by national rules.

The EU Audit Reform was implemented into German law recently, leading to various adjustments and modifications to the German Commercial Code (HGB), the Public Accountant Act (WPO) and the WPK by-laws (Professional Charter, Charter for Quality Assurance).

Some of the previously existing minor differences between German law and the IESBA Code of Ethics are thereby eliminated. As a result German professional rules in combination with the EU Audit Regulation reach convergence with the IESBA Code of Ethics requirements.

In addition, the WPK has just recently conducted a comparison between the latest 2018 version of the IESBA Code and national regulations. The conclusion of this review is that the German professional rules in combination with the EU Audit Regulation reach convergence with the IESBA Code of Ethics 2018 requirements. New IESBA releases, particularly those since 2018, are continually reviewed to ensure that the German ethical standards remain convergent with the IESBA Code.

HONG KONG (HKICPA)

The HKICPA Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants is based on the IESBA Code. The HKICPA Code (Parts A, B and C) has been converged with the IESBA Code since December 2005 http://www.hkicpa.org.hk/file/media/section6_standards/standards/051208e.pdf, with no substantive modifications. There is some clarification of requirements and guidance with reference to Hong Kong legislation and regulations. Part D of the HKICPA Code sets out additional ethical requirements on matters of relevance not covered by the IESBA Code, and is primarily derived from local legal or regulatory requirements. Part E of the HKICPA Code addresses specialized areas of practice – currently only liquidation and insolvency. Part F of the HKICPA Code set out the Guidelines on Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorist Financing for Professional Accountants which came into effect on 1 March 2018.

In November 2018, we issued the revised HKICPA Code of which Chapter A is converged with the IESBA Revised and Restructured Code with no substantive modifications. The HKICPA Code is compliant with the IESBA Revised and Restructured Code. The remaining chapters consist of extant local requirements and guidance which have been carried forward from the extant HKICPA Code. The additional local requirements (e.g. The HKICPA Code restricts payments of referral fees to third parties for the introduction of clients) have the effect of further strengthening ethical requirements on our members (i.e. compliance with the HKICPA Code ensures compliance with the IESBA Code).

INDIA (ICAI)

The ICAI Code of Ethics has been converged in line with 2018 edition of IESBA Code of Ethics edition.

The converged edition is effective from 1st July, 2020. Some of the provisions of IESBA Code of Ethics, 2018 edition have been suitably modified in the process of convergence. These modifications broadly fall under four categories:-

(A) Where the domestic provision of India is stricter than the corresponding provision of IESBA Code. For example, in India, there is complete prohibition on Accounting Services and Internal Audit Services to be undertaken by the Statutory Auditor. Thus, these provisions have accordingly been modified during convergence with the IESBA Code.

(B) Where the domestic requirement in India, resulting from a stipulation which has the force of law, is different as compared to the corresponding provision in the IESBA Code. For example, ICAI Networking Guidelines govern Networking between the professional accountants and the Firms registered with ICAI. Thus, the provisions pertaining to Networking in IESBA Code have been suitably modified, while converging.

(C) Where there exists a domestic requirement in India for which no corresponding provisions are there in the IESBA Code. For example, the IESBA Code mentions partner rotation requirements only, whereas certain important significant sectors in Indian jurisdiction stipulate Firm rotation requirements. Accordingly, the Firm rotation requirements have been incorporated in the ICAI Code, making it clear that the Firm rotation and partner rotation requirements will coexist.

(D) Language/minor changes – for example, “professional accountant in business” has been mentioned as “professional accountant in service” based on the usage in Chartered Accountants Act, 1949, the domestic statute governing the professional accountants in India.

The revised Code has been issued as a Guideline of the Council of ICAI, meaning thereby that the non-compliance of the provisions of Code would result in liability under the disciplinary mechanism of ICAI.

JAPAN (FSA and JICPA)

In Japan, the Ethical rules corresponding to the Code of Ethics of the IESBA, are defined in CPA Act and the Code of Ethics of JICPA.

JICPA has continued to revise the JICPA Code of Ethics and the Guidance to adopt the revision of IESBA Code. Provisions relating to the Ethics in Japan is more stringent (more restrictive, additional provisions) than the IESBA Code. As a result of this situation, JICPA adopts IESBA Code of Ethics.

In the process of revising the Code and guidance, JICPA has discussion with Financial Service Agency about IESBA’s activities including the current status of EDs and efforts on continuing improvements, explains them to stakeholders such as Japan Corporate Auditors Association and investors etc., and discusses the impacts on Japan with those parties. JICPA also keeps informing the JICPA members about the activities of IESBA in the monthly journal.

In July 2019, JICPA released the revision of a) the Code, b) the Guidance on NOCLAR (for PAIB) and c) the Interpretative Guidance for the Professional Ethics, to implement the revised IESBA Code which addressed 1) revised Part C of the Code addressing preparation and

presentation of information and pressure to breach the fundamental principles (based on the close-off document released in March 2016) and 2) NOCLAR for PAIB (revised in 2016). The effective date is April 1, 2020 with early adoption permitted.

In order to reflect the revision of the Long Association provisions in the Guidance on Independence, JICPA also revised the independence check-lists for auditors in April 2020.

JICPA is now in the process of revising a) the Code, b) the Guidance on NOCLAR, c) the Guidance on Independence and d) the Guidance on Conflicts of Interest in accordance with the revised and restructured Code (released in 2018). JICPA plans to release the final pronouncement in July 2022.

NEW ZEALAND (NzAuASB)

The NZAuASB issued its revised and restructured Code in December 2018, effective June 2019 (in line with the IESBA effective date). The XRB has the legal mandate to issue ethical standards only for assurance practitioners. In 2019 that mandate was extended to include related services engagements, which is defined as agreed-upon procedures or other non-assurance work that may ordinarily be carried out by an audit or assurance practitioner.

Professional and Ethical Standard 1 (PES 1) is substantially consistent with the IESBA Code as it applies to assurance practitioners. Part 2 has been adopted by the NZAuASB with an effective date of 15 December 2020.

The principles and requirements of PES 1 are consistent with the IESBA Code except for the following:

- The addition of a scope and application section. PES 1 has a narrower scope and is meant to apply to all assurance practitioners appointed or engaged to perform an assurance engagement. PES 1 refers to assurance practitioners whereas the IESBA Code refers to professional accountants.
- Section 321 Second Opinions has been deleted as it does not relate to assurance engagements. Part 2 of the IESBA Code, that applies to professional accountants in business has not been included in PES 1.
- The addition of paragraphs and definitions prefixed as NZ in PES 1. The additional definitions are of assurance services, assurance practitioner, FMC reporting entity considered to have a higher level of public accountability, key assurance partner, and offer document.
- PES 1 tailors the following IESBA defined terms in the New Zealand environment: assurance client, audit client and public interest entity.

- NZ R310.9.1 requires the assurance practitioner to disclose, in writing, the nature of the conflict of interest and the related safeguards applied to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level to all clients or potential clients affected by the conflict. NZ R310.9.2 requires the assurance practitioner to obtain the client's consent to perform the assurance services when safeguards are applied.
- NZ R310.12.1 requires an assurance practitioner to disengage from the relevant assurance engagement if adequate disclosure to the client of a conflict of interest is restricted as a result of confidentiality requirements.
- The requirements of section 360, *Responding to Non-Compliance with Laws and Regulations*, of the IESBA Code (paragraphs R360.10- NZ 360.28 A1.1) that apply only to audits of financial statements have been broadened to apply to both audit and review engagements. [Note: previously the NZAuASB had also extended the provisions relating to audit engagements to other assurance engagements. However, because of the changes the IESBA made to strengthen the conceptual framework and the revised safeguard provisions, the NZAuASB aligned the provisions relating to other assurance engagements with the IESBA Code when the NZAuASB issued the revised and restructured Code.]

Independence requirements

- NZ400.2.1 extends the scope of Part 4A to cover all assurance engagements in relation to an offer document of a FMC reporting entity considered to have a higher level of public accountability in respect of historical financial information, prospective or pro-forma financial information or a combination of these.
- For the purposes of PES 1, public interest entities include any entity that meets the Tier 1 criteria in accordance with XRB A1² and is not eligible to report in accordance with the requirements of another tier.
- NZ R400.12.1 and NZ R900.15.1 require that when an assurance practitioner identifies multiple threats to independence, which individually may not be significant, the assurance practitioner shall evaluate the significance of those threats in aggregate and apply safeguards to eliminate or reduce them to an acceptable level in aggregate.
- NZ R523.3 specifically prohibits a firm from providing audit services to an entity if the partner or employee of the firm serves as an officer or director, liquidator or receiver in respect of the property of the client or in a similar role.
- NZ R410.3 and NZ R905.3.1 emphasise that an assurance practitioner shall end or withdraw from an engagement where the total fees from the client represent a large proportion of the total fees of the firm and safeguards have not eliminated or reduced the threats to an acceptable level.

² XRB A1 *Application of the Accounting Standards Framework*

Provisions previously added to section 291 to align with section 290 were removed when the NZAuASB issued its revised and restructured Code, because of the changes the IESBA made to strengthen the conceptual framework and the revised safeguard provisions.

SOUTH AFRICA (IRBA)

The IRBA Code of Professional Conduct for Registered Auditors (the IRBA Code), comprising Parts A and B of the IESBA Code of Ethics was adopted and issued under copyright from IFAC during 2010. The IRBA Code is prescribed by the IRBA for use by registered auditors in South Africa with effect from 1 January 2011. The IRBA does not regulate professional accountants (who are not in public practice) and thus does not have any jurisdiction to enforce ethical requirements for professional accountants.

The IRBA Code applies only to registered auditors in public practice and their firms and engagement teams, as the IRBA is the regulator of the auditing profession. In the course of the adoption, the IRBA added certain more stringent requirements relevant to our jurisdiction.

The IRBA Code together with the IRBA Rules Regarding Improper Conduct (Rules) provides the basis for disciplinary action against registered auditors. The IRBA Code and Rules are published in English so translation issues do not arise.

The IRBA Code incorporated and adopted all subsequent changes to the IESBA Code.

The IRBA adopted the IESBA Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants (including International Independence Standards), issued during 2018, with local amendments, following the issue of proposed amendments on exposure in South Africa. This includes Part 1, 3, 4A and 4B. The IRBA Code may be downloaded from the [IRBA website](#).

While the IRBA has not adopted Part 2 of the IESBA Code, the IRBA Code does refer to Part 2, drawing the registered auditor's attention to the clarification that Part 2 will be applicable to registered auditors in so far as their role as professional accountants in business (PAIB). This was possible as SAICA has adopted the IESBA Code in its entirety.

The [IRBA website](#) contains a list of links to relevant guidance on the IRBA Code. A [mapping table](#) is available to facilitate the tracking of changes from the extant IRBA Code to the IRBA Code (Revised November 2018).

The IRBA is in the process of adopting amendments relating to *Alignment of Part 4B with ISAE 3000 (Revised)* and the *Promotion of role and mindset of professional accountants*.

UNITED KINGDOM (FRC)

The FRC is not aware of any significant instances where the relevant parts of the IESBA Code are more restrictive than the FRC's Ethical Standards.

UNITED STATES (AICPA PEEC)

The Professional Ethics Executive Committee (PEEC) is a senior committee of the AICPA charged with the responsibility of interpreting and enforcing the AICPA Code of Professional Conduct (the Code). As an “interpreter” of the Code, the PEEC is responsible for promulgating new interpretations and rulings, and for monitoring those rules and making revisions as needed. The PEEC helps the AICPA carry out key parts of its mission, namely to promote public awareness and confidence in the integrity, objectivity, competence and professionalism of its members; establish and enforce professional ethics standards for the profession; and assist members in continually improving their professional conduct and performance.

The PEEC has an IFAC Convergence & Monitoring standing task force. This task force is charged with identifying the projects that need to be undertaken as a result of convergence inconsistencies between the AICPA and the IFAC’s ethical exposure drafts. Current projects being monitored or evaluated by this standing task force include Non-Assurance Services, Fees, PIE, Tax, Engagement Team, Tax, and Technology. In addition, AICPA staff plans to perform a comparison of the AICPA code to the IESBA code and to consider a convergence matrix to assist members in understanding where the AICPA addresses IESBA topics more robustly in non-authoritative guidance.

3. IESBA’s Non Compliance with Laws and Regulations (NOCLAR) Standard

Please provide the following information:

1. Status of adoption of, or convergence with, the IESBA’s [NOCLAR standard](#) in your country or jurisdiction, including anticipated timing of adoption or convergence where applicable.
2. Any plans or actions to support implementation of the standard in your country or jurisdiction, including links to, or copies of, any implementation support materials developed.
3. Any challenges encountered in relation to adoption/convergence and implementation.

No.	Status of Adoption	Plans or Actions to Support Implementation	Challenges Encountered
AUSTRALIA (APESB)			
1.	<p>In November 2018 APESB issued the restructured APES 110 <i>Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants (Including Independence Standards)</i> (APES 110) which includes the NOCLAR provisions in their restructured format. The restructured APES 110 is effective from 1 January 2020.</p> <p>APESB had previously incorporated the NOCLAR provisions into the extant APES 110. The extant provisions were effective from 1 January 2018.</p> <p>NOCLAR amending standard is available on APESB’s website www.apesb.org.au</p>	<p>From 1 July 2019, new comprehensive whistleblowers protection laws became effective, which apply to the private sector and cover corporate and tax matters for the first time. It also requires public interest entities and some proprietary companies to put in place a whistleblowing policy.</p> <p>To assist Professional Accountants understand how the whistleblowing laws interact with key provisions in APES 110, such as confidentiality and NOCLAR, APESB Technical Staff are in the process of developing a Staff Q&A publication on this topic. The publication is currently being developed with APESB planning to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scope of the NOCLAR provisions and what is considered to be substantial harm is still a challenge for Professional Accountants. • The new Whistleblower legislation is likely to facilitate tax-related disclosures of non-compliance to regulators. Prior to the enactment of this legislation, tax disclosures were legally precluded.

No.	Status of Adoption	Plans or Actions to Support Implementation	Challenges Encountered
		release the publication by the end of 2020.	
CANADA (CPA CANADA PUBLIC TRUST COMMITTEE)			
1.	NOCLAR is under active consideration by the CPA profession's Public Trust Committee in relation to the CPA profession's existing ethical standards and within the context of Canadian laws, regulations, protection of the public and the public interest.		Canada has a complex regulatory and legal environment with a division of legal and authoritative powers within 10 provincial and 2 territorial jurisdictions and a federal jurisdiction. Canada does not have a single or comprehensive legal or regulatory requirement to report NOCLAR and consequently lacks a cohesive administrative framework within which to report NOCLAR and also lacks effective consistent legislative limitations or protections for those who report NOCLAR. Input has been provided by the profession on the need for an overall framework for reporting and protections during federal consultations on reviewing the Canadian AMLTF regime. Specific efforts have been made by CPA Quebec to provide guidance to members on their obligation to protect professional secrecy on behalf of their clients and employer and new legislation allowing for possible disclosures that can be made to the Autorité des marchés financiers

No.	Status of Adoption	Plans or Actions to Support Implementation	Challenges Encountered
GERMANY (WPK)			
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to PIEs, German professional rules in combination with the EU Audit Regulation (EU No 536/2014) reach convergence with the IESBA’s NOCLAR standard • With regard to Non-PIEs German law is also convergent with the IESBA’s NOCLAR standard except for the disclosure of a NOCLAR to an external authority which would generally be prohibited by the strict confidentiality laws in Germany (as the IESBA’s NOCLAR standard provides for such an exception) • Additional application material was implemented in WPK’s Professional Charter recently to provide the profession with further guidance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific Application material for NOCLAR will be included in WPK’s Professional Charter. • Various articles on the IESBA’s NOCLAR standard and its effects on the German profession published, particularly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WPK Guidance (Praxishinweis der WPK): Non-Compliance with Laws and Regulations (NOCLAR), Änderungen am IESBA Code of Ethics in Kraft getreten, http://www.wpk.de/mitglieder/praxishinweise/code-of-ethics/ • WPK Guidance: Non-Compliance with Laws and Regulations (NOCLAR), Änderungen am IESBA Code of Ethics in Kraft getreten, WPK-Magazin 3/2017, Seite 44 ff. • WP/StB/RA Prof. Dr. Jens Poll: NOCLAR und die veränderte Rolle des Wirtschaftsprüfers im Umgang mit Gesetzesverstößen, WPg 17.2017, Seite 986 ff. 	None

No.	Status of Adoption	Plans or Actions to Support Implementation	Challenges Encountered
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WP Prof. Dr. Wienand Schruff, WP Heiko Spang: Künftige Meldepflicht des Abschlussprüfers bei Gesetzesverstößen des Mandanten, WPK Magazin 2/2016, 61 ff. • WP/StB/RA Prof. Dr. Jens Poll: Die Rolle des Wirtschaftsprüfers bei der Entdeckung von Gesetzesverstößen, WPg 24/2015, 1271 ff. 	
HONG KONG (HKICPA)			
2.	The HKICPA adopted the IESBA's NOCLAR Standard in September 2016, with the same effective date as the IESBA's NOCLAR standard.	<p>To support the implementation of the NOCLAR Standard, the HKICPA undertook the following initiatives since adoption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Set up a dedicated webpage in the HKICPA's website to provide guidance and promulgate IESBA supporting materials. (http://www.hkicpa.org.hk/en/standards-and-regulations/technical-resources/newmajor/noclar/) . Conduct face-to-face seminars. . Raise awareness via members' 	<p><i>1. Additional firm resources</i></p> <p>Large firms have a large variety of clients (different businesses, different locations and group companies which are incorporated in different jurisdictions). These clients are governed by different local or international laws and regulations. Firms need additional resources to ensure that professional accountants have adequate knowledge of the relevant Laws and Regulations of their clients.</p> <p>SMPs are also concerned about their limited resources to ensure that they have</p>

No.	Status of Adoption	Plans or Actions to Support Implementation	Challenges Encountered
		<p>communication channels, including e-circular, LinkedIn and Facebook.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Prepare technical update article in the HKICPA magazine. (http://aplusmagazine.realviewdigital.com/?iid=150249#folio=48) . Develop e-learning. <p>Plans for this year</p> <p>Continue to monitor if there is any implementation / application issue and consider the need to develop any local guidance.</p>	<p>considered the complete list of laws and regulations that are within the scope of the NOCLAR standard when they encountered suspected NOCLAR.</p> <p>2. <i>State Secrecy Law</i></p> <p>Certain jurisdictions have State Secrecy Law, e.g. PRC. It is difficult for professional accountants to consider whether communication under the NOCLAR standard may lead to a breach of the State Secrecy Law.</p> <p>3. <i>Laws/regulations vs Local Practice</i></p> <p>In some jurisdictions, there are cases where interpretation and implementation of laws and regulations in local provinces or cities is not the same as stated in the laws, e.g. PRC tax. Client normally follows local practice and it is difficult for professional accountants to determine whether clients have complied with the laws and regulations, and whether professional accountants have to take any further actions, including reporting to the appropriate authority.</p>
INDIA (ICAI)			

No.	Status of Adoption	Plans or Actions to Support Implementation	Challenges Encountered
1.	<p>ICAI has converged with NOCLAR standard as contained in the revised edition of ICAI Code of Ethics, 2019.</p> <p>To start with, NOCLAR provisions contained in ICAI Code apply for Audit Assignments of Listed entities with regard to professional accountants in practice. The requirements of further action/disclosure have been modified in the revised Code to the extent that they are in line with the client confidentiality requirements contained in the Chartered Accountants Act, 1949. Accordingly, the requirement under a law has been incorporated as a precursor for the purpose of proceeding for further action.</p> <p>Examples of “appropriate authority” have been incorporated to offer guidance for the implementation of standard in Indian circumstances.</p> <p>With regard to professional accountants in business, NOCLAR would apply only to employees of listed entities.</p> <p>The extension of applicability of the standard will be reviewed later.</p>	<p>Provisions of NOCLAR have already been issued in the revised Code of Ethics (Volume I), but due to the situation due to COVID-19, provisions of NOCLAR have been deferred till further notification by ICAI.</p> <p>https://www.icaai.org/post/applicability-revised-edition-code-of-ethics</p>	<p>There will be efforts for awareness of this standard, among others, so that this is implemented by the professional accountant in practice and in business.</p>
JAPAN (FSA and JICPA)			

No.	Status of Adoption	Plans or Actions to Support Implementation	Challenges Encountered
1.	<p>JICPA revised the Code to adopt the IESBA’s NOCLAR standard in two steps. Our plan was that we first revised it to adopt the NOCLAR provisions for PAPP, and then, revised it again to adopt the NOCLAR provisions for PAIB.</p> <p>As to the provisions for PAPP, JICPA released the final pronouncement in July 2018.</p> <p>As to the provisions for PAIB, JICPA released the final pronouncement in July 2019.</p> <p>NOTE: In the circumstances where an auditor (CPAs or audit firms) of a listed company identifies the fact that can impact on appropriateness of documents regarding financial calculation, such as violation of law, Financial Instruments and Exchange Act 193-3 requires the auditor (CPAs or audit firms) to notify the client of the fact to encourage the client to take appropriate measures. If the appropriate measures are not taken and the fact constituting a violation of laws and regulations could have a material impact on ensuring the appropriateness of the documents on financial accounting of the client, Financial Instruments and</p>	<p>JICPA developed the interpretative guidance on NOCLAR to support implementation. JICPA included those guidance for PAPP in the Interpretative Guidance for Professional Ethics (Q&A type of guidance) and released it in July 2018. JICPA revised the Interpretative Guidance for Professional Ethics to add the guidance for PAIB in July 2019.</p>	<p>In JAPAN, confidentiality is required to CPA by the law (the CPA Act) that prohibits disclosure of confidential information.</p> <p>Without justifiable grounds, disclosure of confidential client information or employer information to a third party (an appropriate authority) would result in violation of the law (the CPA Act).</p> <p>Therefore, JICPA precluded “disclosure of the matter to an appropriate authority” from the further action.</p>

No.	Status of Adoption	Plans or Actions to Support Implementation	Challenges Encountered
	Exchange Act 193-3 requires the auditor (CPAs or audit firms) to notify the Financial Services Agency of the fact of non-compliance or suspected non-compliance with laws and regulations.		
NEW ZEALAND (NZAuASB)			
1.	<p>The NZAuASB adopted IESBA's NOCLAR standard in section 360 of the Code when the revised and restructured Code was issued in December 2018, effective June 2019. Section 250 was adopted along with Part 2 in October 2020, effective 15 December 2020. Professional and Ethical Standard 1 has adopted but adapted the NOCLAR framework applicable to audit engagements to apply to review engagements also.</p> <p>Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand (CA ANZ) has proposed to adopt the IESBA framework as it applies to non-assurance engagements for other professional accountants in New Zealand.</p> <p>Implementation of the NOCLAR code requirements coincides with the</p>	<p>Joint articles developed with CA ANZ to promote awareness of the changes:</p> <p>Perspectives article - Responding to non-compliance with laws and regulations (Dec 2016)</p>	<p>In adopting the framework for assurance practitioners, the NZAuASB challenged the need for a different framework for audit versus review engagements and other assurance engagements. The NZAuASB decided to adopt the NOCLAR provisions applicable to audit engagements for review engagements also. In reconsidering the applicability of the NOCLAR provisions applicable to audit engagements for other assurance engagements, the NZAuASB determined that the compelling reason test was no longer met. Accordingly, in issuing the revised and restructured Code in NZ, the NZAuASB has aligned the NOCLAR provisions for other assurance engagements with the IESBA Code.</p>

No.	Status of Adoption	Plans or Actions to Support Implementation	Challenges Encountered
	introduction of strengthened New Zealand laws on anti-money laundering, including enhanced disclosure requirements by accountants.		
SOUTH AFRICA (IRBA)			
1.	South Africa has adopted amendments to the IESBA Code of Ethics responding to NOCLAR with the effective date of 15 July 2016.	<p>The Committee for Auditor Ethics (CFAE) of the IRBA issued Frequently Asked Questions relating to NOCLAR in the South African environment.</p> <p>NOCLAR has some similarity to the South African legislative requirement (whistle blowing provisions) of Reportable Irregularities (RI)³ for Registered Auditors, thus there was a need to clarify the difference between the two requirements, and to address how an auditor’s action may cover both NOCLAR and local legislation.</p>	As this is a significant change, the IRBA continues to raise awareness on NOCLAR, via articles and presentations. This will help ensure that all registered auditors are aware of the change.
UNITED KINGDOM (FRC)			
1.	IESBA’s NOCLAR Standard is addressed by the professional accountancy bodies that base their codes of ethics on the IESBA Code.	No further updates since May 2019	No further updates since May 2019

³ More information on Reportable Irregularities for Registered Auditors in South Africa is available <https://www.irba.co.za/guidance-to-ras/reportable-irregularities>

No.	Status of Adoption	Plans or Actions to Support Implementation	Challenges Encountered
UNITED STATES (AICPA PEEC)			
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exposure Draft issued March 10, 2017 • Comment Period ended May 12, 2017 	<p>Ongoing task force meetings to discuss the extreme diversity of comments received and challenges in implementation</p> <p>Collaboration with stakeholders, including regulatory bodies to determine workable provisions</p> <p>Re-exposure estimated for February 2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Litigious environment in the United States • Applicability considerations regarding audit versus non-audit services