

Haysmacintyre LLP response to IAASB's Proposed International Standard on Quality Management 2, *Engagement Quality Reviews*

1. Do you support a separate standard for engagement quality reviews? In particular, do you agree that ED-ISQM1 should deal with the [identification of] engagements for which an engagement quality review is to be performed and ED-ISQM2 should deal with the remaining aspects of engagement quality reviews?

Response: Yes. Having separate standards will make reference easier and should enhance compliance by keeping the requirements relating to the performance of engagement quality reviews separate from the general requirements relating to the overall system of quality management.

2. Are the linkages between the requirements for engagement quality reviews in ED-ISQM1 and ED-ISQM2 clear?

Response: Yes.

3. Do you support the change in terminology from “engagement quality control review/reviewer” to “engagement quality review/reviewer”?

Response: Yes

4. Do you support the requirements for eligibility to be appointed as engagement quality reviewer or assistant to the reviewer?
 - a. What are your views on the need for the guidance on a proposed cooling off period for that individual before being able to act as the engagement quality reviewer?
 - b. If you support such guidance, do you agree that it should be located in proposed ISQM2 as opposed to the IESBA Code?

Responses: Yes

- a. Guidance on the appropriate length of a cooling-off period between ceasing to act as engagement partner and appointment as engagement quality reviewer would be helpful, as well as explanatory material setting out the rationale for any minimum thresholds set.
- b. Yes. This would support ISQM2 as a self-contained standard dealing with the engagement quality review process.

5. Do you agree with the requirements relating to the nature, timing and extent of the engagement quality reviewer's procedures? Are the responsibilities of the engagement quality reviewer appropriate given the revised responsibilities of the engagement partner in the proposed ISA220 (revised)?

Responses: Yes to both questions.

6. Do you agree that the engagement quality reviewer's evaluation of the engagement team's significant judgments includes evaluating the engagement team's exercise of professional scepticism? Do you believe that ED-ISQM2 should further address the exercise of professional scepticism by the engagement quality reviewer? If so, what suggestions do you have?

Response: Yes. ED-ISQM2 appears to adequately address the exercise of professional scepticism by the engagement quality reviewer.

7. Do you agree with the enhanced documentation requirements?

Response: yes

8. Are the requirements for engagement quality reviews scalable for firm's of varying size and complexity?

Response: The requirements appear to be appropriately scalable for a firm of our size and complexity.