



DECEMBER 2024

Accredited body report – NZICA

Findings from the FMA's review of the adequacy and effectiveness of NZICA's audit regulatory systems for the period 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024

This copyright work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 New Zealand licence. You are free to copy, distribute and adapt the work, as long as you attribute the work to the Financial Markets Authority and abide by the licence terms. To view a copy of this licence, visit [creativecommons.org](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/nz/)

Contents

Executive summary	3
About this report	3
About NZICA and its obligations	3
How we approached this review	4
Overall assessment	4
Focus areas	5
Membership, licensing, and registrations	5
Monitoring and general oversight	5
Promoting and monitoring competence of members	6
Complaints, enquiries, investigations, and discipline	6
Future focus	8

Executive summary

About this report

The Auditor Regulation Act 2011 (**the Act**) requires the Financial Markets Authority – Te Mana Tātai Hokohoko (**FMA**) to monitor the audit regulatory systems of accredited bodies and report annually on the extent to which the systems are adequate and effective.

As frontline regulators, accredited bodies play a crucial role in New Zealand's financial markets, with responsibility for overseeing domestic licensed auditors and registered audit firms. One of the FMA's strategic intentions during the review period was to promote trust and confidence in capital markets, which included monitoring the licensed auditor population and the quality of audits.

This report contains the findings of our monitoring assessment of the New Zealand Institute of Chartered Accountants (**NZICA**) for the period 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024.

About NZICA and its obligations

NZICA and the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Australia (**ICAA**) formally amalgamated on 1 January 2015 to form Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand (**CAANZ**). However, NZICA continues to regulate the accountancy profession for members who remain resident in New Zealand. For the purpose of the audit oversight regime, NZICA is the accredited body, and therefore the subject of the FMA's annual review.

CAANZ has over 139,000 members globally, with the majority based in Australasia. Of those, NZICA had approximately 26,468 members, with 17 registered firms and 131 licensed auditors, as at 30 June 2024. CAANZ has a number of offices across New Zealand.

NZICA was granted accreditation in accordance with section 50 of the Act.

As an accredited body, NZICA is required by the Act to have adequate and effective systems, policies and procedures in place to perform its regulatory functions. In addition, the FMA has prescribed minimum standards for accredited bodies in relation to governance and organisational structures, internal compliance procedures, policies and audit regulatory systems.

In relation to this review, audit regulatory systems¹ include:

- Membership, licensing, and registrations
- Monitoring and general oversight
- Promoting and monitoring the competence of members
- Complaints, enquiries, investigations, and discipline.

The Act also requires NZICA to provide to the FMA an annual report assessing its own performance against its obligations.

¹ Requirements of regulatory functions are set out in section 6 of the Auditor Regulation Act 2011 and in section 3 of the Auditor Regulation Act (Prescribed Minimum Standards for Accredited Bodies) Notice 2012.

How we approached this review

We carried out a comprehensive review of NZICA's regulatory systems, employing a risk-based approach and exercising judgement in selecting the level and detail of work performed in each area.

As part of the review process, we assessed information relating to NZICA's regulatory systems and processes. We reviewed policies and procedures, considered the activity during the period, undertook various sample tests and met with various NZICA personnel from the Regulation and Conduct team during an onsite visit in August 2024, obtaining further information at that time. We also reviewed NZICA's annual report and self-assessment, provided to the FMA on 30 September 2024. This, along with other monitoring and engagement in relation to NZICA throughout the year, provided sufficient detail for us to undertake this review.

In its annual report, NZICA concluded that its audit regulatory systems were adequate and effective in discharging its responsibilities as an accredited body under the Auditor Regulation Act during the year, and that it has allocated sufficient resources to ensure its audit regulatory systems are and continue to be adequate and effective.

Overall assessment

We have concluded that NZICA's audit regulatory systems relevant to our review were adequate and effective during the period.

We have some recommendations for further enhancement. Consistent with the prior year, the FMA and NZICA have been engaging constructively, with improvement in the quality of engagement on both auditor and accredited body regulatory matters. We will engage further in the upcoming year to enhance the protocols between the agencies for complaints and referrals.

Focus areas

Membership, licensing, and registrations

During the period, NZICA licensed 7 new auditors, granted 65 renewals, and cancelled 9 auditor licences (all voluntary cancellations). One auditor licence had restrictive conditions imposed.

We reviewed NZICA's systems, policies and procedures for processing and dealing with licence changes, from initial applications to modifications and cancellations, to ensure NZICA meets the prescribed minimum standards for accredited bodies. We also reviewed a sample of the above licensing activity to determine whether the applications and requests were processed and assessed according to these systems, policies and procedures.

Conclusion

In all instances we found the licensing assessments to be reasonable and well documented. All sampled licences and renewals were issued in accordance with the prescribed minimum standards, and the cancellations were appropriately managed. We concluded that NZICA's membership, licensing and registration systems were adequate and effective in the review period.

Monitoring and general oversight

NZICA continued monitoring and oversight of its licensed auditors and registered audit firms during the review period, updating its risk assessments and risk register, and performing a number of monitoring procedures.

We reviewed changes to NZICA's systems, policies and procedures for monitoring domestic licensed auditors and registered audit firms. We reviewed NZICA's risk assessments and risk register, and the outcomes of various reviews and enquiries, to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of monitoring work.

We also considered how NZICA developed and implemented strategies to address or mitigate issues of non-compliance and concerns identified through its own monitoring. In all instances we considered whether monitoring and outcomes aligned with focus areas and desired outcomes of the FMA's current plan for oversight and regulation of auditors.

Conclusion

We observed that NZICA undertakes a risk-based approach to monitoring auditors and audit firms by applying a risk rating to all FMC-licensed auditors in accordance with its protocols, to inform the monitoring activity. NZICA has planned to enhance its process for undertaking risk assessments to complement its audit manual and monitoring processes, and expects to complete this work by the end of the calendar year.

Overall, we concluded NZICA's monitoring and oversight systems, policies and procedures relevant to our review were adequate during the review period.

Promoting and monitoring competence of members

As part of its regulatory functions, NZICA is responsible for promoting the ongoing competence of licensed auditors.

We assessed NZICA's policies in relation to Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and International Education Standard 8 (IES 8) requirements of members, as well as its monitoring and disciplinary protocols related to licensed auditors meeting their ongoing competence requirements. NZICA monitors annual declarations of CPD hours, and requests records for a sample of members.

We reviewed a sample of NZICA's assessments and found that all the sampled licensed auditors provided a good level of record keeping and necessary evidence to support CPD requirement compliance. Most of the sampled licensed auditors were also found to fully comply with IES 8. Where they were not fully compliant, we observed NZICA had a follow-up plan to obtain further evidence.

We also considered NZICA's educational programme, which includes national conferences, online trainings such as webinars, and micro-courses. We reviewed a sample of these to determine the quality of courses promoting auditor competence and whether they respond to evolving issues and address the needs of the industry.

Conclusion

We found training provided to the licensed population is sufficient to maintain and extend knowledge of auditing and accounting standards. Regarding CPD monitoring, we made recommendations to NZICA to provide independent review of the selection criteria and complement the CPD worksheet with guidance to support the review process. We are satisfied that adequate processes are in place to ensure the quality and relevance of courses are considered before they are offered to members. Overall, we concluded NZICA's systems to promote and monitor the competence of licensed auditors to be adequate and effective during the review period.

Complaints, enquiries, investigations, and discipline

We considered NZICA's systems, policies and procedures in relation to complaints, enquiries, investigations and disciplinary matters, in responding to, and taking action against, misconduct. We obtained the status of:

- all enquiries and investigations in response to FMA referrals or complaints;
- complaints made by NZICA; and
- complaints made to NZICA by the public other than those from the FMA

in relation to licensed auditors or firms. We also undertook a review of a Disciplinary Tribunal case that was concluded within the review period.

Conclusion

Our review found there was a robust process with detailed information supporting the complaint through all steps, including the Practice Review Advisory Group, Professional Conduct Committee and Disciplinary Tribunal. We found that most of the self-identified learnings from the prior period were adequately

addressed. Overall, we concluded NZICA's systems relating to complaints, enquiries, investigations, and discipline to be adequate and effective during the review period.

Future focus

We will continue to monitor NZICA's compliance with the requirements of the Act, the prescribed minimum standards, and the conditions of its accreditation.

The FMA has regular contact with NZICA regarding its regulatory functions, through our Audit and Frontline Regulators teams. When required, we communicate early about our expectations, rather than waiting until the end of a review period. There is continuing focus on the enhancement of protocols for complaints and referrals of a disciplinary nature.