January 25, 2022

AICPA
1345 Avenue of the Americas
27th Floor
New York, NY 10105

By e-mail: CommentLetters@aicpa-cima.com

Re: Proposed Statement on Standards for Accounting and Review Services—Quality Management for an Engagement Performed in Accordance With Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services

(November 3, 2021)

The New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants (NYSSCPA), representing more than 21,000 CPAs in public practice, industry, government and education, welcomes the opportunity to comment on the above-captioned exposure draft.

The NYSSCPA’s Accounting and Review Services Committee deliberated the exposure draft and prepared the attached comments. If you would like additional discussion with us, please contact Sharon Brenner, Chair of the Accounting and Review Services Committee, at (516) 542-6300, or Ernest J. Markezin, NYSSCPA staff, at (212) 719-8303.

Sincerely,

Rumbi Bwerinofa-Petrozzello
President
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The New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants (NYSSCPA) welcomes the opportunity to provide comments on the AICPA’s Accounting and Review Services Committee (ARSC) exposure draft of proposed Statement on Standards for Accounting and Review Services, *Quality Management for an Engagement Performed in Accordance with Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services.*

(November 3, 2021)

We appreciate the hard work and diligence of the ARSC in developing the proposed revisions contained in the exposure draft. We support the exposure draft and offer below our responses to the Requests for Specific Comment.

**Request for Specific Comment #1:** Do you agree that the proposed revisions to AR-C sections 60 and 90, excluding the amendment to paragraph .16 of AR-C section 90, result in the SSARSs being appropriately consistent with the proposed auditing standards?

If you believe that the proposed revisions do not result in appropriate consistency, please provide detailed revisions that you think should be made to the SSARSs to ensure appropriate consistency with the proposed auditing standards.

**Response:** We agree that the proposed revisions to AR-C sections 60 and 90 result in the SSARSs being appropriately consistent with the proposed auditing standards. We note a proper emphasis, consistent with the auditing standards, on partner oversight and overall responsibility for ensuring adequate timing and resources for performing a quality engagement. Further, the substantive revisions regarding quality management, specifically in 60.24, is appropriate. We also believe the language removed, separate from the amendment to paragraph .16 of AR-C section 90, is appropriate.

**Request for Specific Comment #2:** Do you agree that the effective date of the proposed SSARS should be consistent with the effective date of the proposed SAS?

If you do not agree, please provide the reasons why you believe the effective date of the proposed SSARS should not be consistent with the effective date of the auditing standard.

**Response:** We support that the effective date of the proposed SSARS should be consistent with the effective date of the proposed SAS. This would help to eliminate any
misunderstanding within the profession or by the public, and provides for effective
implementation.

Request for Specific Comment #3: Do you agree with the proposed revision to
paragraph .16 of AR-C section 90?

If you do not agree, please indicate what revisions you believe should be made to the
SSARSs so that the requirements are consistent.

Response: We agree with the wording of the proposed revision to paragraph .16 of AR-C
section 90. The deletion of “prior to performing the engagement” eliminates uncertainty
as to at which point “prior to performing the engagement” is, as it relates to planning
work such as the determination of expectations, preliminary research related to the
industry and other procedures performed before the start of “fieldwork.” Further, the
existing requirement is too restrictive and puts limitations on the accountant’s judgement.
Additionally, since paragraph .16 of AR-C section 90 includes the word “should” it
further supports eliminating the phrase since it is not indicated as required.

However, if the ARSC does not strike the language from paragraph .16 of AR-C section
90, we suggest the consideration of a more descriptive definition of “prior to performing
the engagement” and indicate at which point in time “prior to” is intended to be.

Request for Specific Comment #4: Do you agree with the proposed amendment to
paragraph .16 being effective upon issuance?

If you do not agree, please provide an effective date that you consider more appropriate
and your reasons for your proposal.

Response: We agree that the proposed amendment to paragraph .16 should be effective
upon issuance because we believe the deletion of the phrase “prior to performing the
engagement” will not result in any practice issues. Furthermore, we agree with the ARSC
that the proposed revision is a technical correction of the literature, adding to our support
of the amendment being effective upon issuance.