The quality reviewer should document the quality control review by marking audit documentation that he or she reviews as “Reviewed” in the audit file; and by documenting comments made using the “Quality Reviewer Notes” column available in this Checklist and/or by documenting directly in the audit file, using the “Quality Reviewer” audit procedure (under B.2.PRG). The quality reviewer should also agree to the disposition of comments and resolve any differences of opinion with the engagement leader and the team, as necessary.

Please refer to the following manual sections, which describe the role of a quality reviewer ([OAG Audit 3063](http://localhost/intranet/performance-audits/manual/3063.shtm)), ([OAG Audit 1012](http://localhost/intranet/performance-audits/manual/1012.shtm)), the identification, resolution, documentation and communication of significant matters ([OAG Audit 1141](http://localhost/intranet/performance-audits/manual/1141.shtm)), [(OAG audit 1142)](http://localhost/intranet/performance-audits/manual/1142.shtm), ([OAG Audit 1143](http://localhost/intranet/performance-audits/manual/1143.shtm)), the documentation of the quality review ([OAG Audit 1161](http://localhost/intranet/performance-audits/manual/1161.shtm)), ([OAG Audit 1163](http://localhost/intranet/performance-audits/manual/1163.shtm)),and the resolution of differences of opinion ([OAG Audit 3082](http://localhost/intranet/performance-audits/manual/3082.shtm)).

Unless otherwise stated, activities apply to both Performance Audits (PA) and Special Examinations (SE).

| **Planning Phase–**  **Requirements for all Product Lines** | **CPA Canada** | **Planning Phase–Quality Reviewer Activities** | **TM Ref (Nov-2018)** | **Quality Reviewer Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Engagement Familiarization and Quality Reviewer Independence** | | | | |
| Ensure you have confirmed your independence to the engagement leader as required by OAG policy.   1. Obtain a general understanding of the planned engagement. | CSQC 1 A45 bullet 1&2,  CAS220.A30 bullet 1&2, | 1. Complete an Independence Confirmation form. | A.2.PRG |  |
| 1. Review key documents and meet with the engagement leader and key team members to discuss. |  |
| 1. Review the risk assessment (i.e. Engagement Risk Assessment; Functional Risk Identification; and Risks and Controls Assessment) | A.5.PRG  C.2.PRG |
| **PA (only)** |  |
| 1. Review the Audit Report Submission. | A.1.PRG |
| **SE (only)** |  |
| 1. Review the report of the previous special examination | C.1.PRG |
| **Discussion with Engagement Team** | | | | |
| 1. Following the above familiarization, discuss with the engagement leader and key members of the engagement team their assessment of: 2. The significant judgements made in assessing engagement acceptance/continuance. 3. The competency profile needed and resources required for the audit team. 4. The significant judgments made in forming their assessment of engagement risk, the identification of significant risks, the risk of fraud, and the audit criteria. 5. Identified threats and safeguards taken in respect of independence and relevant ethical requirements and the process the engagement team is undertaking to identify and resolve threats to independence. 6. Any additional significant matters the engagement leader is aware of, including the approach taken by the engagement team to identify and dispose of such matters. 7. The nature and extent of consultations undertaken during the planning phase as well as expected further consultation. 8. Disagreements between the audit entity and the engagement team relating to audit criteria or other key planning inputs. | CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b-i); A74(b)  CSQC 1.38(a), CAS220.21(a)  CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b); A.74 (a);  CSQC1.37(a), CAS220.19(b)CAS220.20(a)  CSAE 3001 s. 40 (a), (b – i); A74(b)  CAS220.21(b)    CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b-i) – A.74 (b) | *Addressed in 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 above and below.* | N/A |  |
| **Objective Evaluation** | | | | |
| 1. **Objectively evaluate** the engagement team's planning significant judgments and conclusions regarding: |  | *Addressed below* | N/A |  |
| **Acceptance and Continuance** | | | | |
| 1. Engagement **acceptance and continuance considerations** not evaluated elsewhere; 2. Were acceptance or continuance issues appropriately communicated and resolved? |  | *Addressed in 1, 3, 4, and 5 above and below.* | N/A |  |
| **SE (only)**   1. Review the completed "Acceptance and continuance" audit procedure, as applicable. | A.1.PRG |  |
| **Collective Competence, Time and Resources** | | | | |
| 1. The engagement team's **collective competence, resources and time** necessary to perform the assurance engagement; 2. Has the engagement team identified needed specialist help such as an internal specialist or consultation? 3. The engagement budget (hours/contract dollars). |  | 1. Evaluate the significant judgments made regarding the team’s resources and time necessary to perform the audit. |  |  |
| 1. Has the audit team identified needed internal specialists and/or external experts? | A.2.PRG |
| 1. Was the audit budget (hours/contract dollars) properly established by assessing the right level of effort? |  |
| 1. Review the T-Minus schedule (PA) or the key dates for Special Examinations). | A.1.PRG |
| 1. Review the Engagement Risk (and Team Competency) Assessment. | A.5.PRG |
| 1. Review the “Optional—Use of Experts” audit procedure. | A.2.PRG |
| 1. Review the Audit Programs1 and the Budget2. Discuss the budget with the engagement leader to ensure it was properly established by assessing the right level of effort (hours, travel and contract dollars). **Sign off the Budget as “reviewed”.** | 1C.4.PRG  2A.1.PRG |
| **Engagement Planning** | | | | |
| 1. The key components of engagement risk, significant risks, assessed risk of fraud, and audit criteria together with the audit team's planned response to those risks. | CSQC 1.A45 bullet 1 and 2, CAS220 .A30 bullet 1 and 2,  CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b-i); A74(b) | 1. Review the risk assessment (i.e. Functional Risk Identification; and Risks and Controls Assessment). 2. Review the Audit Logic Matrix and assess the suitability of the criteria for auditing the subject matter. Evaluate whether the planned audit criteria will permit the audit team to conclude on the audit objective within the defined scope. **Sign off on the Audit Logic Matrix when reviewed.** | C.2.PRG |  |
| **Independence** | | | | |
| 1. **Independence** and relevant ethical requirements in relation to the specific engagement including the safeguards put in place to eliminate or reduce identified threats to an acceptable level. | CSQC 1.38(a) CAS220.21(a)  CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b-i) – A.74 (a) | 1. Review the Independence Confirmations and any Exception Reports. Ensure that proposed safeguards and actions have been reviewed and approved by the Internal Specialist, Values and Ethics (with Legal Services). | A.2.PRG |  |
| **Other Significant Matters** | | | | |
| 1. The adequacy of the engagement team's planned response to any other significant matters that have come to the attention of the quality reviewer. | CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b-I, iii) – A.74 (b),(c). | 1. Review documentation in the Significant Judgments folder, as required, and any other significant matters. | B.1.PRG |  |
| **Consultation and Differences of Opinion** | | | | |
| 1. Whether appropriate consultations have taken place during the planning phase on any difficult or contentious matters or differences of opinion and have those consultations and conclusions reached been: 2. appropriately documented in the engagement file; 3. agreed with the parties consulted; 4. implemented by the engagement team; 5. Are further consultations planned in response to difficult of contentious matters identified during planning? | CSQC 1.38(b) CAS220.21(b)  CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b); A74(b) | 1. Review the results of consultations made during the Planning Phase. |  |  |
| 1. Review consultations made with the Advisory Committee (if any) and/or the Planning Phase AG Briefing and how the team has disposed of comments received. [([OAG Audit 2050](http://localhost/intranet/performance-audits/manual/2050.shtm)) clarifies that members of the advisory committee do not approve the disposition of advice]. | C.2.PRG |
| 1. Review the consultations made during the elaboration of the Audit Logic Matrix (including appropriate consultations with internal specialists). | C.2.PRG |
| 1. Assess the completeness of documentation and the team responses to consultations. | C.2.PRG |
| 1. Ensure that all necessary consultations have been conducted in response to difficult or contentious matters or differences of opinion. | C.2.PRG |
| 1. Review the Engagement Leader—Examination Approval | C.5.PRG |
| 1. Discuss with the engagement leader or review documentation of any other planned future consultations. | C.4.PRGC.5.PRG |
| **External communications** | | | | |
| 1. Assess the appropriateness of the matters and content included in key planning deliverables to be communicated to Parliament, responsible ministers and/or the legislature, management, those charged with governance and, where applicable, other parties. 2. Review the engagement team's disposition of comments received in response to external communications issued in the planning phase. | CSQC 1.A45 bullet 4, CAS220.A30 bullet 4, | **PA (only)**   1. Review the draft Audit Plan Summary and the team's disposition of comments received from the entity on the Audit Plan Summary. **Sign off on the APS when reviewed.** | C.3.PRG |  |
| **SE (only)**   1. Review the Special Examination Plan and the team's disposition of comments received from management and/or the Audit Committee/Board of Directors on the Special Examination Plan. **Sign off on the SE Plan when reviewed.**   Review the *Engagement and Solicitor Client-Privilege Letter* for the special examination. | C.3.PRG  A.3.PRG |
| **Engagement Documentation** | | | | |
| 1. Consider whether audit **documentation selected for review reflects** the work performed in relation to the significant judgments made and supports the conclusions reached in respect of these matters. | CSQC 1.38(c), 37(c), CAS220.21(c)  CSAE 3001 s.40 (b);  A74 (b), (c). | *See the “Requirements for all Product Lines” column* | N/A |  |
| 1. Evidence your review of engagement documents selected for review by marking them as reviewed. 2. Document any comments resulting from your review of audit planning, including another significant matters that have come to your attention during the quality control review, for disposition by the audit team. 3. Agree to the disposition of the comments and resolve any differences of opinion between the engagement leader and quality reviewer as necessary. |  | *See the “Requirements for all Product Lines” column* | N/A |  |
| **Conclude** | | | | |
| 1. Conclude whether you are aware of any unresolved matters that would cause you to believe that the significant judgments the engagement team made and the conclusions it reached in planning the engagement were not appropriate ([OAG Audit 1163](http://localhost/intranet/performance-audits/manual/1163.shtm)). | CSQC1.42(c)  CSAE 3001 s.40 (b – i, ii);  A74 (b), (c). | 1. Conclude whether you are aware of any unresolved matters that would cause you to believe that the significant judgments made by the engagement team and the conclusions it reached **during the planning phase** were not appropriate ([OAG Audit 1163](http://localhost/intranet/performance-audits/manual/1163.shtm)). | N/A |  |

| **Examination & Reporting Phases–Requirements for all Product Lines** | **CPA Canada** | **Examination & Reporting Phases–Quality Reviewer Activities** | **TM Ref (Nov-2018)** | **Quality Reviewer Notes** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Update Discussion with Engagement Team** | | | | | |
| 1. Discuss with the engagement leader and key members of the engagement team their assessment of: 2. Significant changes to planning assessments and conclusions including: 3. changes to audit scope, objectives or criteria. 4. changes to assessed significant risks including the risk of fraud.   Discuss the engagement team's rationale for the changes identified and planned response.   1. threats and safeguards taken in respect of independence and relevant ethical requirements arising subsequent to planning the engagement. 2. any additional significant matters the engagement leader is aware, including the approach taken by the engagement team to identify and dispose of such matters arising subsequent to planning the engagement. 3. The nature and extent of consultations undertaken subsequent to the planning phase. 4. Disagreements between the audit entity and the engagement team. | CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b – i)  CSQC.1.38(a), CAS220.21(a),  CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b); A.74 (a);  CSQC1.37(a), CAS220.19(b), CAS220.20(a),  CAS220.21(b)  CSAE 3001 s. 40,(b-i) – A.74 (b) | 1. Discuss with the engagement leader and key members of the team and evaluate the significant changes made since the Planning Phase. Discuss the team's rationale for the changes identified. |  | |  |
| 1. Hold a discussion with the engagement leader and other key members of the team and review key documents. |  | |
| 1. Review the documentation of significant judgments and other significant matters, including any changes to audit scope, objective or criteria. **Sign off on documents reviewed.** | A.5.PRG  B.1.PRG  C.2.PRG  C.4.PRG | |
| 1. Assess if changes to audit scope, objective or criteria (if any) were communicated to the entity. | C.4.PRG | |
| **Objective Evaluation** | | | | | |
| 1. Objectively evaluate the engagement team's examination and reporting significant judgments and conclusions regarding: |  | *Addressed in 12, 13 and 14 below* | N/A | |  |
| **Independence** | | | | | |
| 1. **Independence** and relevant ethical requirements in relation to the specific engagement including the safeguards put in place to eliminate or reduce identified threats to an acceptable level. | CSQC1.38 (a), CAS220.21(a),  CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b) – A.74 (a); | 1. Since the Planning Phase of the audit, evaluate the significant judgments made regarding independence, including the safeguards put in place to eliminate or reduce identified threats to an acceptable level. |  | |  |
| 1. Review additions and/or changes made to the completed Independence Confirmations and, where applicable, review the completed Exception Reports. | A.2.PRG | |
| 1. While reviewing Exception Reports (if any), ensure that proposed safeguards and actions have been reviewed and approved by Legal Services. | A.2.PRG | |
| **Changes from Planning** | | | | | |
| 1. Significant changes to planning assessments and conclusions including: 2. changesto audit scope, objectives or criteria 3. changes to assessed significant risks including the risk of fraud and the engagement team's planned response to those risks 4. Changes to audit scope, objective or criteria. |  | 1. Since the Planning Phase of the audit, evaluates the significant changes to planning assessments and conclusions and changes to audit scope, objective or criteria. | B.1.PRG  C.2.PRGC.3.PRG  C.4.PRG | |  |
| **Responses to Significant Risks, Significant Matters** | | | | | |
| 1. The engagement team’s response to significant risks and significant matters identified during planning and/or performing the engagement. Assess the results and work performed in order to conclude on the following: 2. the appropriateness of the conclusions reached and the adequacy of the engagement team’s response; 3. the appropriateness of significant judgements made in reaching the engagement team conclusions; 4. the adequacy of the engagement team's response to any other significant matters that have come to the attention of the quality reviewer | CSQC1.A45 bullet 1 and 2, CAS220.A30 bullet 1 and 2,  CSAE 3001 s.40 (b – iii, iv); A74 (b), (c) | *Addressed in 12-13 above and 14-18 below.* | N/A | |  |
| 1. Where a scope limitation is identified as present, has the team responded appropriately? |  | |  |
| **Consultation and Differences of Opinion** | | | | | |
| 1. Whether appropriate consultations have taken place during the examination and reporting phase on any difficult or contentious matters or differences of opinion and have those consultations and conclusions reached been: 2. appropriately documented in the engagement file; 3. agreed with the parties consulted; 4. implemented by the engagement team. | CSQC1.38 (b)  CAS220.21 (b)  CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b – iii, iv); A74 (b), (c). | 1. Discuss with the team consultations undertaken and review documentation to ensure that these were appropriately documented in the audit file. Assess if any differences of opinion have occurred with those consulted and if they have been resolved. |  | |  |
| 1. Review the consultations made with the AG during the findings discussion with the AG and the disposition of key advice received. | D.2.PRG | |
| 1. Review the consultations made on the internal draft and **sign off as “Reviewed” the “Prepare Internal Draft and Consult Internally” audit procedure**. | D.2.PRG | |
| 1. Review the results of consultations made during the Examination Phase Advisory Committee (if any) and how the team has disposed of comments received. [([OAG Audit 2050](http://localhost/intranet/performance-audits/manual/2050.shtm)) clarifies that advisory committee members do not approve the disposition of advice.] | D.2.PRG | |
| 1. Review the audit procedures related to Report Content Approval and ensure that approvals have been obtained. | E.3.PRG | |
| 1. In exceptional cases where advice on a significant matter was not implemented, ensure that the dispute resolution process was followed. | E.3.PRG | |
| **Subject Matter of the Audit and External Communications** | | | | | |
| 3. Review and evaluate the conclusions reached in formulating the engagement report and whether the proposed assurance engagement report is appropriate in the circumstances:   1. Review the results of the assurance engagement work and the appropriateness of the key judgments made, particularly in high-risk areas (Performance Audit & Special Examinations only). 2. Review the PX Draft (Performance Audit & Special Examinations only). 3. Evaluate the significance of any disagreements between the auditee/entity and the assurance team relating to matters discussed in the assurance engagement report (Performance Audit & Special Examinations only). | CSQC1.37 (d), CAS220.20(d), CAS220 A29  CSQC1.37(b) CAS220.20(b) CAS220.A29  CSQC1.A45 bullet 4, CAS220.A30  CSQC1.A45 bullet 4, CAS220.A30  CSQC1.A45, bullet 3, CAS220.A30 bullet 3  CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b) – A.74 (b), (c)  CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b -ii)    CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b) – A.74 (b), (c) | 1. Review the draft audit report. |  | |  |
| 1. Meet with the engagement leader and team members to discuss the work conducted and the conclusion reached. | E.1.PRG | |
| 1. Review substantiation related to the PX draft, focussing on sections that you consider as being important and/or high risk. **Sign off these areas as reviewed**. | E.1.PRG  E.2.PRG | |
| 1. Review the results of the audit work and the appropriateness of the key judgments made, particularly in high-risk areas. | E.1.PRG | |
| 1. Ensure that the engagement leader was satisfied with the evidence used to support key findings and recommendations and that substantiation for areas identified as high risk have been signed off as “reviewed” by the engagement leader, prior to sending the PX draft to the audited entity. | E.1.PRG | |
| 1. Review the PX draft report prior to issuance to the entity. | E.1.PRG | |
| 1. Review the disposition of entity comments regarding the PX draft. | E.1.PRG | |
| 1. Evaluate the significance of any disagreements between the audited entity and the audit team relating to matters discussed in the audit report | E.1.PRG | |
| 1. Evaluate whether the high-risk findings and conclusions reached in the report are appropriate, based on work conducted and substantiation. | E.1.PRG  E.2.PRG | |
| **Engagement Documentation** | | | | | |
| 4. Consider whether audit documentation selected for review reflects the work performed in relation to the significant judgments made and supports the conclusions reached in respect of these matters as well as the conclusions reached in formulating the auditor's report. | CSQC1.38 (c), 37(c), CAS220.21(c), CAS220.20(d),  CSAE 3001 s. 40 (b); A74 (b), (c). | *Addressed above.* | N/A | |  |
| **Engagement Quality Control Review (EQCR) Completion and Conclusion** | | | | | |
| 5. Conclude whether you are aware of any unresolved matters that would cause you to believe that the significant judgments the engagement team made and the conclusions it reached were not appropriate.  6. Communicate the above conclusion to the engagement leader and the date that the engagement quality control review was completed (note that the engagement quality control review shall be completed on or before the date of the engagement report) ([OAG Audit 3063](http://cmsprd.oag-bvg.gc.ca/intranet/performance-audits/manual/3063.shtm))  Note–Completion of the engagement quality control review means the quality reviewer’s completion of the minimum review set out in the Quality Review Checklist, including the appropriate resolution of any differences of opinion between the engagement team and the quality reviewer. | CSQC1.42 (c), CAS220.25(c)  CSQC1.42 (b), CAS220.25(b) | 1. Hold a discussion with the engagement leader and document the completion of the engagement quality control review. (Note that this documentation may be completed during the audit file final assembly period). |  | |  |
| 1. Document comments in this Checklist and/or elsewhere in the audit file. |  | |
| 1. **Sign off on disposition of comments** once all issues have been resolved. |  | |
| 1. **Sign off appropriate audit procedures and documents**. |  | |
| 1. **Provide Report Content Approval by signing off as “Reviewed” the “Quality Reviewer” audit procedure in the audit file**. | E.3.PRG | |
| 1. Save the completed *Quality Reviewer Checklist* in the audit file. | B.2.PRG | |
| **Engagement Quality Control Review (EQCR) Documentation** | | | | | |
| 7. Document the completion of the engagement quality control review. Note that this documentation may be completed during the audit file final assembly period.   1. That the procedures required by the Quality Reviewer Checklists (Planning, Examination & Reporting) have been performed. 2. That the engagement quality control review has been completed on or before the date of the assurance engagement report. 3. Document that you are not aware of any unresolved matters that would cause the quality reviewer to believe that the significant judgments the engagement team made and the conclusions it reached were not appropriate. 4. Evidence your review of engagement documents selected for review by marking them as reviewed 5. Ensure comments resulting from your review of audit execution and reporting, including any other significant matters that have come to your attention during the quality control review, have been documented. 6. Ensure the disposition of the comments raised and resolution of any differences of opinion between the engagement leader and quality reviewer as necessary are documented including evidence of the agreement by the quality reviewer. | CSQC1.A42  CSQC1.42(a) CAS220.25(a)  CSQC1.42(b), CAS220.25(b)  CSQC1.42(c), CAS220.25(c) | *Addressed above.* | N/A | |  |