

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

Auditing and Its Regulators: Proposals for Reform after Enron

Bob Lyke
Specialist in Social Legislation
Domestic Social Policy Division

Summary

Accounting problems at Enron, WorldCom, and other companies have raised important questions about the audits of corporate financial statements. These audits usually are done by independent accountants who are certified public accountants (CPAs); they are supposed to be carried out in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards (GAAS), rules which have a carefully defined technical meaning. The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission requires audited financial statements when public companies register to sell new securities and annually thereafter. To the extent auditors provide assurances about the financial representations of company managers, they remove a barrier to the efficient use of capital and offer some protection to third party investors.

Auditors are regulated by both governmental agencies and professional organizations, though many now question whether this oversight is adequate. Enron's auditor, Arthur Andersen, has been investigated by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), several congressional committees, and other agencies, and it is facing numerous law suits. A federal jury convicted the firm on obstruction of justice charges on June 15, 2002. Other corporations and their auditors are also under scrutiny.

Numerous accounting and audit reforms have been proposed, including some by the accounting industry. The House passed an audit reform bill (H.R. 3763) on April 24, 2002. Floor debate on the Senate bill (S. 2673) began July 8th. The SEC published proposed reform rules June 26th; on the 28th it required top executives in companies with revenues exceeding \$1.2 billion to personally certify that filed reports are complete and accurate. The President proposed additional sanctions on July 9th.

What is Auditing?

Broadly speaking, auditing is a systematic process for obtaining and assessing evidence regarding assertions of one kind or another in accordance with established criteria. The Enron controversy has raised important questions about **financial statement audits** of corporations and other private sector organizations in which accountants express

an opinion on financial representations made by the management of these entities. Other types of audits include compliance audits, which see if established policies and procedures are being followed, and operational audits, which see if organizations are efficient and effective. Accountants are also increasingly engaged in a widening array of other assurance services, which have different standards and procedures than audits.

Financial statement audits of private sector organizations usually are done by independent accountants (sometimes called external accountants). Today nearly all of these audits are carried out or supervised by accountants who are certified public accountants (CPAs). Independent accountants are owners or employees of private sector firms that are separate from the entities they audit; they might be distinguished from internal accountants, who work for the organizations being audited, and government accountants, who do most auditing of governmental agencies. However, independent accountants also do internal and government accounting work.

Financial statement audits of private sector organizations are to be conducted in accordance with **generally accepted auditing standards (GAAS)**; their basic objective is to see if the balance sheet and related statements about income, retained earnings, and cash flows are fair presentations, in all material respects, of certain financial information in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

- ! GAAS are *qualitative* standards regarding who is to conduct audits, how audits are to be planned and carried out, and how audit results are to be reported; they are not lists of specific audit procedures.
- ! GAAS have a carefully defined technical meaning that clarifies both what audits do and what they do not do; understanding these standards is important when questions arise regarding audit engagements.
- ! GAAS and other standards for private sector audits are established largely by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA).

Generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) are the conventions, rules, and procedures that define accepted financial accounting practices at a particular time; they include both broad guidelines as well as detailed procedures.

- ! The most important source of GAAP for private sector entities is the statements and interpretations of the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB), a nongovernmental entity that began operating in 1973, and similar issuances of its predecessors.
- ! Other sources of GAAP with lesser authority include issuances from FASB task forces and staff and from the AICPA, widely accepted industry practices, and other professional positions and literature.
- ! The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) historically has accepted GAAP developed from these private sources; however, it has broad authority to establish accounting principles for the companies within its jurisdiction (generally, public companies whose securities are offered or sold in interstate commerce).

(On July 10, 2002, the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce approved an amended

version of H.R. 5058 (Stearns) which among other things would establish an Accounting Reform Commission to study and recommend steps for improving accounting standards and the process by which they are set. The bill would instruct FASB to complete work on several projects and develop additional standards regarding off-balance sheet financing and mark-to-market accounting.)

Auditing plays a critical role in modern economies, which are characterized by large multi-faceted organizations, complex economic exchanges, and remote relationships between business managers and the owners and other investors. Managers have the ability to obtain reliable information about their own organizations, at least in theory, but it is risky for outside investors and other creditors to rely on managers' representations alone. To the extent they provide assurances about these representations, auditors remove a barrier to the efficient use of capital and offer some protection to parties that could be indirectly affected by investing decisions. Annual financial statement audits have become common for nearly all large organizations because of the demands of outside investors (in the case of business entities), outside supporters (in the case of not-for-profit organizations), tax authorities, and government regulators. The SEC requires audited financial statements when public companies register to sell new securities and annually thereafter.

Who Regulates Auditors?

Currently, auditors are subject to regulatory oversight from both governmental agencies and professional organizations. In addition, they can sometimes be legally liable for breach of contract or for a tort (a civil wrong other than breach of contract).

State Boards of Accountancy. These governmental boards (or agencies that perform similar functions) administer state laws governing accountants and accounting services. They are responsible for licensing CPAs, for whom there is no national or federal certification. All states require CPAs to have passed the Uniform CPA Examination, and most now require new candidates to have at least 150 college credit hours (i.e., 5 years of college), including courses in accounting subjects. Most states require CPAs to have 30 to 40 hours of continuing education each year, and some require practical experience before granting full licenses. State accountancy boards can require CPAs and their firms to undertake remedial steps to continue their practice, and they sometimes suspend and terminate licenses. It is widely expected that Andersen will lose its right to practice in some states due to the June 15th obstruction of justice conviction.

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The AICPA is a professional trade association of certified public accountants. In addition to establishing auditing standards for the private sector, it has a Code of Professional Conduct for its members with both general principles and rules of conduct. The six general principles provide a framework for professional conduct; they deal broadly with CPA responsibilities, the public interest, integrity, objectivity and independence, due care, and the scope and nature of services. Members are required to comply with the rules of conduct (for which formal interpretations provide additional guidance); they include provisions on independence, engagement standards, confidentiality, contingent fees, discreditable acts, advertising, etc. Violations are considered by the Professional Ethics Division and may result in requirements for continuing education or prior clearance of future work. Serious misconduct can result in suspension or termination of AICPA

membership. **State CPA societies** have similar though not always identical rules for their members. Sometimes state societies and the Professional Ethics Division conduct joint investigations.

Securities and Exchange Commission. The SEC is an independent federal regulatory agency responsible for administering federal securities laws. It has authority to regulate the initial issuance of securities and their subsequent sale; for both, it requires companies to submit financial statements that have been audited by independent accountants. Under Regulation S-X, Rule 2-01, it prescribes qualifications for these accountants, including the rules just mentioned on auditor independence. Historically the SEC has relied on the AICPA to oversee accountants, including those who audit public companies, but under Administrative Rule 2(e) it may disqualify from its practice accountants who are unqualified, lack character or integrity, engage in unethical or improper professional conduct, or willfully violate (or aid and abet others to violate) federal securities laws. Other sanctions include peer review, prohibitions on new engagements, and requirements for continuing education. After its conviction on obstruction of justice charges, Andersen informed the SEC that it would cease practicing before it by August 31, 2002 unless the Commission set an earlier date. (See page 6 for recent SEC regulatory changes.)

Other Legal Liability. Auditors can be sued for breach of contract by their clients (the entities being audited) for failing to carry out their work with due professional care. Among other things, clients usually must show they suffered damages and that there is a close causal connection between the breach and the damages. To reduce this risk, most accounting firms use engagement letters to clarify what they will do and identify client responsibilities.

Third parties normally can sue auditors only in a tort action, not for breach of contract. (One exception would be if the third party is a subrogee of the client, such as a trustee in bankruptcy.) Third parties must also show they suffered damages and that there is a close causal connection between the auditor's breach and the damages. However, in some states, barring a showing of gross negligence or fraud, third parties may be unsuccessful in their suit unless it is shown that the auditors actually foresaw the parties would rely on the audit (or in some states, that the auditors might reasonably have foreseen their reliance). Third parties may also sometimes bring suit against auditors under provisions of federal securities laws.

What Audit Issues Are Being Raised?

Controversy over corporate accounting practices continues to grow as new allegations of errors, misstatements, and fraud keep emerging. It is apparent that the audit problems at Enron were not isolated occurrences, though it remains unclear how widespread and how material audit shortcomings generally are. Nonetheless, it is important to distinguish the following kinds of corporate accounting problems since remedies and steps to prevent future problems would differ:

- ! was there failure of auditors to select appropriate auditing procedures or to make particular accounting judgments that would have revealed more of a corporation's finances?

- ! was there failure of auditors to follow generally accepted auditing standards?
- ! was there failure or weakness of the auditing standards themselves?
- ! was there failure or weakness of the accounting standards?
- ! was there failure of the corporation to provide material information?

Audits do not prevent bad business decisions, let alone shield firms from bankruptcy. To some, Enron's bankruptcy might be attributed primarily to its trading in the derivatives market and its continual need for capital. However, others ask whether audit problems may have contributed to both the rapid rise and sharp fall of Enron's stock prices.

Questions regarding the Enron audits have received widespread publicity. Perhaps the most important for the accounting industry is whether Andersen's extensive consulting work for Enron – \$27 million in its last audit year alone – compromised the independence it should have maintained throughout its work. The AICPA has long had rules on independence (codified in Rule 101 of the Code of Professional Conduct), and it had been cooperating with the SEC to strengthen them for audits of public companies. Nonetheless, criticism of independence standards has increased in recent years as accounting firms have expanded their consulting work. In June 2000, the SEC proposed substantially more restrictive rules for audits of public companies, though the final provisions adopted that November were generally seen as favorable for the accounting firms. (For further information about this particular controversy, see CRS Report RS20707, *Auditor Independence: the SEC's New Rule*, by Mark Jickling.)

What Reforms Have Been Proposed?

Numerous accounting and auditing reforms have been proposed, including some by the accounting industry. The leading proposals would establish a new oversight board for auditors of public companies, though they differ on the scope of its powers and the degree of its independence from the firms and accountants it would regulate. For more information, see CRS Report RL31483, *Auditor Reform Proposals: A Side-by-Side Comparison*, by Mark Jickling.

House Legislation. The leading House bill is an amended version of H.R. 3763 (Oxley), which the House approved on April 24, 2002. Among other things, this legislation would establish a new public regulatory organization (PRO) for regulating auditors of public companies (i.e., companies registered with the SEC). The PRO would have 5 members, at least 2 of whom are licensed accountants with recent experience auditing public companies and 1 of whom has never been a licensed accountant. The PRO, which would be overseen by the SEC, would have disciplinary powers; it would have no authority to set audit standards. Accountants could not design or implement financial information systems or perform internal audit services for their audit clients. Other relevant House bills include H.R. 3617 (Markey), H.R. 3671 (Hastings), H.R. 3693 (Jackson-Lee); H.R. 3736 (Ackerman); H.R. 3795 (Kucinich), H.R. 3818 (LaFalce), H.R. 3829 (Stupak), H.R. 3970 (Dingell), and H.R. 4083 (LaFalce).

Senate Legislation. The leading Senate bill (S. 2673) was reported by the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs on June 25, 2002. Floor debate began on July 8th. Among other things, this legislation would establish a public company accounting oversight board (PCAOB) with five members, only two of whom have ever

been CPAs. The PCAOB, which would be overseen by the SEC, would establish standards regarding auditing, quality control, ethics, independence, and other matters, and it would have disciplinary powers. Accountants could not provide numerous specified services for audit clients. Other relevant Senate bills include S. 1896 (Boxer), S. 1933 (Shelby), S. 2004 (Dodd), S. 2056 (Nelson), S. 2247 (Durbin), and S. 2460 (Levin).

The SEC. On June 26, 2002, the Commission published proposed rules to reform oversight and improve accountability of auditors of public companies. The rules would create a new private sector public accountability board (PAB) with 9 members, at least 6 of whom are independent public members and no more than 3 of whom are practicing or retired members of public accounting. The PAB, which would be overseen by the SEC, would be responsible for setting high ethics, auditing, and quality control standards, and it would have disciplinary powers. It would not set accounting standards. For details, see [<http://www.sec.gov/rules/proposed/33-8109.htm>]. On June 28th, the Commission identified 945 companies with annual revenues exceeding \$1.2 billion whose chief executive and chief financial officers would have to personally certify that the most recent reports filed with the Commission are both complete and accurate.

Since the Enron controversy broke, the SEC has stepped up its review of company financial statements and started investigations of a number of accounting irregularities. Some question whether the agency has enough resources to monitor accounting practices at all public companies, let alone take on new oversight responsibilities. The U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) has found that the SEC does not have sufficient staff or authority even for all of its current work and that it lacks a comprehensive strategy for dealing with these problems (GAO-02-483T). One appropriations issue is whether the agency's budget should be increased to provide pay parity with other financial regulators.

The President. On March 7, 2002, President Bush outlined a 10-point plan to improve corporate responsibility and shareholder protections. Included were proposals for an independent regulatory board for the accounting profession, for greater investor confidence in auditor independence and integrity, and for accounting standards more responsive to investor needs. The SEC would be responsible for these reforms. On July 9th, the President called for longer prison sentences for executives convicted of fraud, a new task force to pursue and prosecute criminal activity, and additional personnel and funding for the SEC.

The Accounting Industry. The AICPA and the largest accounting firms generally oppose strict external oversight of auditing, arguing that new regulatory bodies would be cumbersome and lack professional expertise. The "Big-5" accounting firms have all stated that they will no longer provide certain consulting services for their audit clients, nor will they serve both internal and external audit functions at the same company. (The five largest accounting firms are PricewaterhouseCoopers, Deloitte and Touche, KPMG, Ernst and Young, and Arthur Andersen. In recent years, these firms have done most of the audits of public companies registered with the SEC. As Andersen's future has grown doubtful, it has lost audit clients and a number of its partners and employees to the other large firms.)