

Public consultation on strengthening the quality of corporate reporting and its enforcement

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

This consultation is now available in 23 European Union official languages.

Please use the language selector at the top of this page to choose your language for this consultation.

High quality and reliable corporate reporting is of key importance for healthy financial markets, business investment and economic growth. The [EU corporate reporting framework](#) should ensure that companies publish the right quantity and quality of relevant information allowing investors and other interested stakeholders to assess the company's performance and governance and to take decisions based on it. High quality reporting is also indispensable for cross-border investments and the development of the [capital markets union \(CMU\)](#).

In the context of this consultation, corporate reporting comprises the financial statements of companies, their management report that includes the non-financial and corporate governance statements and country-by-country reporting. It would also include sustainability information pursuant to the [proposed Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive](#).

The consultation takes into account the outcomes of the [2018 consultation on the EU framework for public reporting by companies](#) and the [2021 fitness check on the EU framework for public reporting by companies](#). This consultation however focuses on companies listed on EU regulated markets (hereafter 'listed companies' or 'issuers'), that is a subset of the companies subject to public reporting requirements under EU law. Please note that in terms of reporting, this consultation does not seek the views of stakeholders on the applicable accounting standards, such as International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) or the standards in the Accounting Directive, or the views of stakeholders on public country-by-country reporting or the Commission's proposal for a Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive.

The 2018 consultation did not cover the areas of corporate governance or statutory audit. Therefore, this consultation contains questions to evaluate aspects of the [Audit Regulation 537/2014](#), [Audit Directive 2006/43/EC](#) and of [Accounting Directive 2013/34/EU](#). However, it covers the EU framework on corporate governance only in so far as relevant for corporate reporting by listed companies and the statutory audit of so-called public interest entities (PIEs). Listed companies, credit institutions, insurance undertakings and entities designated as such by Member States are PIEs.

This consultation also builds on the work carried out by the [European Securities and Markets Authority \(ESMA\)](#) and the [Committee of European Audit Oversight Bodies \(CEAOB\)](#).

This consultation is divided into 5 parts

- The first part seeks your views about the overall impact of the EU framework on the three pillars of high quality and reliable corporate reporting - corporate governance, statutory audit and supervision. It also seeks your views about the interaction between the three pillars
- The second part of the questionnaire focuses on the corporate governance pillar, as far as relevant for corporate reporting. It aims to get your feedback in particular on the functioning of company boards, audit committees and your views on how to improve their functioning
- The third part focuses on the statutory [audit pillar](#). The first questions in this part aim at getting your views on the effectiveness, efficiency and coherence of the EU audit framework. It focuses in particular on the changes brought by the [2014 audit reform](#). Subsequently, the questions aim to seek views on how to improve the functioning of statutory audit
- The fourth part asks questions about the supervision of PIE statutory auditors and audit firms
- Finally, the consultation will ask questions about the supervision of corporate reporting and how to improve it

This consultation will directly feed into an impact assessment that the Commission will prepare in 2022 with a view to possibly amend and strengthen the current EU rules.

Please note: In order to ensure a fair and transparent consultation process **only responses received through our online questionnaire will be taken into account** and included in the report summarising the responses. Should you have a problem completing this questionnaire or if you require particular assistance, please contact fisma-corporate-reporting@ec.europa.eu.

More information on

- [this consultation](#)
- [the consultation document](#)
- [the consultation strategy](#)
- [company reporting](#)
- [the protection of personal data regime for this consultation](#)

About you

* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech

- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Irish
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

* First name

Julia

* Surname

Dobritch Bodnarova

* Email (this won't be published)

julia@accountancyeurope.eu

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Accountancy Europe

* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

4713568401-18

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti | <input type="radio"/> Libya | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Dominica | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> Samoa |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt | <input type="radio"/> Macau | <input type="radio"/> San Marino |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar | <input type="radio"/> |

- Angola
- Anguilla
- Antarctica
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
-
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Eswatini
- Ethiopia
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
-
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar/Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
-
- São Tomé and Príncipe
- Saudi Arabia
- Senegal
- Serbia
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Sint Maarten
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
-

- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
-
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
-
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
-
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
-

- Croatia
- Kuwait
- Romania
- Vietnam
- Cuba
- Kyrgyzstan
- Russia
- Wallis and Futuna
- Curaçao
- Laos
- Rwanda
- Western Sahara
- Cyprus
- Latvia
- Saint Barthélemy
- Yemen
- Czechia
- Lebanon
- Saint Helena
- Zambia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Lesotho
- Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Zimbabwe
- Denmark
- Liberia
- Saint Lucia

* Role in the corporate reporting market

- Preparer of corporate reporting
- User of of corporate reporting
- Preparer and user of corporate reporting
- Statutory auditor
- Accounting professional
- Supervisor
- None
- Other

* Please specify your role in the corporate reporting market

Accountancy Europe unites 50 professional organisations from 35 countries that represent 1 million qualified accountants, auditors and advisors.

* Field of activity or sector (if applicable)

- Accounting
- Auditing
- Banking
- Credit rating agencies
- Insurance
- Pension provision
- Investment management (e.g. hedge funds, private equity funds, venture capital funds, money market funds, securities)

- Market infrastructure operation (e.g. CCPs, CSDs, Stock exchanges)
- Other financial services (e.g. advice, brokerage)
- Social entrepreneurship
- Trade repositories
- Other
- Not applicable

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **For the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association', 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

* Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

Part I - The EU framework for high quality and reliable corporate reporting

The EU framework for corporate reporting has developed significantly since the EU adopted the [fourth company law Directive \(Directive 78/660/EEC\)](#) which coordinated the national provisions on the presentation, content and publication

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
III. Relevant in terms of overall needs and objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
IV. Coherence with other related EU frameworks / internal coherence	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
V. EU Added value: was and is EU intervention justified?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

b) Statutory audit

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
III. Relevant in terms of overall needs and objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
IV. Coherence with other related EU frameworks / internal coherence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
V. EU Added value: was and is EU intervention justified?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

c) Supervision by public authorities of statutory auditors/audit firms

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
III. Relevant in terms of	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

overall needs and objectives						
IV. Coherence with other related EU frameworks / internal coherence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
V. EU Added value: was and is EU intervention justified?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

d) Supervision by authorities of corporate reporting

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
III. Relevant in terms of overall needs and objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
IV. Coherence with other related EU frameworks / internal coherence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

V. EU Added value: was and is EU intervention justified?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

e) The eco-system composed of all of the above

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
III. Relevant in terms of overall needs and objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
IV. Coherence with other related EU frameworks / internal coherence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
V. EU Added value: was and is EU intervention justified?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 2.1 Please describe the main issues that you see, if any, in the four areas mentioned in question 2 and in the eco-system composed of all four areas. Where possible, please provide concrete examples and evidence supporting your assessment.

You may want to consider the following aspects

- **have any factors reduced the effectiveness / rendered the relevant EU framework less effective than anticipated? Which rules have proven less effective than anticipated?**
- **is there room to improve efficiency via further simplification?**
- **are existing provisions coherent with each other?**

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-The EU Framework for corporate governance is limited and not conducive to consistency within the EU. Its effectiveness and coherence are minimal as corporate governance systems and practices vary significantly amongst EU Member States (EU MS). A more elaborate EU Corporate Governance system could remediate this, if well enforced.

-The objectives of the 2014 EU Framework for statutory audit of PIEs were primarily to reinforce auditor independence, more choice in the audit market, enhanced audit quality and improved supervision. The measures introduced were very elaborate and have contributed to some of these objectives. The Audit Regulation includes numerous MS options which reduces its effectiveness, efficiency and coherence at EU level. Re efficiency, an IFAC survey indicates big differences in EU audit fees as a % of revenues (<https://bit.ly/3qMKL11>). See response to Question 11.

-Audit supervision lacks harmonisation and the quality of supervision in different EU MS varies significantly, especially related to methodologies of inspections and transparency of their results, investigations and sanctioning. The CEAOB lacks adequate powers at EU level, its role needs to be strengthened to enable it to become a more robust regulator and achieve more consistency in the mentioned areas and enhance how national audit oversight authorities discharge their duties. See response to Questions 15.1 & 16.1.

-The EU Framework for accounting and transparency sets out minimum requirements on supervision by national competent authorities (NCAs). ESMA plays a key role and contributes to high quality reporting. Its authority over NCAs should be strengthened to improve the consistency and the quality of supervision. See response to Question 18.1.

-A systemic approach for corporate reporting, statutory audit and their supervision is key. All relevant stakeholders need to play their role. Looking into only one or some of the pillars will not achieve the necessary changes.

The [ESMA report on enforcement and regulatory activities of European enforcers in 2020](#) notes that supervisors undertook the examination that year of 729 financial statements drawn up in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). Based on these examinations, European enforcers took enforcement actions against 265 issuers in order to address material departures from IFRS. This represents an action rate of 38%.

As regards the audit sector the [Commission's market monitoring report](#) highlights deficiencies in audit firms' internal quality control systems, but also in individual files for audits of PIEs. National audit oversight bodies also report that part of statutory audits is not up to standards.

Question 3. Based on your own experience how do you assess the quality and reliability of corporate reporting by listed EU companies?

- 1 - Very low
- 2 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 4 - High
- 5 - Very high
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 3.1 Please provide concrete examples and evidence supporting your assessment in question 3 and explain the consequences that the quality and reliability of corporate reporting or lack thereof has on you.

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-A proxy for the quality and reliability of corporate reporting would be the continued existence of listed entities, making abstraction of orderly delistings because of a merger, takeover, wind-up, squeeze-out, buy-out etc. A non-orderly delisting from a regulated market is a bankruptcy and insolvency of a listed entity. There were 5 of those in 2020, see the Federation of European Stock Exchanges (FESE) <https://bit.ly/32koMVV> (slide 8) which includes 27 of the 30 EEA Member States (not Liechtenstein, Slovakia and Slovenia).

-The number of listed entities for the same countries is 4.800, see our publication (<https://bit.ly/3ltuhB5> 2019).

-This resulted in only 0,1% of bankruptcies of listed entities in 2020.

-This concurs with the Final Report by the European Commission (EC) on the Fitness Check of Public Reporting by EU Companies (issued in April 2021). This excerpt is particularly relevant:
"The reliability of financial information disclosed by listed companies was found to be overall good, due to the cascade of requirements of collective board responsibility for the true and fair view of financial statements, to the mandatory statutory audit for all listed companies, and securities market supervision. However, enforcement practices of national supervisors still differ significantly across the EU.
The Wirecard case confirmed this and indicated that the EU framework presents potential weaknesses as regards the effectiveness of enforcement practices, in particular as regards the lack of coordination between national authorities and the independence of the authorities in charge of examining financial information."

-As indicated by our response to Question 5, we nevertheless see room for improvement in all pillars of the ecosystem.

-Further improvement in sustainability reporting, its assurance and supervision are needed, which is expected to be achieved once the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive is in force.
Please also see our response to Q 19.

Question 4. There are no generally accepted standards or indicators to measure the quality of corporate reporting and of statutory audit, nor the effectiveness of supervision. In light of this, what are your views on the following questions?

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (rather disagree)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather agree)	5 (strongly agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Would it be useful to have specific indicators to measure the quality of corporate reporting, of statutory audits and the effectiveness of supervision?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Is it possible to have clear and reliable indicators to measure the quality of corporate reporting, of statutory audit and the effectiveness of supervision?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should the European Commission develop indicators on the quality of corporate reporting, of statutory audits and the effectiveness of supervision?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 4.1 Please provide any further explanation supporting your views, and, where relevant, please suggest possible indicators of the quality and reliability of corporate reporting, statutory audit and supervision, where possible with concrete examples:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

- We are supportive of quality indicators for corporate reporting, statutory audit and supervision. For them to be well informed, up to date, effective, efficient and relevant, they should be developed on a multi-stakeholder basis including supervisors, users, investors, preparers, auditors and standard setters at European or even global level.
- We are not aware of a set of generally accepted quality indicators of corporate reporting and supervision. We strongly support such indicators being developed, as high-quality corporate reporting is the foundation for high quality audit.
- Audit Quality Indicators (AQIs) have been developed by a number of organisations in the past (see <https://bit.ly/3rBwsvw>). Accountancy Europe will continue working with its members and other stakeholders on audit quality and its indicators.
- AQIs could be an effective mechanism to improve audit quality enriching discussions among stakeholders. They need to be adapted based on users' needs. Firms develop and use them as part of their quality management systems. Audit committees can greatly benefit from AQIs while tendering for an auditor and monitoring the auditor's performance. We observe that some public oversight bodies collect AQI data from firms and analyse them to determine their supervisory approach and priorities.
- AQIs should not be seen as just quantitative measurements and exchange of information should take place to better understand what is beyond numbers. In other words, AQIs should not be based on measuring inputs and outputs only. They should also consider the company's operating environment, audit procedures and communications which have taken place during the audit.
- The audit profession is currently implementing the new robust International Standard on Quality Management 1 (ISQM1), focused on achieving quality objectives through identifying and responding to quality risks. This will further enhance internal quality control or management within audit firms.

Question 5. In your view, should the Commission take action in the areas of the corporate governance pillar, the statutory audit pillar, the supervision of PIE auditors and audit firms and the supervision of corporate reporting to increase the quality and reliability of reporting by listed companies?

- Yes, there is a need to improve the **some or all of the areas listed above**
- Yes, there is a need to improve some or all of the areas listed above **as well as other areas**
- No, but there is a need to improve other areas than those listed above
- No, there is no need to take further action in any area
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please indicate to what extent you think the Commission should take action in each of the areas below to increase the quality and reliability of reporting by listed companies:

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (rather disagree)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather agree)	5 (strongly agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Improve the corporate governance pillar	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improve the statutory audit pillar	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improve the supervision of PIE auditors and audit firms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improve the supervision of corporate reporting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you think there is a need to improve other areas than those listed above please indicate which areas you have in mind:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

- We believe that each party, companies, auditors, users and supervisors, and the interactions amongst them, need to evolve to create a stronger ecosystem, which is only as strong as its weakest component. Such ecosystem should be well equipped to deal with the changing environment and challenges ahead. Strengthening the ecosystem will likely require additional effort, resource and time investment of the stakeholders involved which will translate into higher costs. These costs have to be weighed up against potential benefits.
- The issues considered are unlikely to be addressed by a quantitative approach adding regulation and stringency. Better, simpler, more consistent and harmonised regulation will be a more effective route. The overall framework should be more coherent ensuring the complementarity and systemic effectiveness of the different pillars across the EU.
- In the audit pillar, we believe that the use of Member State (MS) options should be allowed only if it can be justified by public interest considerations in a particular jurisdiction. More harmonisation at EU level is needed in the area of mandatory auditor rotation and prohibition of non-audit services. Refer also to our response to Q 11.
- It is important that the European audit rules remain aligned with International Standards on auditing and ethics to allow for consistently high standards and international comparability and operability. These standards provide a good framework for auditors' work and keep evolving to address issues such as fraud, going concern, digitalisation, conflicts of interest.
- Amending and introducing any new rules will also require considering the scope of these rules to focus only on systemically important entities, like the most systemically important within the 3 categories of PIEs set at EU level. This is due to the fact that currently, in regard to PIEs, MS have significantly differing definitions (<https://bit.ly/3ltuhB5>) which could be further harmonised at EU level.

Question 5.1 Please provide any further explanation supporting your views, and where appropriate describe what actions you would prioritise and why, with concrete examples:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

- We strongly support the 'system-wide' approach as this is the only way for achieving sustainable quality improvements in the ecosystem as a whole, i.e. in corporate governance, reporting, audit and their supervision.
- However, one needs to acknowledge that even in a mature corporate governance and audit regime such as the one in the EU, failures cannot be completely eradicated. No amount of improvement can prevent all corporate failures as companies taking risk, within boundaries, is part of our free-market economy. The challenge is how the risk of failures can be minimised and how potential failures can be identified more quickly to allow for corrective action. It is also crucial to address how to minimise the impact of failures on the economy and investor confidence, and importantly, how those failures are used as a learning experience for the whole ecosystem.
- In this regard, a supervisory framework should build an environment that fosters learning and development for both companies and auditors, rather than be focused only on (ex-post) sanctioning.
- It should be appreciated that (perceived and real) issues about audit quality are complex and interlinked. There do not appear to be any 'silver bullet' solutions. We, therefore, encourage legislators and regulators

not to look at potential actions in isolation as this would be ineffective and may have unintended consequences on the ecosystem.

-It is crucial to seek global coordination and cooperation on changes to reporting models, the auditor's role and supervision. This is needed to avoid different expectations in different Member States and regulatory fragmentation. It also benefits users, including investors, to have harmonised and comparable standards and information.

Question 5.2 At what level should action be taken to improve the quality of corporate governance, audit, audit supervision and/or supervision of corporate reporting?

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (rather disagree)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather agree)	5 (strongly agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Companies themselves should take action to improve their reporting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Auditors themselves should take action to improve audits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Audit supervisors themselves should take action to improve their functioning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Individual Member States should take action if the situation in their market requires this	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The EU should take action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Several of the above should take action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 5.3 Please provide any further explanation supporting your views expressed in question 5.2:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

- Robust corporate governance and reporting are the drivers for enhancing the auditor's role with regards to internal controls, including on fraud and going concern. Companies should issue a public statement about the effectiveness of their internal controls over financial reporting with a focus on fraud and going concern, which could be audited.
- All PIEs should have a separate audit committee that has a sufficient number of members with competence in accounting and/or auditing and is, in the case of large PIEs, supported by an independent internal audit function and well-established whistleblowing structures.
- We support quality indicators for corporate reporting, statutory audit and supervision which should be developed on a multi-stakeholder basis at EU or global level.
- Member State options granted by the EU audit legislation have led to differing implementation of the rules across European countries, namely on the prohibition of non-audit services and mandatory auditor rotation. These aspects can be further simplified and harmonised across the EU.
- We welcome measures that aim to increase choice and capacity in the PIE audit market noting that substantive change in the market structure is likely to take place in the longer term and requires a combination of measures. In many jurisdictions, audit firms have left the PIE market, often to avoid excessive compliance costs. Mid-tier audit firms need time to further invest in the capacity and expertise needed to enhance their involvement in the PIE market.
- There is merit in harmonising supervisory policies like methodologies of inspections, enhanced transparency of their results, investigations and sanctioning, to support robust supervision and enhanced regulators at EU and national level, with new powers being proportionate with appropriate safeguards.
- The supervisory framework should focus on an environment that fosters learning & development for both companies & auditors, rather than only on sanctioning.

Question 6. To what extent is there a need to modify the EU framework on corporate reporting to support the following objectives?

	1 (not at all necessary)	2 (rather not necessary)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather necessary)	5 (highly necessary)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. The green transition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. The digital transition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
III. Facilitating doing business by SMEs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
IV. Reducing burdens and/or simplification	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
V. Better corporate social responsibility, including tax transparency and fair taxation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 6.1 Please provide, if needed, any further explanation supporting your views expressed in question 6:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-We fully support the European Green Deal ambitions. The world needs to transform its 'business model' to become sustainable. Sustainability reporting will help stakeholders support and drive this change. We support the work of EFRAG on sustainability reporting standards and believe that international comparability would be best underpinned if the EU used a common baseline based on global sustainability reporting standards, after a robust assessment and due process. The EU should be able to make additions to global standards to meet its public policy goals and own requirements, provided EFRAG is appropriately financed.

-We welcome the EC digital finance package for a recovery through digital transition. This could be a catalyst to modernise the European economy and turn Europe into a global digital player. A pan-EU one-stop-shop reporting of information by businesses for various regulatory requirements in the Single Market (especially smaller ones), similar to ESAP, is key.

-The EC should carefully assess and analyse the potential impacts – including indirect and spill-over impacts – on SMEs' corporate reporting rules and burdens. For SMEs that would like to access capital market financing, in particular the onerous reporting rules could act as a disincentive.

-To reduce and simplify burdens, integrated financial and sustainability reporting (and its assurance) are crucial.

-We continue to be a proponent of expanding tax transparency – and in particular market led initiatives such as GRI 207 – to provide key information to investors and reinforce public trust in tax systems' fairness.

-A lot of information is already disclosed to tax administrations, and they are at risk of not being able to deal with the information flows. The EC should thus also strongly focus on assisting tax administrations in capacity building & technological solutions to enable them to make use of the information, as compliance costs for businesses should deliver added value to society.

Part II - Corporate governance

The EU corporate governance framework focuses on the relationships between company boards, shareholders and other stakeholders, and therefore, on the way a company is managed and controlled. The framework consists of a combination of EU and Member State legislation and soft law, namely national corporate governance codes applied on a 'comply or explain' basis. It aims inter alia to provide protection for shareholders and other parties with a particular interest in companies, such as employees and creditors.

A [sustainable corporate governance initiative](#) is planned to be adopted by the Commission in 2021. (In addition, the [Commission's study on directors' duties and sustainable corporate governance, July 2020](#), assesses the root causes of 'short termism' in corporate governance and discusses their relationship with current market practices and/or regulatory frameworks).

Key features of the EU framework on corporate governance that are relevant for corporate reporting are

- The collective responsibility of the members of the administrative, management and supervisory bodies of a company for drawing up and publishing annual financial statements and management reports
- The requirement for a statement by the persons responsible within the issuer that, to the best of their knowledge, the financial statements prepared give a true and fair view of the assets, liabilities, financial position and profit or loss of the issuer
- The requirement for PIEs to establish, in principle, an audit committee

Question 7. How do you assess the effectiveness, efficiency, and coherence of the key features of the EU framework on corporate governance, considering how they underpin quality and reliability of corporate reporting?

a) Board responsibilities for reporting

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

b) Liability of company boards for reporting

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

c) Obligation to establish an audit committee

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

d) Rules on the composition of the audit committee

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

e) Tasks of the audit committee

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

f) External position of the audit committee (e.g. in relation to shareholders)

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Question 7.1 Please describe the main issues you see, if any, as regards corporate governance and, where possible, please provide concrete examples and evidence supporting your assessment.

You may want to consider the following aspects

- **are there factors that have reduced the effectiveness / rendered the relevant EU framework less effective than anticipated? Which rules have proven less effective than anticipated?**
- **is there room to improve efficiency via further simplification?**
- **are existing provisions coherent with each other?**

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-The starting points are quite different with regards to corporate governance structures and practices in the EU Member States (MS). For example, in some jurisdictions, the 2-tier board structure brings significant differences in terms of roles and responsibilities. Lack of consistency amongst MS does not help the overall effectiveness of the corporate governance framework.

-Robust corporate governance should be the starting point and the driver for enhancing the auditor's role with regards to internal controls. In parallel, proportionality and compatibility with existing requirements are important factors to consider when introducing new requirements for companies.

-Boards and audit committees should have clear and collective responsibilities, including for risk management and oversight of internal controls over financial reporting. This requires having adequate competences and expertise as well as independence for audit committees. A sufficient number of members in the audit committee should have competence in accounting and/or auditing as well as sustainability. In cases where an audit committee has only one member with such experience, the workload and responsibility will likely burden only this specific member.

-We observe a wide variety of audit committee performance in practice. Good practices are seen when an audit committee has the necessary skills and attitude to be able to proactively detect potential issues in reporting and challenge management where necessary.

-There is lack of transparency on how boards and audit committees discharge their responsibilities and corporate governance statements should be improved to provide more insights. Companies should be more specific when reporting information on the effectiveness of their internal control mechanisms. Experience shows that companies' reporting on corporate governance tends to be too descriptive and boilerplate.

Question 8. Considering the level of material departures from IFRS reported in the [ESMA report on enforcement and regulatory activities of European enforcers in 2020](#), to what extent can such departures be attributed to deficiencies of the EU framework on corporate governance?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 8.1 Please explain the main issues you see, and, where possible, please provide concrete examples and evidence supporting your assessment:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-While responding to questions in Part 2 of this consultation, we focused on how the corporate governance framework could be improved to better manage the key risks for a company rather than the risk of departures from the accounting framework. These key risks include fraud, going concern, technology and sustainability related matters. We believe that better managing or mitigating these risks should be the driving element for improving the EU framework on corporate governance.

-In our recent publications, we set out recommendations to strengthen the financial reporting ecosystem, including corporate governance. See <https://bit.ly/3qNpPaj> and <https://bit.ly/3Kz8PMD>

-Please also see our response to 18.1 where we present a preliminary analysis of, and our considerations related to, the ESMA enforcement report.

Question 9. How effective and efficient would the following actions be in increasing the quality and reliability of reporting by listed companies?

a) Strengthen the (collective) responsibilities of the board / tasks for reporting / liability of boards for incorrect reporting

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

b) Require proper expertise of specific board members in relation to corporate reporting (internal controls, accounting framework, sustainability reporting, etc.)

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

c) Increase the responsibilities of specific board members (e.g. Chief Executive Officer or the Chief Financial Officer) and their liability on corporate reporting

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

d) Give company boards an explicit responsibility to establish effective risk management and internal control systems for the preparation of corporate reporting, including as regards controls for risks of fraud and going concern

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

e) More transparency of company boards about the effectiveness of the companies' risk management and report on the actions undertaken during the reporting period

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

f) Remove exemptions in EU legislation for establishing an audit committee

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

g) Increase the tasks of the audit committee, e.g. for providing assurance on internal control systems for the avoidance of risk and fraud and going concern

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

h) Strengthen the external position of the audit committee (e.g. vis-à-vis the auditor or by reporting to shareholders)

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

i) Require the setting up of specific whistle blowing procedures inside listed companies and supervisors of corporate reporting to strengthen the protection of whistle blowers

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

j) Require auditors to provide assurance on the systems and internal controls implemented by the board, including fraud, going concern and related reporting requirements

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

k) Strengthen the role of shareholders on corporate reporting

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 9.1 Have you identified other actions that would effectively and efficiently increase the quality and reliability of reporting by listed companies?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

9.1.1 Please specify to what other action(s) you refer in your answer to question 9.1:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-We believe that collecting and sharing of good practices at EU level could contribute to better corporate governance in listed companies. In this regard, the CEAOB surveys and analyses on audit committees could be expanded. They should cover, for instance, audit committees' interactions with internal and external auditors, including the audit committee's reaction to findings communicated by the auditors.

- As per the EU Whistle-blowers Protection Directive, EU Member States shall have brought into force the laws, regulations, and administrative provisions necessary to comply with this Directive by 17 December 2021 for legal entities with more than 250 workers. The same should be done for other entities by 17 December 2023. Implementation of this Directive will provide a framework for balanced and effective whistle-blower protection. By reporting breaches of EU law that are harmful to the public interest, whistle-blowers play a key role in safeguarding the welfare of society. Therefore, we welcome this initiative and look forward to observing the improvements it will bring.

Question 9.2 Please provide any details to support your views. Any evidence, including on expected benefits and costs of such action is welcome:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-All PIEs should have a separate audit committee that has a sufficient number of members with competence in accounting and / or auditing and is, in the case of large PIEs, supported by an independent internal audit function and well-established whistleblowing structures. Audit committees should monitor the quality of the corporate (including and integrating both financial and sustainability) reporting process as well as the quality of financial statements audit and sustainability assurance. In order to achieve this, they should collectively have the necessary competence in relevant areas such as climate, environmental science, digitalisation and industry risks.

-Companies (or their directors) should issue a public statement about the effectiveness of the internal controls over financial reporting with a focus on fraud and going concern. This disclosure could be made as part of a corporate governance statement included in a company's management report. Such a public statement would help ensure that directors are discharging their responsibilities with regards to the effectiveness of internal controls.

-When a company makes a statement on the effectiveness of the internal controls over financial reporting with a focus on fraud and going concern, stakeholders will naturally expect to receive a form of attestation on this statement. Hence, auditors could be required to report publicly their conclusion on the management's statement.

Part III - Statutory audit

The overall objective of statutory audits is to ensure that financial statements are free from material misstatements and provide a true and fair view. The auditor has to identify and assess the risk of material misstatements and gather sufficient and appropriate audit evidence as the basis for his opinion that the financial statements provide a true and fair view and to publicly report on the results of his audit work. The EU audit rules promote audit quality and seek to ensure the independence of auditors and audit firms.

Therefore, the final objective of statutory audit is to contribute to the quality and reliability of financial statements of companies.

Question 10. How do you assess the effectiveness, efficiency and the coherence with other relevant EU frameworks of the key features of EU audit legislation in so far as it applies to PIE auditors and audit firms?

a) The rules on independence of auditors/audit firms and absence of conflicts of interest

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

b) The rules on the content of the audit and of the audit report

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable

I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

c) The rules applicable to non-audit services

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

d) The rules on auditor/audit firm rotation

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable

I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

e) The rules on transparency (transparency report, additional reports to other parties / audit committees / supervisors)

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 11. Please describe the main issues you see, if any, in the audit pillar and, where possible, please provide concrete examples and evidence supporting your assessment.

You may want to consider the following aspects

- **are there factors that have reduced the effectiveness / rendered the relevant EU framework less effective than anticipated? Which rules have proven less effective than anticipated?**
- **is there scope to improve efficiency via further simplification?**
- **are existing provisions coherent with each other?**

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-EU Member State (MS) options granted by the EU audit legislation have led to differing implementation across MS. This has created a rather complex set of rules and obstructed the creation of a European level-playing field (<https://bit.ly/3fHM4bp> on MS implementation of the PIE definition, non-audit services prohibition, mandatory firm rotation, public oversight). Hence, we support removing MS options such as allowing derogation for prohibited non-audit services.

-The provision of non-audit services by auditors to PIE audit clients is already firmly restricted by the EU legislation and ethical rules. A service is provided by the auditor only if it does not compromise the auditor's independence which is subject to the audit committee's scrutiny and independent public oversight. As noted by the Audit Analytics report, the % of non-audit fees received from PIE audit clients has been declining since new measures at EU level came into effect in 2014 (see <https://bit.ly/3AksJpX>).

- Non-audit services are not a homogeneous group of services and there is a need for clarification on this. Auditors provide assurance services, such as sustainability assurance, to meet stakeholders' valid expectations and to respond to emerging requirements. Assurance services do not compromise auditor's independence and thus should be excluded from cap calculations as per the Article 4 of the Audit Regulation. In addition, auditors should continue to be permitted to provide services that are closely linked to audit, subject to existing independence rules (see <https://bit.ly/3rpF89K>).

-Differing rules across countries also pose operational & practical difficulties and result in additional work & costs for audited companies, auditors and stakeholders that operate internationally.

-We believe that further simplification and harmonisation of rules across Europe would be beneficial while allowing different national implementation in cases justified by public interest consideration in a MS.

Question 12. To which extent you agree to the following statements?

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (rather disagree)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather agree)	5 (strongly agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Statutory audits contribute as much as is possible to the quality and reliability of corporate reporting by PIEs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. I am satisfied with the role of the statutory auditors / audit firms of PIEs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
III. The work of auditors is reliable so I trust their assessment and reports and their work inspires trust in capital markets	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
IV. There is not enough choice for public interest entities in finding an audit firm at appropriate costs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
V. Joint audits contribute to the quality of audit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12.1 If you want to add any comments, and/or mention specific issues you see you can insert them here. Where possible, please provide concrete examples and evidence supporting your assessment:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

I,II,III: Majority of audits are of adequate quality, ensuring reliability of companies' financial information. Audits thus help instill trust in the economy. See our response to Q 3.1. on EC findings on the good reliability of financial information of listed companies achieved also thanks to auditors' work.

IV: As per the 2021 EC report, the number of audit firms auditing PIEs has decreased significantly following the 2014 EU Audit Reform, although it varies across countries. In exploring the market opening measures, it is necessary to understand why decisions of market participants (companies & audit firms) have led to the current market structure.

-To increase the number of audit firms in the PIE market, legislative interventions will not be effective on their own. Regulatory burden, the liability regime for auditors & interaction of different regulatory measures further decrease this number.

-We welcome measures that aim to increase choice and capacity in the PIE audit market noting that substantive change in the market structure is likely to take place in the longer term and require a combination of measures. Joint audit/managed shared audit could be measures for consideration to open the PIE audit market, subject to the necessary conditions (e.g. an applicable framework, standards, proportionate liability regimes, adequate auditor rotation regime) and considering that mid-tier audit firms will need time to further invest in the required expertise and capacity to undertake PIE audits. Mid-tier firms could develop & enhance their capacities also through more participation in auditing the public sector, incentivised through public procurement.

-We would welcome to discuss this further with the EC.

V: Further evidence is needed on the impact of joint audits on audit quality. Available studies, e.g. Joint Audit & Audit Quality (<https://bit.ly/33xPIYn>) and Effects of & Experiences with Joint Audit (<https://bit.ly/3fLBCQ4>) do not provide conclusive answers.

The audit quality issues that occur most often at EU level are

- deficiencies in audit firms' internal quality control systems
- the lack of, or inappropriate, monitoring of high-risk audited entities
- and the lack of audit evidence and documentation.

Question 13. To what extent can these quality issues be attributed to deficiencies in the EU legal and supervisory framework for statutory audit?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 13.1 Please explain, and where possible, provide evidence for your assessment under question 13:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-We believe that the quality issues cannot be fixed solely by the introduction of more or more stringent regulation. It should be considered that the majority of audits are in fact of adequate quality and therefore any measures aimed at improving the quality of audits should be proportionate and take into account the efficiency aspect as well as any potential consequences on other matters such as auditor choice in the already highly regulated PIE market.

-To enhance the quality of audits for the future, we believe that the educational and remedial aspect of inspections needs to be enhanced. Inspection reports should always include information on what should have been done (differently) to ensure this, i.e. constructive comments to help the auditors and audit firms develop and improve. Overall, the system of supervision should not focus only on compliance with requirements such as on documentation and/or on sanctioning. Instead, it should consider the auditor's use of professional judgement and focus on ensuring creation of an environment that fosters learning and development of the audit profession.

Question 14. How effective and efficient would the following actions be in increasing the quality of statutory audits of PIEs?

a) Ask auditors to disclose how they have assured the directors' statement on material fraud, and what steps they have taken to assess the effectiveness of the relevant internal controls and to detect any fraud

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

b) Strengthen the informational value of audit reports

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

c) Improve the internal governance of audit firms

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

d) Incentivise or mandate the performance of joint audits for PIEs, including to enhance competition on the PIE audit market

	1 (not at all effective/efficient)	2 (rather not effective/efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/efficient)	5 (very effective/efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

e) Further harmonise the rules on mandatory rotation

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

f) Limit the scope for statutory auditors and audit firms to provide non-audit services

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

g) Increase or eliminate caps on auditor liability, at least for cases of gross negligence of statutory auditors

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

h) Limit the number of Member State options in the EU Audit framework to ensure consistency across the EU and to incentivise cross-border statutory audits

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

i) The creation of a passporting system for PIE auditors and audit firms, allowing auditors to provide their services across the Union based on their approval in a Member State

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 14.1 Have you identified other actions that would effectively and efficiently increase the quality and reliability of statutory audits of PIEs?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

14.1.1 Please specify to what other action(s) you refer in your answer to question 14.1:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-Integrating financial and sustainability reporting and the subsequent auditor's involvement would be beneficial as it would provide a more accurate picture of a company to stakeholders. Sustainability reporting (including environmental, social and governance related risks) would need to be considered by audited companies and their auditors, as many business models are becoming increasingly vulnerable to such risks such, e.g. climate change.

-An increasing number of stakeholders think that understanding these impacts and dependencies helps in assessing the resilience of the business model and thus the company's ability to continue as a going concern and associated risks, and its longer-term viability and resilience.

-We welcome the recent ESAP proposal which will make corporate reporting at large, and transparency reports in particular, more accessible and thus improve their value.

Question 14.2 Please provide any details to support your views. Any evidence, including on expected benefits and costs of such action is welcome:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

- a) See our responses to Q 5.3 and 9.2
- b) International comparability of the audit report is important for investors and global markets. Currently, an audit report prepared under the ISAs is compatible with the EU requirements, thus auditors who have to comply with both do not need to produce 2 differing sets of reports which would create more compliance costs.
The informational value of audit reports could be further strengthened by including more company and audit specific information. If fraud, going concern (company viability), internal controls and other matters should be addressed in more detail in the audit report, the regulatory frameworks for the company reporting and subsequently for the audit report would have to be further developed.
- c) The diversity of an audit team enhances audit quality. Firms should therefore stay multidisciplinary to meet evolving expectations from the audit while adhering to audit-centred governance and policymaking. Providing other assurance or advisory services to non-audit clients is essential for maintaining experts' knowledge and practical experience. They bring to the audit team views and insight on market practices in their specific domain.
- d) Our '4' rating relates to joint audit as a measure to potentially open the PIE audit market to more players. On impact of joint audit on audit quality, refer to our responses to Q 12 V where the rating is '3' and to 12.1.
- e) f) h) See our response to Q 11

g) Currently, different audit liability regimes exist across European countries. We have not found evidence that this results in significant variations in audit quality. Liability regime is seen as an important factor within audit markets. Unlimited liability may be a barrier to innovation, extending the scope of audit and entry for smaller competitors and a factor that contributes to audit firms leaving the PIE market. It could therefore further impact the concentration in the PIE audit market.

Part IV - Supervision of PIE statutory auditors and audit firms

National competent authorities are responsible for the approval and registration of statutory auditors and audit firms, the adoption of audit standards, quality assurance and investigative and administrative disciplinary systems.

At European level, the cooperation between competent authorities is organised within the framework of the [Committee of European Audit Oversight Bodies \(the 'CEAOB'\)](#). The CEAOB has different tasks aimed at supervisory convergence, but it has no power to take binding decisions (Article 30 [Audit Regulation](#)).

Question 15. How do you assess the effectiveness, efficiency, and coherence of the key features of the EU supervisory framework for PIE statutory auditors and audit firms?

a) The supervision of PIE statutory auditors and audit firms in the EU

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

b) The establishment and operation of national audit oversight bodies

						Don't know -

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

c) The Member State systems for investigations and sanctions

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

d) The role of the CEAOB

						Don't know -

	1 (very low)	2 (low)	3 (medium)	4 (high)	5 (very high)	No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness in reaching its objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency: has the framework been cost efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
III. Coherence with relevant EU rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 15.1 Please describe the main issues you see, if any, in relation to the supervision of statutory auditors and audit firms and, where possible, please provide concrete examples and evidence supporting your assessment. You may want to consider the following aspects

- **are there factors that have reduced the effectiveness / rendered the relevant EU framework less effective than anticipated? Which rules have proven less effective than anticipated?**
- **is there scope to improve efficiency via further simplification?**
- **are existing provisions coherent with each other?**

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

- a) Despite the establishment of the CEAOB and ongoing efforts to enhance supervisory convergence, there is still lack of harmonisation in how national audit oversight bodies discharge their duties. At EU level, we support further harmonisation and enhancement in this regard, with the ultimate aim of improving corporate reporting and audit quality.
- b) The status, organisational structure and funding of national oversight bodies vary across Europe (see <https://bit.ly/3AI0sha>) which ultimately influences the way each body carries out its work. We support further

harmonisation in this regard.

c) In general, we believe more consistency in the area of investigations and sanctioning is needed across countries.

The transparency of oversight bodies' work varies: i) individual audit firm quality/other inspections' results are public in 7 countries and ii) disciplinary measures and sanctions are published on a name basis in 10 countries (see <https://bit.ly/3AIOsha>) We are in favour of i) common supervisory guidelines and coordinated methodologies and processes, set by the CEOAB with appropriate and independent staff and ii) more transparency and harmonisation by publishing individual audit firm results across the EU, including remedial actions taken by audit firms as agreed with the regulator, like it is for instance in the reports published by the US Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB).

d) We support robust supervision and enhanced supervisory bodies at EU and national level, but any new powers need to be proportionate with appropriate safeguards to help ensure objectivity of the process and stakeholders' confidence in the supervisory system. To achieve further supervisory convergence across the EU, we believe we need a more robust regulator with adequate powers at EU level. Therefore, the role of the CEOAB needs to be strengthened.

Question 16. Considering the findings in the [Commission monitoring report](#) and reports of national audit oversight bodies how would you rate the quality of audit supervision?

- 1 - Very low
- 2 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 4 - High
- 5 - Very high
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

16.1 If you want to add any comments and/or provide evidence for your assessment in question 16, you can provide it below. You may also include the consequences that your assessment of the quality of audit supervision or the lack thereof has:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-There is a need for a proportionate approach and regulation that creates a level playing field across the EU.
-We concur with the EC report's proposals that national oversight bodies should i) Ensure convergence in the interpretation of findings & categories, ii) Identify effective quality indicators to improve the measuring of audit quality (refer also to our response to Question 4.1) and iii) Enhance the evaluation & interpretation of systemic risk. This should be harmonised across the EU. Only issues identified as systemic at EU level require wider regulatory action.

-The educational and remedial aspect of inspections needs to be enhanced. Inspection reports should always include information on what should have been done (differently) to ensure this. Inspections' primary aim should be quality improvement, not opening of sanctioning procedures. The system of supervision should not focus on sanctioning ex-post but on ensuring creation of an environment that fosters learning and development of the audit profession.

-Separation of powers is needed (setting rules/inspections/sanctioning) to enhance the overall control of

audit quality and its objectivity.

-The regulatory burden relating to the investigations and sanctioning should be proportionate and not act as a disincentive to auditors as that could lead to further concentration in the already heavily regulated PIE audit market.

-Importantly, inspections should not be limited to a compliance exercise, i.e. supervisors should not only check auditors' compliance with standards and legislation, but they should properly consider the use of professional scepticism and judgement.

-In addition, the time between an inspection and informing the auditor about its result should have an appropriate maximum limit to allow for the auditor's addressing of potential findings in a timely fashion.

-For investigations, there should be a maximum time limit set and a possibility to have a formal appeal procedure.

Question 17. How effective and efficient would the following actions be to increase the quality and effectiveness of supervision of PIE statutory auditors and audit firms?

a) Ensure better the independence and appropriate resources of supervisors of auditors and audit firms

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

b) Increase the transparency of audit supervisors

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

c) Increase the consistency of supervision of cross-border networks of audit firms

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

d) Ensure supervision of audit committees

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

e) Harmonise and strengthen the investigation and sanctioning powers of audit supervisors

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

f) Ensure that at European level there are legal instruments available that ensure supervisory convergence as regards statutory audit of PIEs

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

g) Grant a European body the task to register and supervise PIE statutory auditors and audit firms

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 17.1 Have you identified other actions that would effectively and efficiently increase the quality and reliability of supervision of PIE statutory auditors and audit firms?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

17.1.1 Please specify to what other action(s) you refer in your answer to question 17.1:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-We believe that it would be beneficial to encourage sharing of good practices amongst European audit oversight bodies within the CEAOB. This would enable learning from each other and also help audit and supervisory convergence in Europe.

Question 17.2 Please provide any details to support your views. Any evidence, including on expected benefits and costs of such action is welcome:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

- a) As said in our response to Question 15.2, the status, organisational structure and funding of national audit oversight bodies vary across Europe. There are also diverging composition and appointment processes to the various bodies within the national audit oversight bodies. This also has an impact on the independence and level of resources of an oversight body. We support further harmonisation in this regard, with focus on ensuring real independence (including appropriate appointment process and rotation of supervisors /inspectors) and adequate resources, qualification and expertise. This will enable adequate quality of audit supervision.
- b) We believe that there should be enhanced transparency on national public oversight bodies' internal governance and own internal supervision.
Also refer to our response to Question 15.1 on the need for enhanced transparency of oversight bodies' work on inspections and sanctions.
- c) Refer to our response to Question 15.1
- d) We believe that each PIE should be required to set up a separate audit committee which should be subject to supervision in each Member State. Having harmonised EU performance standards for audit committees that are monitored by an independent authority is desirable and would improve audit committees' functioning and transparency of their work. Such standards are also vital to ensure a clear understanding of expectations from and accountability for audit committees.
- e) f) Refer to our response to Question 15.1
- g) We believe that the costs and practical difficulties (different legal regime and language used in each country) associated with establishing a European body to register and supervise PIE statutory auditors and audit firms would be considerable while we do not see clear advantages of such a measure.

Part V - Supervision and enforcement of corporate reporting

The supervision and enforcement of corporate reporting refers to the examination by competent authorities of listed companies' compliance with the disclosure obligations stemming from the applicable reporting framework, as well as taking appropriate measures when infringements are identified.

Based on enforcement activities by national competent authorities, ESMA reports a significant level of material misstatements. In the follow up of the Wirecard case and based on its experience, ESMA recommended a number of actions to improve the enforcement of corporate reporting ([see ESMA letter of 26 February 2021 to the Commissioner McGuinness on next steps following Wirecard - ESMA32-51-818](#)).

The [Transparency Directive](#) includes a number of requirements relating to supervision of corporate reporting

- the designation of a central competent authority in each Member State. For the enforcement of corporate reporting, Member States may designate a competent authority other than the central authority and/or delegate tasks to other entities
- national central competent authorities must be independent from market participants. There are no specific provisions as regards the independence of other designated authorities. As regards entities with delegated tasks, the entity in question must be organised in a manner such that conflicts of interest are avoided and information obtained from carrying out the delegated tasks is not used unfairly or to prevent competition
- Member States must provide competent authorities with certain powers, including investigative powers
- ESMA is tasked to foster supervisory convergence as regards the enforcement of financial statements prepared in accordance with the IFRS. For this purpose it has adopted in [2014 guidelines on the enforcement of financial information](#)

This part of the consultation complements the [Commission targeted consultation on the supervisory convergence and the Single Rulebook](#) from 12 March 2021 to 21 May 2021.

Question 18. Considering the level of material departures from IFRS in the financial statements of listed companies found in the [ESMA report on enforcement and regulatory activities of European enforcers in 2020](#), how would you rate (on a scale of 1 to 5) the degree to which such departures can be attributed to deficiencies in the EU supervisory framework?

- 1 - Very low
- 2 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 4 - High
- 5 - Very high
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

18.1 If you want to add any comments and/or provide evidence for your assessment in question 18, you can provide it below. You may also include the consequences that your assessment of the quality of audit supervision or

the lack thereof has:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-We believe there is a need for clarifying the nature of 'material departures' referred to in ESMA's report. National authorities required a reissuance only in 9 of the 265 'material departures' identified in 689 examinations. For other cases, the actions taken were public corrective notes (47) and corrections in future financial statements (209).

-There might be various reasons to explain 38% of 'material departures' not giving rise to a qualified audit opinion, including the following:

- 1- The auditor's objective is to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole are free from material misstatements. Auditors report individual uncorrected misstatements to the board and audit committee of the company. When forming their opinion auditors take into account these uncorrected misstatements. If, in aggregate, those uncorrected misstatements are not material to the financial statements, the audit opinion remains unqualified. However, national enforcers might have a different approach to materiality.
- 2- National authorities might apply divergent policies and practices depending on their local regulations and enforcement power.

-It should also be noted that these examinations are made on a risk-based approach focusing on the companies and accounting areas with a higher risk. Consequently, the departure rate observed in inspections cannot be extrapolated to the whole market.

-Finally, more details about the enforcing actions taken would give a better idea on the root causes of departures from IFRS. These details could include for example, the nature of the companies, for how long they were listed, whether there was any follow-up action by the company (such as formal objection, court case) and if so, what the outcome was, etc.

Question 19. How effective and efficient would the following actions be in increasing the quality and reliability of reporting by listed companies?

a) Clarify the role and responsibilities of the national authorities charged with the enforcement of corporate reporting and entities to whom the supervision of corporate reporting is delegated/designated, and improve their cooperation

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

b) Improve the system for the exchange of information between authorities and entities involved in the supervision of corporate reporting, and other relevant national authorities

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

c) Strengthen the rules ensuring the independence of national authorities or entities involved in the supervision of corporate reporting

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

d) Increase the resources of national authorities or entities involved in the supervision of corporate reporting

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

e) Increase the powers for national competent authorities to enforce corporate reporting, such as forensic, powers to obtain any necessary information from banks, tax or any other authorities in the country, powers to request information and corrective actions, etc.

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

f) Improve cooperation and coordination between national authorities of different Member States

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

g) Increase transparency on the conduct and results of enforcement activities by national authorities

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

h) Strengthen the role of ESMA on the enforcement of corporate reporting

	1 (not at all effective/ efficient)	2 (rather not effective/ efficient)	3 (neutral)	4 (rather effective/ efficient)	5 (very effective/ efficient)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I. Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
II. Efficiency in term of cost/benefits of action	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 19.1 Have you identified other actions that would effectively and efficiently increase the quality and reliability of reporting by listed companies?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

19.1.1 Please specify to what other action(s) you refer in your answer to question 19.1:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-There is merit in harmonising enforcing policies and activities of the national competent authorities (NCAs) to have a level playing field embedded in EU legislation. This should include more transparency about their governance, independence, resources and enforcing activity results.

-In addition, the coordination and cooperation between different supervisors (on reporting, auditing, securities markets, etc.) within a jurisdiction should be improved and better interlinked.

-Finally, maintaining an open dialogue among the NCAs, listed companies and auditing profession both at national and at EU level will be very beneficial to clarify expectations and avoid inconsistent interpretations. This could include preventive measures such as the exchange of views with the NCAs before the issuance of the financial statements on whether a particular accounting treatment would or would not meet applicable requirements, including IFRS and listing rules, under relevant circumstances.

Question 19.2 Please provide any details to support your views. Any evidence, including on expected benefits and costs of such action is welcome:

2000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

-The ultimate objective of any action should be providing reliable and timely information to shareholders, investors and other stakeholders.

-In this regard, ESMA plays a key role and contributes to high quality reporting. Its authority over national authorities should be strengthened to improve the consistency and the quality of the supervision. Ideally, national enforcers should follow common methodologies and impose the same type of sanctions for departures with a similar nature.

-Publication of annual European Common Enforcement Priorities and the European Enforcers Coordination Session database on IFRS interpretations are found to be very useful. However, we note that the latter could be improved in terms of:

- i. comprehensiveness (by describing in detail the rationale behind the conclusions) and
- ii. completeness (by including information from all Member States, some of which cannot provide full transparency currently due to confidentiality requirements).

-We observe that NCAs' internal procedures are usually complex, and a long time is needed for actions to be taken. NCAs already have resource constraints and granting additional powers will most likely not provide any benefit. Conversely, powers such as forensic examination or requesting information from banks and tax authorities will potentially lead to practical challenges and unintended consequences. However, enhancing their expertise and improving examination procedures to ensure that necessary corrections are made sooner

will greatly enhance the impact of enforcement.

-The interconnectivity between financial and non-financial information is essential. Hence, sustainability reporting should also be supervised. This means national authorities will soon need more resources and guidance on supervising sustainability information, including the nature of sanctions to be exercised in case of breaches.

Additional information

Should you wish to provide additional information (e.g. a position paper, report) or raise specific points not covered by the questionnaire, you can upload your additional document(s) below. **Please make sure you do not include any personal data in the file you upload if you want to remain anonymous.**

The maximum file size is 1 MB.

You can upload several files.

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Useful links

[More on this consultation \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2021-corporate-reporting_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2021-corporate-reporting_en)

[Consultation document \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2021-corporate-reporting-consultation-document_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2021-corporate-reporting-consultation-document_en)

[Consultation strategy \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2021-corporate-reporting-consultation-strategy_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2021-corporate-reporting-consultation-strategy_en)

[More on company reporting \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/company-reporting-and-auditing_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/company-reporting-and-auditing_en)

[Specific privacy statement \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/specific-privacy-statement_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/specific-privacy-statement_en)

[More on the Transparency register \(http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?locale=en\)](http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?locale=en)

Contact

fisma-corporate-reporting@ec.europa.eu

