

February 28, 2017

Robert M. Prill, CPA
Peer Review Committee Chair
Oregon Society of CPAs
PO Box 4555
Beaverton, OR 97076

Dear Mr. Prill:

On February 23, 2017, the AICPA Peer Review Board Oversight Task Force accepted the report and letter of procedures and observations on the most recent oversight visit for the Oregon Society of CPAs, the administering entity for the AICPA Peer Review Program, and the administering entity's response thereto. A copy of this acknowledgement, the two oversight visit documents, and your response have now been posted to the AICPA Peer Review Program website.

The next administering entity oversight visit will be in 2018.

The AICPA Peer Review Board appreciates your cooperation and efforts in making the peer review program a success.

Sincerely,

Brian Bluhm

Brian Bluhm, CPA, Vice Chair
Oversight Task Force
AICPA Peer Review Board

cc: Sherri L.D. McPherson, CAE, President/CEO
Phyllis B. Barker, CAE, VP Administration & Finance

Laurel Gron, Manager – Peer Review
AICPA Peer Review Program

Oversight Visit Report

September 30, 2016

To the Oregon Society of CPAs Peer Review Committee

We have reviewed the Oregon Society of CPAs' administration of the AICPA Peer Review Program as part of our oversight program. Our procedures were conducted in conformity with the guidance established by the AICPA Peer Review Board (the "Board") as contained in the *AICPA Peer Review Program Oversight Handbook*. The administering entity is responsible for administering the AICPA Peer Review Program in compliance with the *AICPA Standards for Performing and Reporting on Peer Reviews* (the "Standards"), interpretations, and other guidance established by the Board. Our responsibility is to determine whether (1) administering entities are complying with the administrative procedures established by the Board as set forth in the *AICPA Peer Review Administrative Manual*, (2) the reviews are being conducted and reported on in accordance with the Standards, (3) the results of the reviews are being evaluated on a consistent basis by all administering entity peer review committees, and (4) information disseminated by administering entities is accurate and timely.

Based on the results of the procedures performed, we have concluded that the Oregon Society of CPAs has complied with the administrative procedures and Standards in all material respects as established by the Board.

As is customary, we have issued a letter of oversight visit procedures and observations that details the oversight procedures performed and sets forth recommendations that were not considered to be of sufficient significance to affect the conclusions expressed in this report.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Debra Seefeld".

Debra Seefeld, Member, Oversight Task Force
AICPA Peer Review Program

September 30, 2016

To the Oregon Society of CPAs Peer Review Committee

We have reviewed the Oregon Society of CPAs' administration of the AICPA Peer Review Program (the "Program") as part of our oversight program and have issued our report thereon dated September 30, 2016. That report should be read in conjunction with any observations in this letter, which were considered in determining our conclusions. The observations described below were not considered to be of sufficient significance to affect the conclusions expressed in that report.

The oversight visit was conducted according to the procedures in the *AICPA Peer Review Program Oversight Handbook*. An oversight program is designed to improve the administering entity's administration of the AICPA Peer Review Program through feedback on its policies and procedures, and to provide resource assistance from an AICPA Peer Review Board Oversight Task Force member on both technical and administrative matters.

In conjunction with the oversight visit of the Oregon Society of CPAs, the administering entity for the Program, conducted on September 29 and 30, 2016, the following observations are being communicated.

Administrative Procedures

On the morning of September 29, 2016, I met with the Peer Review Administrator to review the Program's administration. I believe the administrative processes were being handled in a manner consistent with peer review standards.

I reviewed files which were still open due to follow-up actions and which had not yet been completed. I found that follow-up actions were being effectively monitored for completion by the administrative staff and the peer review committee.

I also reviewed the policies and procedures for the granting of extensions. I found that the Peer Review Administrator handles short-term extension requests with discussion from the committee when the circumstances warrant.

I also reviewed the timeliness of the scheduling process, technical reviews, and the preparation of acceptance and follow-up letters. During this review, I noted that in some instances, scheduling letters were not being sent to the reviewed firms within the prescribed time-frame.

The Oregon Society of CPAs has developed a back-up plan to support the Peer Review Administrator if she becomes unable to serve in her designated capacity. Because the Oregon Society of CPAs has several technical reviewers, there is adequate back-up in the event one or more technical reviewers become unable to fulfill their responsibilities.

Web Site and Other Media Information

I met with the Peer Review Administrator who oversees the web site, to review the administering entity's procedures to determine if the information disseminated regarding the AICPA Peer Review Program by the administering entity on their web site and other media information is accurate and timely.

After the AICPA staff's review of the web site material and my review of other disseminated peer review materials, I noted that the administering entity maintains and disseminates current information as it relates to the peer review program. In addition, the administering entity has an individual who is responsible for maintaining the web site and monitors the web site to ensure peer review information is accurate and timely.

Working Paper Retention

I reviewed the completed working papers for several reviews and found compliance with the working paper retention policies.

Technical Review Procedures

On September 29, 2016, I met with the Oregon Society of CPAs' two primary technical reviewers to discuss procedures. They are experienced reviewers and perform substantially all technical reviews.

I reviewed the reports, letters of response, if applicable, and the working papers for several of the reviews being presented to the report acceptance body ("RAB") on September 30, 2016. I believe that all review issues were appropriately addressed by the technical reviewers before the reviews were presented to the RAB which contributed to an effective and efficient acceptance process.

Reviews are presented to the RAB by a committee member who is not the technical reviewer. Feedback is issued to the technical reviewers when deemed appropriate by the RAB.

Review Presentation

Reviews are brought to the committee without open technical issues. Accordingly, it was not necessary for the RAB to spend a great deal of time reviewing specific technical issues.

Committee and RAB Procedures

I met with the committee chair and discussed the procedures for disseminating the comments resulting from the AICPA working paper oversights and RAB observation reports to the appropriate individuals. It was determined the committee had issued reviewer feedback when appropriate.

On September 30, 2016, I attended the onsite peer review committee meeting. I observed the committee's acceptance process and offered my comments at the close of discussions.

The onsite committee functioned as the report acceptance body (RAB), and the meeting was very orderly. It was apparent that the committee members had reviewed the reports and working papers prior to the meeting and had a good understanding of the program to reach an appropriate decision for each review.

Appropriate decisions were made in the acceptance process, including assigned corrective actions and reviewer monitoring. Reviews were being presented to the RAB on a timely basis.

Oversight Program

The Oregon Society of CPAs peer review committee has adopted a formal oversight program that is well documented. I reviewed the document and procedures performed and found the oversight program to be comprehensive.

Summary

As a result of the aforementioned observations and to enhance the Oregon Society of CPAs' administration of the Program, the Peer Review Committee should develop and establish appropriate policies and procedures to ensure that:

1. Peer review scheduling letters are sent to the reviewed firms within the prescribed time-frame.



Debra Seefeld, Member, Oversight Task Force
AICPA Peer Review Program



November 18, 2016

Debra Seefeld
Oversight Task Force
AICPA Peer Review Board
Palladian I Corporate Center
220 Leigh Farm Road
Durham, NC 27707-8110

Re: Oversight Visit to Oregon Society of CPAs

Dear Ms. Seefeld:

This letter represents our response to the report and letter of procedures and observations issued in connection with the review of the Oregon Society of CPAs' administration of the AICPA Peer Review Program (program) performed on September 29-30, 2016. The matters discussed herein were brought to the attention of all peer review program committee members, administrative staff, and technical reviewer(s). In addition, the matters discussed in this letter will be monitored to ensure they are effectively implemented as part of our administration of the AICPA Peer Review Program.

Administrative Procedures

We recognize the importance of ensuring the timeliness of sending peer review scheduling letters to firms within the prescribed time-frame. The majority of the letters that were not sent in the prescribed time-frame were requests for information required for scheduling reviews forms. Great efforts are made to ensure all firms submit the required form so that firms are not dropped from the peer review program. To that end, knowing that about 67% of the firms are primarily tax practitioners and the letters would be ignored due to tax filing due dates, letters were delayed two-weeks in March, April, September and October. As a result, Oregon rarely has a firm dropped from the peer review program for failure to provide the information required for scheduling reviews. It has been our understanding that we had a two-week leeway on sending out all letters. Every effort will be made to ensure scheduling letters are sent to the reviewed firms within the prescribed time-frame.

We appreciate Debra Seefeld's constructive advice and suggestions.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Prill, Peer Review Committee Chair
Oregon Society of CPAs