

**PRESENTATION OF THE
BOARD OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTANCY**

TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE
Regular Session of 2010

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.

**TESTIMONY ON SENATE BILL NO. 2501, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, RELATING TO
PUBLIC ACCOUNTANCY.**

TO THE HONORABLE MARCUS R. OSHIRO, CHAIR,
AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

My name is Thomas Ueno and I am the Vice-Chairperson of the Board of Public Accountancy ("Board"). Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony on Senate Bill No. 2501, S.D. 1, H.D. 1, Relating to Public Accountancy.

The purpose of this bill is to provide a mechanism for firms engaged in the practice of public accountancy to undergo peer review on a regular basis; and to grant the Board appropriate power to regulate the peer review process.

The Board is in support of this measure that was passed by the House Committee on Consumer Protection and Commerce after including a number of the Board's recommendations; however, respectfully provides the following additional comments for this Committee's consideration:

- Section 2 of the bill amends HRS section 466-3 by adding two new definitions to the terms "attest" and "peer review", and amending the definition of the term "firm".

- The Board believes that the term “attest” is too narrowly defined and may limit the Board’s ability to recognize other types of attest work or other standards that may need to be acknowledged in the future. The Board has prepared a new definition for this term, which is attached for your consideration.
- The Board also believes the definition of the term “peer review” should be expanded to include clear guidelines on the qualifications of the individual who conducts a peer review. The Board has also prepared amendments to this definition, which is attached for your consideration.
- In addition, the Board recommends that the definition of the term “firm” be amended to include the language, “or any other form of business entity”.
- Section 5 of the bill amends HRS section 466-13.
 - Subpart (a): It is unclear to the Board whether the inclusion of Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms in the peer review requirement should be mandated. If passed, Hawaii would be the only state in the nation that would require a local office of a national firm to be peer reviewed in order to renew that firm’s permit to practice. The Board requests that the language “including the Hawaii offices and

Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms” be stricken from this section.

Subpart (b): The requirement that the “peer review process be for educational or remedial and not punitive purposes” would prevent the Board from acting in the best interest of the public in the case where a licensee commits a flagrant and serious violation of the laws and rules. The Board requests that the term “remedial” be defined, and that this sentence be amended to allow the Board to act expeditiously against licensees whose egregious violations of the Board's laws and rules adversely affect Hawaii's public.

- o Subpart (d)(4): This provision to establish a process to allow a firm to appeal the findings of a peer review that results in the denial, termination, or non-renewal of its firm permit again points to the inconsistency in the characterization of a peer review to be “not punitive” in purpose. Implementing the Board's previously-noted recommended changes to Section 5 of this measure will address this inconsistency and allow a CPA firm to appeal the conclusions of an unsatisfactory peer review that results in the Board's punitive actions against the firm's permit.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on Senate Bill No. 2501, S.D. 1, H.D. 1. I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

ATTACHMENT
TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE ON SENATE BILL NO. 2501,
S.D. 1, H.D. 1, RELATING TO PUBLIC ACCOUNTANCY

The Board requested amendment to the following definitions contained in S.B. No. 2501, S.D. 1, H.D. 1:

1. This definition be used instead for "attest":

"Attest" means and includes:

- (1) An audit or other similar engagement;
- (2) A review of a financial statement;
- (3) An examination of prospective financial information;
- (4) Any engagement to be performed in accordance with the standards of the PCAOB; and
- (5) Any other services specified in the rules of the Board.

The standards to be followed when performing attest services shall be specified in the rules of the Board; provided that such standards shall, at a minimum, include those developed for general application by recognized national accountancy organizations, such as the AICPA and the PCAOB.

2. This definition, as amended, be used instead for "peer review":

"Peer review" means a study, appraisal, or review of one or more aspects of the professional work of a license holder or CPA firm that issues attest or compilation reports, by a person or persons who currently hold permits to practice public accountancy under section 466-7 and who certificates or licenses, are CPAs, and are not affiliated with the license holder or CPA firm being studied, appraised, or reviewed.

**HAWAII ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS**

Organized August 7, 1943
P.O. BOX 61043
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96839



Before the Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.

Conference Room 308

Re: Support for SB2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

John W. Roberts, MBA, CPA

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and committee members:

I am a certified public accountant (CPA) and State President of the Hawaii Association of Public Accountants (HAPA). HAPA represents local public accounting practitioners throughout the State of Hawaii. I am also a principal of Niwao & Roberts, CPAs, a P.C.

HAPA is in favor of measures to improve the quality of the accounting profession, and HAPA's board of directors supports the language of SB 2501, SD1, HD1. Any Hawaii peer review program should be administered fairly and equitably with respect to the Hawaii market so that all firms are treated equally, regardless of whether they are a small local firm or the Hawaii office of a large international or multi-state firm. No CPA firm performing attest work in Hawaii or for Hawaii clients should be exempt from a Hawaii peer review for the protection of Hawaii consumers. In addition, the peer review process should be constructive and helpful to accountancy firms to improve the quality of their work, rather than punitive in nature. SB 2501, SD1, HD1 meets these conditions and will serve Hawaii's consumers and public accounting community well.

HAPA's support for SD1, HD1 of SB2501 is contingent upon no substantive changes being made to the language of SD1, HD1.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "John W. Roberts".

John W. Roberts, M.B.A., CPA
HAPA State President



Donald P. Yannell
Senior Vice President;
and Area Manager
Waikiki Branch

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

Testimony of Donald Yannell, Senior Vice President, First Hawaiian Bank

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee and Committee Members:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards.

The benefits of mandatory peer review program will: (1) improve the quality of the financial statements being prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii; (2) enhance the creditability and reliability of financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii; (3) most importantly, better protect the unsuspecting public and users of such financial statements, who incorrectly believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review or practice monitoring program to ensure that they comply with established professional standards; and (4) place CPAs who prepare and issue financials statements in the State of Hawaii on an equal playing field and enhance their competitiveness.

Hawaii is one of the few remaining states that do not have a peer review requirement (42 states have adopted peer review legislation).

For the above reasons, I urge you to support mandatory peer review for CPAs as it will provide the public with an improved level of assurance that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards and fulfill the public's expectations.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Donald Yannell", written over a circular stamp or mark.

Donald Yannell



SEVEN-ELEVEN HAWAII, INC.
7-ELEVEN Stores

House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

Testimony in Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Dear Chair, Vice-Chair and Committee Members:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards. Additionally, I support mandatory peer review, which has been mandatory since 1988 for a majority of practicing CPAs who prepare and issue financial statements in the State of Hawaii and are members of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants ("AICPA"), as the current national debate is not whether peer review should be mandatory but should the peer review findings be made transparent and disclosed to better inform and protect the public's interest similar to the review results of the Public Company Oversight Accounting Board ("PCAOB") created under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act for publicly-held companies.

In turn, the benefits of mandatory peer review program will: (1) improve the quality of the financial statements being prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii; (2) enhance the creditability and reliability of financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii; (3) most importantly, better protect us, the unsuspecting public and users of such financial statements, who incorrectly believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review or practice monitoring program to ensure that they comply with established professional standards; and (4) place CPAs who prepare and issue financial statements in the State of Hawaii on an equal playing field and enhance their competitiveness.

For the above reasons, I urge you to support mandatory peer review for CPAs as it will provide the public with an improved level of assurance that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards and fulfill the public's expectations.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Greg Hanna'.

Greg Hanna
Chief Financial Officer

△ GMK CONSULTING

VALUATION ADVISORY SERVICES

March 23, 2010

Before the House Committee on Finance

DATE: Friday, March 26, 2010
TIME: 12:00 P.M.
PLACE: Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The argument proposed by opponents of this bill claims that multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Please do the right thing to protect the public.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.



Gary Kuba
2766A Manoa Road
Honolulu, HI 96822

△ GMK CONSULTING

VALUATION ADVISORY SERVICES

March 23, 2010

Before the House Committee on Finance

DATE: Friday, March 26, 2010
TIME: 12:00 P.M.
PLACE: Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:


Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The argument proposed by opponents of this bill claims that multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Please do the right thing to protect the public.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.



Jody Teruya
1635 Young Street #303
Honolulu, HI 96826

Presentation of the Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.

Testimony on Bill S.B. 2501, SD1, HD1 Peer Review for Public Accountancy

Support the Intent

TO: The Honorable Chair Marcus R. Oshiro
The Honorable Vice Chair Marilyn B. Lee
Members of the Committee

I am Gary Fujitani, Executive Director of the Hawaii Bankers Association (HBA), testifying on behalf of HBA in **support of the intent** of S.B. 2501, SD1, HD1. HBA is the trade organization that represents all FDIC insured depository institutions doing business in Hawaii.

SB 2501 is to provide a mechanism for firms engaged in the practice of public accounting to undergo peer review on a regular basis. We understand the intent of peer review is to enhance the quality of accounting, auditing and attestation services performed by Certified Public Accountants (CPAs) in public practice.

Banks, as lenders to business, rely on financial statements audited by CPAs in making loan decisions. Therefore, the reliability of the financial data presented for a loan request is of paramount importance in making a proper loan analysis.

Our expectation is that CPA firms are qualified to express an independent and expert opinion on the fairness of financial statements, an important and valuable service rendered by the public accounting profession.

If peer review helps to improve the quality and reliability of audited financial data, it will aid us in making the appropriate loan decisions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our testimony



Taketa, Iwata, Hara & Associates, LLC

Certified Public Accountants & Consultants

101 Aupuni Street, Suite 139

Hilo, Hawaii 96720-4260

Before the House of Representatives Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.

Conference Room 308

State Capitol

Re: Support for SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Testimony of Gregg M. Taketa

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee and committee members:

I respectfully ask that you vote YES on SB 2501, SD1, HD1. I am a partner in the CPA firm of Taketa, Iwata, Hara & Associates, LLC in Hilo. I am also a member of the Hawaii Association of Public Accountants, Hawaii Society of Certified Public Accountants (HSCPA) and the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA).


Our firm has been a member of the Private Companies Practice Section (PCPS) of the AICPA since 1989 and we completed our first on-site peer review (now known as a system review) in 1991. I am a firm believer in the benefits of peer reviews as it provides a healthy exchange of information and ideas between peer reviewer and the firm with the objective of continued improvement in attest work.

I support SB 2501, SD1, HD1 because it addresses the main concerns regarding mandatory peer review rather than relying on the rules to clarify issues.

- SB 2501, SD1, HD1 provides a level playing field as all CPA firms performing attest work in Hawaii would be required to participate in the peer review process administered by the state board of public accountancy.
- SB 2501, SD1, HD1 provides definitions for "peer review" and "attest" and clarifies the definition of "firm".
- SB 2501, SD1, HD1 provides due process provisions for firms that may lose their right to practice due to the peer review process.
- SB 2501, SD1, HD1 states that the peer review process shall be for educational or remedial rather than punitive purposes. This setting will foster a relationship between peer reviewer and CPA firm that will encourage the exchange of information and ideas necessary for the continued improvement of professional services.

I urge the committee to support SB 2501, SD1, HD1 for these reasons. Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Respectfully submitted,


Gregg M. Taketa, CPA

Gregg M. Taketa, CPA • Brian M. Iwata, CPA • Janet W. Hara, CPA

Tel (808) 935-5404 Fax (808) 969-1499 E-mail: info@tihcpa.com Website: www.tihcpa.com

S A N D A L W O O D A V I A T I O N L L C

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010

12:00 p.m.

Conference Room 308

Testimony of Timothy Ng

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Chair Oshiro, Vice-Chair Lee and Committee Members:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards.

The benefits of mandatory peer review program will: (1) improve the quality of the financial statements being prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii; (2) enhance the creditability and reliability of financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii; (3) most importantly, better protect the unsuspecting public and users of such financial statements, who incorrectly believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review or practice monitoring program to ensure that they comply with established professional standards; and (4) place CPAs who prepare and issue financials statements in the State of Hawaii on an equal playing field and enhance their competitiveness.

For the above reasons, I urge you to support mandatory peer review for CPAs as it will provide the public with an improved level of assurance that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards and fulfill the public's expectations.

Sincerely,

Timothy Ng
Founding Member
Sandalwood Aviation LLC



Jani-King Hawaii
94-165 Leole Street
Suite 119
Waipahu, Hawaii 96797
(808) 535-6100
(808) 535-6199 Fax

House Committee on Finance
Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

United States
Albuquerque
Atlanta • Austin
Baltimore
Baton Rouge
Birmingham
Boston • Buffalo
Charleston
Charlotte • Chicago
Cincinnati • Cleveland
Colton • Columbia
Columbus • Dallas
Dayton • Denver
Detroit • Fort Worth
Greensboro
Greenville/Spartanburg
Hampton Roads
Hartford • Hawaii
Houston • Huntsville
Indianapolis • Jackson
Jacksonville • Kansas City
Knoxville • Las Vegas
Los Angeles • Louisville
Madison • Memphis
Miami • Milwaukee
Minneapolis • Mobile
Nashville • New Jersey
New Orleans
New York • Oakland
Oklahoma City • Orlando
Philadelphia • Phoenix
Pittsburgh • Portland
Raleigh/Durham
Rhode Island • Richmond
Sacramento
St. Louis • Salt Lake City
San Antonio • San Diego
San Francisco • Seattle
Southeast Mississippi
Tampa Bay • Tucson
Tulsa • Washington, D.C.

Dear Chair, Vice-Chair and Committee Members:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards. Additionally, I support mandatory peer review, which has been mandatory since 1988 for a majority of practicing CPAs who prepare and issue financial statements in the State of Hawaii and are members of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants ("AICPA"), as the current national debate is not whether peer review should be mandatory but should the peer review findings be made transparent and disclosed to better inform and protect the public's interest similar to the review results of the Public Company Oversight Accounting Board ("PCAOB") created under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act for publicly-held companies.

In turn, the benefits of mandatory peer review program will: (1) improve the quality of the financial statements being prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii; (2) enhance the creditability and reliability of financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii; (3) most importantly, better protect us, the unsuspecting public and users of such financial statements, who incorrectly believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review or practice monitoring program to ensure that they comply with established professional standards; and (4) place CPAs who prepare and issue financials statements in the State of Hawaii on an equal playing field and enhance their competitiveness.

For the above reasons, I urge you to support mandatory peer review for CPAs as it will provide the public with an improved level of assurance that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards and fulfill the public's expectations.

Sincerely,

Lani Price
Controller

Argentina
Australia
Brazil
Canada
Toronto
Windsor
France
Great Britain
Hong Kong
Korea
Malaysia
Mexico
New Zealand
Singapore
Taiwan
Turkey



Horwath Kam & Company
An Accountancy Corporation
Member of Horwath International
700 Bishop Street, Suite 1700
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 USA
808.524-8080 Tel
808.524-8081 Fax
www.horwath-hi.com

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
THE TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE
REGULAR SESSION OF 2010**

Testimony in Support of SB2501, SB1, HB1

Dear Chair Marcus R. Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee & Committee Members on Finance:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards.

The benefits of mandatory peer review program will: (1) improve the quality of the financial statements being prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii; (2) enhance the creditability and reliability of financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii; (3) most importantly, provide a greater level of confidence to the public and users of such financial statements, who currently, but incorrectly, believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review process or practice monitoring program to ensure that those statements comply with established professional standards.

Additionally, we are one of the few remaining states that have yet to enact a mandatory peer review requirement for CPA's (42 states have a mandatory peer review requirement).

For these reasons, I urge you to support mandatory peer review for CPAs as it will provide the public with an improved level of assurance that CPA-prepared financial statements are issued pursuant to uniform professional standards, and most importantly fulfill the public's expectations and reliance thereon.

For the above reasons, I urge you to support mandatory peer review for CPAs, who perform attest services, to include the suggested modifications.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Howard K. Kam, Jr.'.

Howard K. Kam, Jr., CPA
Managing Director

ALAN K. BERNALDO
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT

1871 WILI PA LOOP, SUITE B
WAILUKU, HAWAII 96793

(808) 242-5951 / FAX: (808) 244-3030

Before the Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.

Conference Room 308

Re: Support for SB2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Testimony of ALAN K. BERNALDO, CPA

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and committee members:

I am a practicing CPA whose practice is located on the island of Maui. I have been in practice for just about 30 years and have always voluntarily participated in the State's peer review program.

SB2501, SD1, HD1 provides for mandatory peer review once every three years for a CPA firm's attest work, in conjunction with the renewal of a CPA firm's permit to practice. I am in favor of measures to improve the quality of the public accounting profession in Hawaii. I also support the language of SB2501, SD1, HD1 in that the requirements for peer review are applied equitably to all CPA firms practicing public accountancy in Hawaii, including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large international CPA firms (which are usually not selected for peer review).

If an exception is made to exempt the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of these foreign or multi-state firms from peer review, only local firms would be at risk for losing their firms' permit to practice and only local firms would be required to take remedial measures. In addition, exempting the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large CPA firms is not in the best interest for Hawaii consumers who depend upon the Hawaii work product of CPA firms who do business in Hawaii.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan K. Bernaldo, CPA

Before the Committee on Finance
Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

**Re: Support for SB2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy**

Testimony of Gary Y. Miyashiro

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and committee members:

I am a CPA practicing in Hawaii with Manoa Consulting Group, LLC – Certified Public Accountants, and our firm has been voluntarily peer reviewed for a number of years.

SB2501, SD1, HD1 provides for mandatory peer review once every three years for a CPA firm's attest work, in conjunction with the renewal of a CPA firm's permit to practice. I am in favor of measures to improve the quality of the public accounting profession in Hawaii. I also support the language of SB2501, SD1, HD1 in that the requirements for peer review are applied equitably to all CPA firms practicing public accountancy in Hawaii, including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large international CPA firms (which are usually not selected for peer review).

If an exception is made to exempt the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of these foreign or multi-state firms from peer review, only local firms would be at risk for losing their firms' permit to practice and only local firms would be required to take remedial measures. In addition, exempting the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large CPA firms is not in the best interest for Hawaii consumers who depend upon the Hawaii work product of CPA firms who do business in Hawaii.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Respectfully submitted,



Gary Y. Miyashiro, CPA

Natalie J. Iwasa, CPA, Inc.
1331 Lunalilo Home Road
Honolulu, HI 96825
808-395-3233

DATE: March 24, 2010

TO: Representative Oshiro, Chair
Representative Lee, Vice Chair
Committee on Finance

HEARING DATE: Friday, March 26, 2010, 12 p.m.

SUBJECT: SB2501, SD1, HD1 Relating to Public Accountancy - **Additional Comments**


Aloha Chair, Vice Chair and Members of the Committee,

Thank you for this opportunity to provide additional comments regarding this bill and its related amendments.

Page 1, line 17, defines "attest" in part as "any compilation or review of a financial statement" Under AICPA rules, a firm is not required to be peer reviewed if the highest level of service performed is compilations of management-use only financial statements with no report. The current wording of this bill and its amendments would require firms that currently are not required to have a peer review to be reviewed. Consideration should be given to the impact this new requirement would have on firms that only issue management-use only financial statements.

Page 3, line 9, indicates "An applicant for the initial issuance or renewal of a permit shall have," continuing on line 20, "Undergone any applicable peer review process" The due date of a firm's first peer review, under AICPA rules, is ordinarily 18 months from the date it enrolled in the peer review program or should have enrolled, whichever date is earlier. Consideration should therefore be given to clarifying when a peer review is required for initial permit applicants.

Sincerely,



Natalie Iwasa, CPA

Ann Fukuhara, CPA MBA
An Accountancy Corporation

714 Kanoelohua Avenue
P.O. Box 6691
Hilo, Hawaii 96720
(808) 961-5532
Facsimile: (808) 934-8589

Before the Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.

Conference Room 308

Re: Support for SB2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy
Testimony of Ann Fukuhara CPA

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and committee members:

I am a certified public accountant in Hilo, Hawaii and have been in private practice for over fifteen years.

SB2501, SD1, HD1 provides for mandatory peer review once every three years for a CPA firm's attest work, in conjunction with the renewal of a CPA firm's permit to practice. I am in favor of measures to improve the quality of the public accounting profession in Hawaii. I also support the language of SB2501, SD1, HD1 in that the requirements for peer review are applied equitably to all CPA firms practicing public accountancy in Hawaii, including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large international CPA firms (which are usually not selected for peer review).


If an exception is made to exempt the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of these foreign or multi-state firms from peer review, Hawaii firms exclusively would be at risk for losing their firms' permit to practice and only Hawaii firms would be required to take remedial measures.

In addition, exempting the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large CPA firms is not in the best interest for Hawaii consumers who depend upon the Hawaii work product of CPA firms who do business in Hawaii.

Thank you for your consideration of the above matter and please do not hesitate to contact me at (808) 961-5532 if you have any questions concerning my testimony.

Very truly yours,

Ann Fukuhara, CPA MBA, An Accountancy Corporation



Ann Fukuhara, CPA MBA

FUSATO CPA INC.
140 N. Market Street, Suite 200
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793-1732
(808) 242-9100
Fax (808) 244-1375

Before the Committee on Finance
Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
Re: Support for SB2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy

Testimony of Ross Fusato

Dear Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and committee members:


I am a CPA that started my own practice in 2009. My company on Maui employs 10 people and offers tax, bookkeeping and payroll services.

SB2501, SD1, HD1 provides for mandatory peer review once every three years for a CPA firm's attest work, in conjunction with the renewal of a CPA firm's permit to practice. I am in favor of measures to improve the quality of the public accounting profession in Hawaii. I also support the language of SB2501, SD1, HD1 in that the requirements for peer review are applied equitably to all CPA firms practicing public accountancy in Hawaii, including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large international CPA firms (which are usually not selected for peer review).

If an exception is made to exempt the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of these foreign or multi-state firms from peer review, only local firms would be at risk for losing their firms' permit to practice and only local firms would be required to take remedial measures. In addition, exempting the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large CPA firms is not in the best interest for Hawaii consumers who depend upon the Hawaii work product of CPA firms who do business in Hawaii.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Respectfully submitted,



Ross Fusato

FUSATO CPA INC.
140 N. Market Street, Suite 200
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793-1732
(808) 242-9100
Fax (808) 244-1375

Before the Committee on Finance
Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
Re: Support for SB2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy

Testimony of Mindy Fusato

Dear Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and committee members:


I am a CPA that started my own practice in 2009. My company on Maui employs 10 people and offers tax, bookkeeping and payroll services.

SB2501, SD1, HD1 provides for mandatory peer review once every three years for a CPA firm's attest work, in conjunction with the renewal of a CPA firm's permit to practice. I am in favor of measures to improve the quality of the public accounting profession in Hawaii. I also support the language of SB2501, SD1, HD1 in that the requirements for peer review are applied equitably to all CPA firms practicing public accountancy in Hawaii, including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large international CPA firms (which are usually not selected for peer review).

If an exception is made to exempt the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of these foreign or multi-state firms from peer review, only local firms would be at risk for losing their firms' permit to practice and only local firms would be required to take remedial measures. In addition, exempting the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large CPA firms is not in the best interest for Hawaii consumers who depend upon the Hawaii work product of CPA firms who do business in Hawaii.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Respectfully submitted,


Mindy Fusato

FUSATO CPA INC.
140 N. Market Street, Suite 200
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793-1732
(808) 242-9100
Fax (808) 244-1375

Before the Committee on Finance
Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
Re: Support for SB2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy

Testimony of CAROL S. UHL, CPA

Dear Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and committee members:

I am a CPA licensed to practice in the State of Hawaii for the past thirty years and have worked for several local firms as well as one of the Big Four. I am currently employed at a local CPA firm here on Maui.

SB2501, SD1, HD1 provides for mandatory peer review once every three years for a CPA firm's attest work, in conjunction with the renewal of a CPA firm's permit to practice. I am in favor of measures to improve the quality of the public accounting profession in Hawaii. I also support the language of SB2501, SD1, HD1 in that the requirements for peer review are applied equitably to all CPA firms practicing public accountancy in Hawaii, including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large international CPA firms (which are usually not selected for peer review).

If an exception is made to exempt the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of these foreign or multi-state firms from peer review, only local firms would be at risk for losing their firms' permit to practice and only local firms would be required to take remedial measures. In addition, exempting the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large CPA firms is not in the best interest for Hawaii consumers who depend upon the Hawaii work product of CPA firms who do business in Hawaii.

Thank you for your consideration of this testimony.

Respectfully submitted,


Carol S. Uhl, CPA

BRAND, KARIMOTO & COMPANY LLC
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Serving Hawaii Business Since 1973

Before the Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.

Conference Room 308

Re: Support for SB2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Testimony of Jean Wu

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and committee members:

I am a Certified Public Accountant and Staff Accountant of Brand, Karimoto & Company. Our firm has voluntarily been peer reviewed.

SB2501, SD1, HD1 provides for mandatory peer review once every three years for a CPA firm's attest work, in conjunction with the renewal of a CPA firm's permit to practice. I am in favor of measures to improve the quality of the public accounting profession in Hawaii. I also support the language of SB2501, SD1, HD1 in that the requirements for peer review are applied equitably to all CPA firms practicing public accountancy in Hawaii, including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large international CPA firms (which are usually not selected for peer review).

If an exception is made to exempt the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of these foreign or multi-state firms from peer review, only local firms would be at risk for losing their firms' permit to practice and only local firms would be required to take remedial measures. In addition, exempting the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large CPA firms is not in the best interest for Hawaii consumers who depend upon the Hawaii work product of CPA firms who do business in Hawaii.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Respectfully submitted,



Jean Wu

BRAND, KARIMOTO & COMPANY LLC
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Serving Hawaii Business Since 1973

Before the Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.

Conference Room 308

Re: Support for SB2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Testimony of Wayne Karimoto

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and committee members:

I am a Certified Public Accountant and Principal of Brand, Karimoto & Company. Our firm has voluntarily been peer reviewed.

SB2501, SD1, HD1 provides for mandatory peer review once every three years for a CPA firm's attest work, in conjunction with the renewal of a CPA firm's permit to practice. I am in favor of measures to improve the quality of the public accounting profession in Hawaii. I also support the language of SB2501, SD1, HD1 in that the requirements for peer review are applied equitably to all CPA firms practicing public accountancy in Hawaii, including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large international CPA firms (which are usually not selected for peer review).

If an exception is made to exempt the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of these foreign or multi-state firms from peer review, only local firms would be at risk for losing their firms' permit to practice and only local firms would be required to take remedial measures. In addition, exempting the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large CPA firms is not in the best interest for Hawaii consumers who depend upon the Hawaii work product of CPA firms who do business in Hawaii.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Respectfully submitted,



Wayne Karimoto

BRAND, KARIMOTO & COMPANY LLC
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Serving Hawaii Business Since 1973

Before the Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.

Conference Room 308

Re: Support for SB2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Testimony of Kent Ahuna

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and committee members:

I am a Certified Public Accountant and Senior Accountant of Brand, Karimoto & Company. Our firm has voluntarily been peer reviewed.

SB2501, SD1, HD1 provides for mandatory peer review once every three years for a CPA firm's attest work, in conjunction with the renewal of a CPA firm's permit to practice. I am in favor of measures to improve the quality of the public accounting profession in Hawaii. I also support the language of SB2501, SD1, HD1 in that the requirements for peer review are applied equitably to all CPA firms practicing public accountancy in Hawaii, including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large international CPA firms (which are usually not selected for peer review).

If an exception is made to exempt the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of these foreign or multi-state firms from peer review, only local firms would be at risk for losing their firms' permit to practice and only local firms would be required to take remedial measures. In addition, exempting the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of the large CPA firms is not in the best interest for Hawaii consumers who depend upon the Hawaii work product of CPA firms who do business in Hawaii.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Respectfully submitted,



Kent Ahuna

NIWAO
&
ROBERTS

Certified Public Accountants, A Professional Corporation

Before the Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.

Conference Room 308

Re: Support for SB2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Testimony of Marilyn M. Niwao, J.D., CPA

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and committee members:

I am a licensed certified public accountant (CPA) and attorney in the State of Hawaii. I am also a principal of Niwao & Roberts, CPAs, a P.C., a CPA firm on Maui. Our firm has voluntarily obtained on-site peer reviews from 1990, when it was first required for membership in the AICPA.

Our firm supports SB2501, SD1, HD1. SB2501, SD1, HD1 provides for mandatory peer review once every three years for a CPA firm's attest work, in conjunction with the renewal of a CPA firm's permit to practice. I am in favor of measures to improve the quality of the public accounting profession in Hawaii.

SB2501, SD1, HD1 provides that all firms, including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms, shall undergo peer review on the firm's attest work. There shall be no exceptions from peer review for any firms performing attest work in Hawaii. This means that if a foreign or multi-state CPA firm performs attest work in Hawaii, the Hawaii peer review requirement cannot be met by having a mainland office of the foreign or multi-state CPA firm peer reviewed.

Currently, Hawaii offices of the large international CPA firms are oftentimes not peer reviewed because they are not picked in the sample of offices to be peer reviewed because of their relatively small size compared to other mainland offices. However, in these cases, the firm peer review should not be utilized to meet the Hawaii peer review requirement. Otherwise, it is like saying that the health inspections of a mainland McDonald's restaurant in New York should be utilized to exempt a Hawaii McDonald's restaurant from any Hawaii health inspection requirement because both McDonald's restaurants are held to the same standards by the franchisor.

Our firm supports SB2501, SD1 as long as there are no substantive changes to the language of the bill, and all firms performing attest work in Hawaii must undergo mandatory peer review, with no exceptions.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Respectfully submitted,



Marilyn M. Niwao, J.D., CPA
President

Ronald I. Heller
700 Bishop Street, Suite 1500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

phone 808 523 6000 fax 808 523 6001
rheller@torkildson.com

**TESTIMONY BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE
ON FINANCE**

Re: Senate Bill 2501 SD 1, HD 1

**Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 pm
State Capitol, Conference Room 308**

Agenda #3

Chair Oshiro, Vice-Chair Lee, and Members of the Committee:

My name is Ronald Heller. I am a practicing attorney, and also licensed as a Certified Public Accountant. I support the general intent of Senate Bill 2501, and urge you to pass this bill.

In order to obtain a CPA license in Hawaii, the applicant is required to satisfy strict criteria regarding education and experience, and to pass an examination. Those rules exist to make sure that anyone holding himself or herself out to the public as a CPA is qualified to perform professional services. However, we can and should improve on that protection. The existing rules focus on the initial licensing of a CPA. This bill would add a system for reviewing the quality of a CPA's professional work on a continuing basis throughout his or her career.


Many CPAs already participate in peer-review programs on a voluntary basis. Unfortunately, some do not. Typically, consumers are not aware of this, and do not know whether they are receiving services from a CPA who has been through a peer review process.

TESTIMONY OF RONALD I. HELLER
Re: Senate Bill 2501 SD 1, HD 1

Friday, March 26, 2010 at 12:00 pm
Page 2 of 2

Senate Bill 2501 would tie the peer review process to license renewal, to create a process that lasts throughout a CPA's entire career. This would enhance professionalism and competence, and improve protection for the public.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald I. Heller

Andrew Kamikawa
94-553 Poloahilani Street
Mililani, HI 96789

Before the House Committee on Finance

March 26, 2010
12 noon
Conference Room 308

IN SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENT OF SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

I believe that it is important for Hawaii to have a mandatory peer review system. Peer review strengthens the quality of the audit and attest services provided by CPA firms, protecting those who purchase such services and those who use the financial statements resulting from such services. Peer review also provides for continuous quality improvements as CPAs make changes to their processes to improve the quality of their work.

Currently, over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants peer review program ("AICPA PRP"). The 45 states with mandatory peer review have determined that participation in the AICPA PRP is sufficient to meet each state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA PRP, all offices of a multistate firm must be included in the scope of the firm's peer review. However, because peer review is focused on high-risk engagements, there is no requirement for every office of a multistate firm to be inspected during each three-year review cycle.

A requirement that the Hawaii office of a multistate firm be inspected during a peer review would be contrary to the risk-based AICPA PRP process, and would impose extra compliance burdens on CPA firms which are subject to peer review in multiple jurisdictions. Currently, no state requires that a peer review specifically address one or more of a firm's in-state offices as a condition of satisfying the state's peer review program. In addition, this requirement would create a significant cost to and burden on the State Board of Public Accountancy by requiring it to develop two peer review programs - an office peer review program covering only the four multistate firms in Hawaii and a firm peer review program covering the rest of the CPA firms in the state. This requirement should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

John Robert Field, CPA
1906 Halakau Place, Honolulu, HI 96821

Before the House Committee on Finance

March 26th
12 noon
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENT OF SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

I believe that it is important for Hawaii to have a mandatory peer review system. Peer review strengthens the quality of the audit and attest services provided by CPA firms, protecting those who purchase such services and those who use the financial statements resulting from such services. Peer review also provides for continuous quality improvements as CPAs make changes to their processes to improve the quality of their work.

Currently, over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants peer review program ("AICPA PRP"). The 45 states with mandatory peer review have determined that participation in the AICPA PRP is sufficient to meet each state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA PRP, all offices of a multistate firm must be included in the scope of the firm's peer review. However, because peer review is focused on high-risk engagements, there is no requirement for every office of a multistate firm to be inspected during each three-year review cycle.

A requirement that the Hawaii office of a multistate firm be inspected during a peer review would be contrary to the risk-based AICPA PRP process, and would impose extra compliance burdens on CPA firms which are subject to peer review in multiple jurisdictions. Currently, no state requires that a peer review specifically address one or more of a firm's in-state offices as a condition of satisfying the state's peer review program. In addition, this requirement would create a significant cost to and burden on the State Board of Public Accountancy by requiring it to develop two peer review programs — an office peer review program covering only the four multistate firms in Hawaii and a firm peer review program covering the rest of the CPA firms in the state. This requirement should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Jennifer A. Isobe, CPA
337 Kealahou Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96825

Before the House Committee on Finance

March 26th
12 noon
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENT OF SB 2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

I believe that it is important for Hawaii to have a mandatory peer review system. Peer review strengthens the quality of the audit and attest services provided by CPA firms, protecting those who purchase such services and those who use the financial statements resulting from such services. Peer review also provides for continuous quality improvements as CPAs make changes to their processes to improve the quality of their work.

Currently, over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants peer review program ("AICPA PRP"). The 45 states with mandatory peer review have determined that participation in the AICPA PRP is sufficient to meet each state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA PRP, all offices of a multistate firm must be included in the scope of the firm's peer review. However, because peer review is focused on high-risk engagements, there is no requirement for every office of a multistate firm to be inspected during each three-year review cycle.

A requirement that the Hawaii office of a multistate firm be inspected during a peer review would be contrary to the risk-based AICPA PRP process, and would impose extra compliance burdens on CPA firms which are subject to peer review in multiple jurisdictions. Currently, no state requires that a peer review specifically address one or more of a firm's in-state offices as a condition of satisfying the state's peer review program. In addition, this requirement would create a significant cost to and burden on the State Board of Public Accountancy by requiring it to develop two peer review programs – an office peer review program covering only the four multistate firms in Hawaii and a firm peer review program covering the rest of the CPA firms in the state. This requirement should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Mona S. Medley
98-2016 Kipikua Street
Aiea, Hawaii 96701

Before the House Committee on Finance

March 26th
12 noon
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENT OF SB 2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

I believe that it is important for Hawaii to have a mandatory peer review system. Peer review strengthens the quality of the audit and attest services provided by CPA firms, protecting those who purchase such services and those who use the financial statements resulting from such services. Peer review also provides for continuous quality improvements as CPAs make changes to their processes to improve the quality of their work.

Currently, over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants peer review program ("AICPA PRP"). The 45 states with mandatory peer review have determined that participation in the AICPA PRP is sufficient to meet each state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA PRP, all offices of a multistate firm must be included in the scope of the firm's peer review. However, because peer review is focused on high-risk engagements, there is no requirement for every office of a multistate firm to be inspected during each three-year review cycle.

A requirement that the Hawaii office of a multistate firm be inspected during a peer review would be contrary to the risk-based AICPA PRP process, and would impose extra compliance burdens on CPA firms which are subject to peer review in multiple jurisdictions. Currently, no state requires that a peer review specifically address one or more of a firm's in-state offices as a condition of satisfying the state's peer review program. In addition, this requirement would create a significant cost to and burden on the State Board of Public Accountancy by requiring it to develop two peer review programs -- an office peer review program covering only the four multistate firms in Hawaii and a firm peer review program covering the rest of the CPA firms in the state. This requirement should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Holly Park
44-154 Nanamoana St.
Kaneohe, HI 96744

Before the House Committee on Finance

March 26th
12 noon
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENT OF SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

I believe that it is important for Hawaii to have a mandatory peer review system. Peer review strengthens the quality of the audit and attest services provided by CPA firms, protecting those who purchase such services and those who use the financial statements resulting from such services. Peer review also provides for continuous quality improvements as CPAs make changes to their processes to improve the quality of their work.

Currently, over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants peer review program ("AICPA PRP"). The 45 states with mandatory peer review have determined that participation in the AICPA PRP is sufficient to meet each state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA PRP, all offices of a multistate firm must be included in the scope of the firm's peer review. However, because peer review is focused on high-risk engagements, there is no requirement for every office of a multistate firm to be inspected during each three-year review cycle.

A requirement that the Hawaii office of a multistate firm be inspected during a peer review would be contrary to the risk-based AICPA PRP process, and would impose extra compliance burdens on CPA firms which are subject to peer review in multiple jurisdictions. Currently, no state requires that a peer review specifically address one or more of a firm's in-state offices as a condition of satisfying the state's peer review program. In addition, this requirement would create a significant cost to and burden on the State Board of Public Accountancy by requiring it to develop two peer review programs – an office peer review program covering only the four multistate firms in Hawaii and a firm peer review program

covering the rest of the CPA firms in the state. This requirement should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Erin R. Okuno
98-980 Palula Way
Aiea, Hawaii 96701

Before the House Committee on Finance

March 26th
12 noon
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENT OF SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

I believe that it is important for Hawaii to have a mandatory peer review system. Peer review strengthens the quality of the audit and attest services provided by CPA firms, protecting those who purchase such services and those who use the financial statements resulting from such services. Peer review also provides for continuous quality improvements as CPAs make changes to their processes to improve the quality of their work.

Currently, over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants peer review program ("AICPA PRP"). The 45 states with mandatory peer review have determined that participation in the AICPA PRP is sufficient to meet each state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA PRP, all offices of a multistate firm must be included in the scope of the firm's peer review. However, because peer review is focused on high-risk engagements, there is no requirement for every office of a multistate firm to be inspected during each three-year review cycle.

A requirement that the Hawaii office of a multistate firm be inspected during a peer review would be contrary to the risk-based AICPA PRP process, and would impose extra compliance burdens on CPA firms which are subject to peer review in multiple jurisdictions. Currently, no state requires that a peer review specifically address one or more of a firm's in-state offices as a condition of satisfying the state's peer review program. In addition, this requirement would create a significant cost to and burden on the State Board of Public Accountancy by requiring it to develop two peer review programs – an office peer review program covering only the four multistate firms in Hawaii and a firm peer review program

covering the rest of the CPA firms in the state. This requirement should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Jeremiah V. Ana, C.P.A.
600 Queen Street, Apt 1506 Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

March 26th
12 noon
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENT OF SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

I believe that it is important for Hawaii to have a mandatory peer review system. Peer review strengthens the quality of the audit and attest services provided by CPA firms, protecting those who purchase such services and those who use the financial statements resulting from such services. Peer review also provides for continuous quality improvements as CPAs make changes to their processes to improve the quality of their work.

Currently, over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants peer review program ("AICPA PRP"). The 45 states with mandatory peer review have determined that participation in the AICPA PRP is sufficient to meet each state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA PRP, all offices of a multistate firm must be included in the scope of the firm's peer review. However, because peer review is focused on high-risk engagements, there is no requirement for every office of a multistate firm to be inspected during each three-year review cycle.

A requirement that the Hawaii office of a multistate firm be inspected during a peer review would be contrary to the risk-based AICPA PRP process, and would impose extra compliance burdens on CPA firms which are subject to peer review in multiple jurisdictions. Currently, no state requires that a peer review specifically address one or more of a firm's in-state offices as a condition of satisfying the state's peer review program. In addition, this requirement would create a significant cost to and burden on the State Board of Public Accountancy by requiring it to develop two peer review programs – an office peer review program covering only the four multistate firms in Hawaii and a firm peer review program covering the rest of the CPA firms in the state. This requirement should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Dina M.K. Miyahira
45-886 Keneke Street
Kaneohe, HI 96744

Before the House Committee on Finance

March 26th
12 noon
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENT OF SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

I believe that it is important for Hawaii to have a mandatory peer review system. Peer review strengthens the quality of the audit and attest services provided by CPA firms, protecting those who purchase such services and those who use the financial statements resulting from such services. Peer review also provides for continuous quality improvements as CPAs make changes to their processes to improve the quality of their work.

Currently, over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants peer review program ("AICPA PRP"). The 45 states with mandatory peer review have determined that participation in the AICPA PRP is sufficient to meet each state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA PRP, all offices of a multistate firm must be included in the scope of the firm's peer review. However, because peer review is focused on high-risk engagements, there is no requirement for every office of a multistate firm to be inspected during each three-year review cycle.

A requirement that the Hawaii office of a multistate firm be inspected during a peer review would be contrary to the risk-based AICPA PRP process, and would impose extra compliance burdens on CPA firms which are subject to peer review in multiple jurisdictions. Currently, no state requires that a peer review specifically address one or more of a firm's in-state offices as a condition of satisfying the state's peer review program. In addition, this requirement would create a significant cost to and burden on the State Board of Public Accountancy by requiring it to develop two peer review programs – an office peer review program covering only the four multistate firms in Hawaii and a firm peer review program

covering the rest of the CPA firms in the state. This requirement should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Lauren C. Sato, C.P.A.
600 Queen Street, Apt 1506 Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

March 26th
12 noon
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENT OF SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

I believe that it is important for Hawaii to have a mandatory peer review system. Peer review strengthens the quality of the audit and attest services provided by CPA firms, protecting those who purchase such services and those who use the financial statements resulting from such services. Peer review also provides for continuous quality improvements as CPAs make changes to their processes to improve the quality of their work.

Currently, over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants peer review program ("AICPA PRP"). The 45 states with mandatory peer review have determined that participation in the AICPA PRP is sufficient to meet each state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA PRP, all offices of a multistate firm must be included in the scope of the firm's peer review. However, because peer review is focused on high-risk engagements, there is no requirement for every office of a multistate firm to be inspected during each three-year review cycle.

A requirement that the Hawaii office of a multistate firm be inspected during a peer review would be contrary to the risk-based AICPA PRP process, and would impose extra compliance burdens on CPA firms which are subject to peer review in multiple jurisdictions. Currently, no state requires that a peer review specifically address one or more of a firm's in-state offices as a condition of satisfying the state's peer review program. In addition, this requirement would create a significant cost to and burden on the State Board of Public Accountancy by requiring it to develop two peer review programs – an office peer review program covering only the four multistate firms in Hawaii and a firm peer review program covering the rest of the CPA firms in the state. This requirement should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Danny P.C. Wong
5090 Likini Street # 603
Honolulu, HI 96818

Before the House Committee on Finance

March 26th
12 noon
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENT OF SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

I believe that it is important for Hawaii to have a mandatory peer review system. Peer review strengthens the quality of the audit and attest services provided by CPA firms, protecting those who purchase such services and those who use the financial statements resulting from such services. Peer review also provides for continuous quality improvements as CPAs make changes to their processes to improve the quality of their work.

Currently, over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants peer review program ("AICPA PRP"). The 45 states with mandatory peer review have determined that participation in the AICPA PRP is sufficient to meet each state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA PRP, all offices of a multistate firm must be included in the scope of the firm's peer review. However, because peer review is focused on high-risk engagements, there is no requirement for every office of a multistate firm to be inspected during each three-year review cycle.

A requirement that the Hawaii office of a multistate firm be inspected during a peer review would be contrary to the risk-based AICPA PRP process, and would impose extra compliance burdens on CPA firms which are subject to peer review in multiple jurisdictions. Currently, no state requires that a peer review specifically address one or more of a firm's in-state offices as a condition of satisfying the state's peer review program. In addition, this requirement would create a significant cost to and burden on the State Board of Public Accountancy by requiring it to develop two peer review programs – an office peer review program covering only the four multistate firms in Hawaii and a firm peer review program

covering the rest of the CPA firms in the state. This requirement should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Grant Nakagawa
770 Luakaha St.
Honolulu, HI 96816

Before the House Committee on Finance

March 26th
12 noon
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENT OF SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

I believe that it is important for Hawaii to have a mandatory peer review system. Peer review strengthens the quality of the audit and attest services provided by CPA firms, protecting those who purchase such services and those who use the financial statements resulting from such services. Peer review also provides for continuous quality improvements as CPAs make changes to their processes to improve the quality of their work.

Currently, over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants peer review program ("AICPA PRP"). The 45 states with mandatory peer review have determined that participation in the AICPA PRP is sufficient to meet each state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA PRP, all offices of a multistate firm must be included in the scope of the firm's peer review. However, because peer review is focused on high-risk engagements, there is no requirement for every office of a multistate firm to be inspected during each three-year review cycle.

A requirement that the Hawaii office of a multistate firm be inspected during a peer review would be contrary to the risk-based AICPA PRP process, and would impose extra compliance burdens on CPA firms which are subject to peer review in multiple jurisdictions. Currently, no state requires that a peer review specifically address one or more of a firm's in-state offices as a condition of satisfying the state's peer review program. In addition, this requirement would create a significant cost to and burden on the State Board of Public Accountancy by requiring it to develop two peer review programs – an office peer review program covering only the four multistate firms in Hawaii and a firm peer review program

covering the rest of the CPA firms in the state. This requirement should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Sheryl Fukunaga
1722 Makiki Street #502
Honolulu, HI 96822]

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The argument proposed by opponents of this bill claims that multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Please do the right thing to protect the public.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Wesley B. Hiyane
3194 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The argument proposed by opponents of this bill claims that multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Please do the right thing to protect the public.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

**J. Misa Sadoyama, CPA
46-130 Nahewai Place
Kaneohe, HI 96744**

House Committee on Finance

**Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308**

Testimony of J. Misa Sadoyama

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Dear Chair Oshiro, Vice-Chair Lee and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The argument proposed by opponents of this bill claims that multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Please do the right thing to protect the public.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Jean Suh
1356 Alewa Drive
Honolulu, HI 96817

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The argument proposed by opponents of this bill claims that multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Please do the right thing to protect the public.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Chikako Nagayasu
1133 Waimanu St., #401
Honolulu, HI 96814

BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The argument proposed by opponents of this bill claims that multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Please do the right thing to protect the public.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Lauren K.C.L. Lui
1070 Lanui Place
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The argument proposed by opponents of this bill claims that multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Please do the right thing to protect the public.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Yi Chen
2873 S. King St. #301
Honolulu, HI. 96826

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The argument proposed by opponents of this bill claims that multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Please do the right thing to protect the public.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Alton K. Miyashiro
765 Onaha Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1 – With Amendment

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The argument proposed by opponents of this bill claims that multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Currently, multistate firms are not exempt from the peer review process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review as defined in the Uniform Accountancy Act.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Peter Le
611 Coolidge Street, Suite 4
Honolulu, HI 96826

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1 – With Amendment
Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The argument proposed by opponents of this bill claims that multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Currently, multistate firms are not exempt from the peer review process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review as defined in the Uniform Accountancy Act.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

CHERYL R. NG
P.O. BOX 1621
HONOLULU, HI 96806

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1 – With Amendment

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The argument proposed by opponents of this bill claims that multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the peer review process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Rommel Marzan
1441 Kaumualii Street, #136E
Honolulu, HI 96817

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1 – With Amendment

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The argument proposed by opponents of this bill claims that multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the peer review process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Shari W.F. Lau
3916 Keanu Street
Honolulu, HI 96816

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1 – With Clarification

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The concerns argued with this bill relate to equity and to level the playing field for all firms by having multistate firms in Hawaii included. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review. They are not exempt.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Nelson K. Watanabe
60 N. Beretania St. #PHB-6
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1 – With Amendment

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The argument proposed by opponents of this bill claims that multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the peer review process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Alina Cheng
P.O. Box 89458
Honolulu, Hawaii 96830

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1 – With Clarification
Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The concerns argued with this bill relate to equity and leveling the playing field for all firms by having multistate firms in Hawaii included. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review. They are not exempt.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Jenny Yeung
1355 A 13th Ave.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1 – With Clarification

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The concerns argued with this bill relate to equity and leveling the playing field for all firms by having multistate firms in Hawaii included. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). Multistate firms are not exempt from the process. All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review. They are not exempt.

The unsuspecting public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Gordon Kim
798 Hoomaemae Street
Pearl City, Hawaii 96782

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 P.M.
Conference Room 308

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 P.M.
Conference Room 308,

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1 – With Clarification

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relate to exempting multistate/international firms. They are not exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies are required to undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality, the National Peer Review Committee, and the Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review.

To level the playing field, the law should then require that all CPA firms in Hawaii be required to submit evidence of peer review, and if the firm received a substandard report, the Hawaii Board of Public Accountancy may take such correction action.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Michael I. Tanaka, CPA
775 Kinalau Place #1709
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 P.M.
Conference Room 308,

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1 – With Clarification

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relate to exempting multistate/international firms. They are not exempt. Those firms that audit publicly traded companies are required to undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality, the National Peer Review Committee, and the Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). All offices within a firm must be included in the scope of the peer review.

To level the playing field, the law should then require that all CPA firms in Hawaii be required to submit evidence of peer review, and if the firm received a substandard report, the Hawaii Board of Public Accountancy may take such correction action.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Ross Murakami
1848 St. Louis Drive
Honolulu, HI 96816

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Gordon Tom
60 N Beretania #2606
Honolulu, HI 96817

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Charise Shigeta
380-H Kawaihae Street
Honolulu, HI 96825

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Adam Campbell
1315 Heulu Street Apt 403A
Honolulu, HI 96822

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Dallas Weyand
1088 Bishop Street Apt 1113
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Ian Fitz-Patrick
1003 Bishop Street Suite 2800
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

**Colleen Shinsato
555 Hahaione Street
Honolulu, HI 96825**

Before the House Committee on Finance

**Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308**

**In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy**

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Paul Kimura
869 Puu Ikena Drive
Honolulu, HI 96821

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

James Merrill
2301 Kula Kolea Drive
Honolulu, HI 96819

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

**Diane Kimura
869 Puu Ikena Drive
Honolulu, HI 96821**

Before the House Committee on Finance

**Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308**

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

**James Nakayama
98-1240 Kulawai Street
Aiea, HI 96701**

Before the House Committee on Finance

**Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308**

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Deanna Awa
3677 Lilinoe Place
Honolulu, HI 96816

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Rachel Ledford
1870 Lusitana Street #308
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Dayle Murakami
1848 St. Louis Drive
Honolulu, HI 96816

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Lindy Facer
1003 Bishop Street Suite 2800
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Derrick Shiroma
2915 Lauoha Place
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Alicia Burnham
94-1202 Keahua Loop
Waipahu, HI 96797

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Jaime Nakao
579 Uluwao Street
Kailua, HI 96734

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Donna Shiroma
2915 Lauoha Place
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Stuart Burnham
94-1202 Keahua Loop
Waipahu, HI 96797

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Mary Ann Fernandes
94-207 Waho Place
Waipahu, HI 96797

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Reid Ikemori
909 Kapiolani Blvd #801
Honolulu, HI 96814

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Dallas Shiroma
2915 Lauoha Place
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Ann Suganuma
1003 Bishop Street Suite 2800
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Alfred Fernandes
94-207 Waho Place
Waipahu, HI 96797

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Valerie lyn Ikemori
909 Kapiolani Blvd #801
Honolulu, HI 96814

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Elias Beniga
1003 Bishop Street Suite 2800
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

In Support (with Modification) of SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

Mandatory peer review for CPAs will fulfill the public's expectations and ensure that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards.

The arguments of this bill relates to leveling the playing field to all firms especially multistate firms. All of the multistate firms with physical offices in Hawaii audit publicly traded companies and therefore undergo a much more rigorous peer review program through the Center for Audit Quality and Public Company Audit Oversight Board (PCAOB). The peer review process for multistate firms encompasses all of their offices, not just the large ones like New York or Los Angeles. Accordingly, the Hawaii offices of the multistate firms are included in the scope of their peer review process and therefore they should be exempt from incurring the additional cost and burden of conducting an additional peer review for Hawaii only.

The public deserves to know that a CPA firm's quality control policies and procedures are in accordance with those professional standards promulgated by the accounting profession and that the firm is complying with those policies and procedures. Without mandatory peer review, the public is exposed to potentially sub-standard audits by uninformed or incompetent CPA's.

Please do the right thing to protect the public. Require mandatory peer review.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Lawrence Chew
95-1008 Ahulili Street
Mililani, HI 96789

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

NANCY C. ROSE, CPA
1177 Queen Street, #2309
Honolulu, HI 96814

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest.

While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection.

Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Gordon D. Ciano
1434 Hoa Koa Pl., Honolulu, HI 96821

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest.

While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection.

Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT

exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Nelson Lau
1677 Hoohalia St.
Pearl City, HI 96782

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Terri Fujii
919 Kahena Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96825

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection.

Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. Multistate firms undergo three robust quality control review processes, including peer review.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. The results of this oversight and testing of the firm's internal inspection program are taken into consideration in the two additional quality control reviews undergone by each multistate firm as conducted by the PCAOB and the peer reviewer under the AICPA peer review standards.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Ann Lijii

Mitchell Taira
2754 Kuilei Street, #1102
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. . That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.


Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. J. [unclear]", is written in a cursive style.

**Connie Ho
1002 Hunakai Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816**

Before the House Committee on Finance

**Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street**

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. . That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'C. B. D.', is located at the bottom of the page.

**Brent Kobayashi
98-1039 Alania Street
Aiea, Hawaii 96701**

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. . That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B. A. King". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Ben Choi
888 4th Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. . That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

**Michael Ching
1583 Laukahi Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96821**

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be the initials 'M. J.' followed by a stylized flourish.

**Christine Perez
1231 Ala Alii St., #22
Honolulu, Hawaii 96818**

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals) The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. . That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Chris Gossert
46-160 Kiowai Street, #2322
Kaneohe, Hawaii 96744

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. . That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

**Charie Wicklund
91-1077 Hoomaliu Street
Kapolei, Hawaii 96707**

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Chauhd Moleund

**Grayson Nose
1212 Punahou Street, #2604
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826**

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. . That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Bryce", written in a cursive style.

**Wendy Manuel
6740 Pukoo Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96825**

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "L. J. ...", is written in a cursive style.

**Keric Chang
2652C Booth Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813**

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010

12:00 p.m.

Conference Room 308

State Capitol

415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.


Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be the initials 'R.A.' or similar, written in a cursive style.

**Jason Nagai
926 15th Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816**

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. . That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "D. A. W.", is written in a cursive style.

**Judith Chock
3225 Ala Ilima Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96818**

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals) The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. . That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "J. M. [unclear]".

**Nathan Lee
1012A 9th Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816**

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. . That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.


Nathan Lee

**Brett Aka
2759 Kahawai Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822**

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer review as a condition of certified public accountancy firm permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals) The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. . That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures performed at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program, which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Carey Carpenter
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Brandon Une
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Ryan Suekawa
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Victoria J. Villafuerte
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Michael Tejada
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Monica Tse
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Adina Wakayama
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Erin Tsuda
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Linda Park
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Jennifer Przygodzinski
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Marc Sim
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Cheryl Lum
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretana Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Franklin Shiraki
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Harshana Subasinghe
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Dathan Choy
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Ross Kohara
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Stacie Nakamura
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Tertia M. Freas
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Lynnsey Nunes
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Dong Yan Wen
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Crystal Ping
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Keri Taoka
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Tomoko Tanega
 132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
 Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
 12:00 p.m.
 Conference Room 308
 State Capitol
 415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Lezlie Lam
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Kyle Chang
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Roberta Straughn
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Sean Tsutsui
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Landon Beers
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Melaney Lee
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Josef Fukano
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Lori Taira
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Jarid Kawamoto
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

David Kwon
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Asami Nagata
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Mana Newton
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Glenn Sakuda
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Nicholas Cotton
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Perry Dang
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Travis Harada
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Steven Wong
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Kelly Yamamoto
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Clair Gonzales
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Gregg Furuya
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Cullen Reid
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Michael Silberfeld
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Garrett Taira
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Tricia Tenn
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Ryan Cutwright
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Dane Maehara
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Lacey Nakaguma
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Kris Nezu
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Cody Xiao
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Jaymee Zeller
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Hye Ri Lee
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Taryn Hamamoto
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Ryan Taguchi
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Gary T. Nishikawa
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Paul H. Higo
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Valerie N. Shintaku
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Joanna Kawamoto
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Tracy Nakano
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Lynelle Tamashiro
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

IN QUALIFIED SUPPORT OF AND PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

The purpose of this Bill is to require peer reviews as a condition of certified public accountancy permits to practice.

The goal of peer review is to promote quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by CPA firms (and individuals). The public deserves to know that the quality control policies and procedures of every CPA firm are in accordance with professional standards and that each firm is complying with those policies and procedures.

Mandatory peer review for CPA firms will serve the public's interest. While we support most of the concepts in this Bill, we urge you to amend Section 5 on page 5, line 22 through page 6, line 1 by deleting the phrase "including the Hawaii offices and Hawaii engagements of foreign or multistate firms." A full understanding of how the peer review process works will support this amendment.

Virtually all of the key elements of the system of quality control of a multistate firm are not established at the local office level but instead at the region or firm level. This ensures that the quality controls are consistent office by office throughout the firm. That is why peer review is intended to evaluate quality control at the firm level and not at each specific office within the firm. Mandating peer review of a local office as proposed in this Bill would do little to evaluate the design, or in most instances, the compliance with many elements of the system of quality control and, therefore, would not serve to increase public protection. Some have stated that the phrase in Section 5 of this Bill is necessary because "multistate firms in Hawaii should not be exempt from peer review." In fact, multistate firms in Hawaii are NOT exempt from the peer review process or other regulatory oversight and testing. The multistate firms in Hawaii are included in the multistate firms' peer review process.

A key element of every multistate firm's system of quality control is the internal inspection process, which includes engagements specific to the Hawaii offices. The internal inspection

process and the corresponding results of the multistate firms is subject to oversight and testing annually by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) and triennially by the firm conducting the peer review. This oversight and testing of the firm's inspection program is in addition to the inspection procedures at the engagement and firm level that are annually performed both by the PCAOB and triennially by peer review for multistate firms.

Over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) peer review program. All 47 states with mandatory peer review use the AICPA peer review program to meet their state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA's peer review program, all offices of a firm, including Hawaii offices, are included in the scope of a firm's peer review.

Peer review in Hawaii should be based on the AICPA's peer review program which is a well-established and accepted peer review program. No state requires office-specific peer review as proposed in this Bill because that is inconsistent with the AICPA's peer review program.

Hawaii should not be different from other states when it comes to peer review. There is no evidence of unique problems in Hawaii which justifies creating a new system of peer review which does not exist in any other state. Such a requirement would result in an unnecessary, yet significant expense to and burden on the Hawaii public. The State Board of Public Accountancy would need to retain a third party to create and manage an entirely new system of peer review in addition to the already existing AICPA peer review program.

For the above reasons, an office-specific peer review should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii. This is why this Bill should be amended to delete this requirement in Section 5.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

FINTestimony

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 9:07 AM
To: FINTestimony
Cc: msagara@horwathkam.com
Subject: Testimony for SB2501 on 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM

Testimony for FIN 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM SB2501

Conference room: 308
Testifier position: support
Testifier will be present: No
Submitted by: Melissa Sagara
Organization: Individual
Address:
Phone:
E-mail: msagara@horwathkam.com
Submitted on: 3/25/2010

Comments:

FINTestimony

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 9:57 AM
To: FINTestimony
Cc: lingjon@earthlink.net
Subject: Testimony for SB2501 on 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM

Testimony for FIN 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM SB2501

Conference room: 308
Testifier position: support
Testifier will be present: No
Submitted by: Jessica Swanson
Organization: Individual
Address: 1428 Haleko Drive Honolulu, HI 96821
Phone:
E-mail: lingjon@earthlink.net
Submitted on: 3/25/2010

Comments:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support mandatory peer review because I believe it will provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are prepared in accordance with established professional standards. Consequently, it will provide a higher level of confidence to the public and users of such financial statements, who currently, but incorrectly. Most financial statement users currently thought that all CPAs participate in a peer review process or a monitoring program when in fact, some of the CPA are not.

FINTestimony

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 10:03 AM
To: FINTestimony
Cc: akam@horwathkam.com
Subject: Testimony for SB2501 on 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM

Testimony for FIN 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM SB2501

Conference room: 308
Testifier position: support
Testifier will be present: No
Submitted by: Amelia Kam
Organization: Individual
Address: 7532 Puumahoe Place Honolulu, HI 96825
Phone:
E-mail: akam@horwathkam.com
Submitted on: 3/25/2010

Comments:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs because it will provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards. Most importantly, SB 2501 provides a greater level of confidence to the public and users of such financial statements who currently, but incorrectly, believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review process or practice monitoring program to ensure that those statements comply with established professional standards.

FINTestimony

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 10:53 AM
To: FINTestimony
Cc: jayohh.river@gmail.com
Subject: Testimony for SB2501 on 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM

Testimony for FIN 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM SB2501

Conference room: 308
Testifier position: support
Testifier will be present: No
Submitted by: Justin Okawa
Organization: Horwath Kam & Co.
Address: 700 Bishop St. Honolulu, Hi
Phone: 524-8080
E-mail: jayohh.river@gmail.com
Submitted on: 3/25/2010

Comments:

I strongly support SB2501 and believe that a mandatory peer review will help our profession as accountants in the state of Hawaii.

FINTestimony

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 11:50 AM
To: FINTestimony
Cc: ho_blah@hotmail.com
Subject: Testimony for SB2501 on 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM

Testimony for FIN 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM SB2501

Conference room: 308
Testifier position: support
Testifier will be present: No
Submitted by: Glenn Yoza
Organization: Individual
Address: 98-1401 Kamahao St., #175 Pearl City, HI 96782
Phone:
E-mail: ho_blah@hotmail.com
Submitted on: 3/25/2010

Comments:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support the mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards. Most importantly, SB 2501 provides a greater level of confidence to the public and users of such financial statements, who currently, but incorrectly, believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review process or practice monitoring program to ensure that those statements comply with established professional standards.

FINTestimony

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 9:28 AM
To: FINTestimony
Cc: cyamada@horwathkam.com
Subject: Testimony for SB2501 on 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM

Testimony for FIN 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM SB2501

Conference room: 308
Testifier position: support
Testifier will be present: No
Submitted by: Casey Yamada
Organization: Individual
Address: 1356 Wilhelmina Rise Honolulu, HI 96816
Phone: 808-524-8080 ext. 515
E-mail: cyamada@horwathkam.com
Submitted on: 3/25/2010

Comments:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards. Most importantly, SB 2501 provide a greater level of confidence to the public and users of such financial statements, who currently, but incorrectly, believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review process or practice monitoring program to ensure that those statements comply with established professional standards.

FINTestimony

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 9:30 AM
To: FINTestimony
Cc: ntachida@horwathkam.com
Subject: Testimony for SB2501 on 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM

Testimony for FIN 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM SB2501

Conference room: 308
Testifier position: support
Testifier will be present: No
Submitted by: Naoko Tachida
Organization: Individual
Address: 3814 Pukalani Place Honolulu, HI 96816
Phone:
E-mail: ntachida@horwathkam.com
Submitted on: 3/25/2010

Comments:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards. Most importantly, SB 2501 provide a greater level of confidence to the public and users of such financial statements, who currently, but incorrectly, believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review process or practice monitoring program to ensure that those statements comply with established professional standards.

FINTestimony

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 9:47 AM
To: FINTestimony
Cc: shuang@horwathkam.com
Subject: Testimony for SB2501 on 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM

Testimony for FIN 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM SB2501

Conference room: 308
Testifier position: support
Testifier will be present: No
Submitted by: Yinen Huang
Organization: Individual
Address: 633 Nalanui Street, Apt #306 Honolulu, HI 96817
Phone:
E-mail: shuang@horwathkam.com
Submitted on: 3/25/2010

Comments:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards. Most importantly, SB 2501 provide a greater level of confidence to the public and users of such financial statements, who currently, but incorrectly, believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review process or practice monitoring program to ensure that those statements comply with established professional standards.

FINTestimony

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 9:50 AM
To: FINTestimony
Cc: ymorinaga@horwathkam.com
Subject: Testimony for SB2501 on 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM

Testimony for FIN 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM SB2501

Conference room: 308
Testifier position: support
Testifier will be present: No
Submitted by: Yumi Morinaga
Organization: Individual
Address: 1655 Makaloa Street, APT. 1714 Honolulu, HI 96814
Phone:
E-mail: ymorinaga@horwathkam.com
Submitted on: 3/25/2010

Comments:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards. Most importantly, SB 2501 provide a greater level of confidence to the public and users of such financial statements, who currently, but incorrectly, believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review process or practice monitoring program to ensure that those statements comply with established professional standards.

FINTestimony

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 9:57 AM
To: FINTestimony
Cc: mcortez@horwathkam.com
Subject: Testimony for SB2501 on 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM

Testimony for FIN 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM SB2501

Conference room: 308
Testifier position: support
Testifier will be present: No
Submitted by: Marie Lou Cortez
Organization: Individual
Address: 91-852 Keakaula Place Ewa Beach, HI
Phone:
E-mail: mcortez@horwathkam.com
Submitted on: 3/25/2010

Comments:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards. Most importantly, SB 2501 provide a greater level of confidence to the public and users of such financial statements, who currently, but incorrectly, believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review process or practice monitoring program to ensure that those statements comply with established professional standards.

FINTestimony

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 10:16 AM
To: FINTestimony
Cc: jhatakenaka@horwathkam.com
Subject: Testimony for SB2501 on 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM

Testimony for FIN 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM SB2501

Conference room: 308
Testifier position: support
Testifier will be present: No
Submitted by: Jill Hatakenaka
Organization: Individual
Address: 700 Bishop St Ste 1700 Honolulu, HI
Phone: 808-524-8080
E-mail: jhatakenaka@horwathkam.com
Submitted on: 3/25/2010

Comments:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirements for CPAs. I support the mandatory peer review requirement in order for financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii to be uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards. Most importantly, SB 2501 provides a greater level of confidence to the users of the financial statements.

FINTestimony

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 10:16 AM
To: FINTestimony
Cc: tsujir@hawaiiintel.net
Subject: Testimony for SB2501 on 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM

Testimony for FIN 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM SB2501

Conference room: 308
Testifier position: support
Testifier will be present: No
Submitted by: Ryosuke Tsuji
Organization: Individual
Address: 6710 Hawaii Kai Dr. #814 Honolulu, HI 96825
Phone: 808-395-7077
E-mail: tsujir@hawaiiintel.net
Submitted on: 3/25/2010

Comments:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards. Most importantly, SB 2501 provide a greater level of confidence to the public and users of such financial statements, who currently, but incorrectly, believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review process or practice monitoring program to ensure that those statements comply with established professional standards.

FINTestimony

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2010 11:44 AM
To: FINTestimony
Cc: meeyo@hotmail.com
Subject: Testimony for SB2501 on 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM

Testimony for FIN 3/26/2010 12:00:00 PM SB2501

Conference room: 308
Testifier position: support
Testifier will be present: No
Submitted by: Lisa Yoza
Organization: Individual
Address: 98-1401 Kamahao St., #175 Pearl City, HI 96782
Phone:
E-mail: meeyo@hotmail.com
Submitted on: 3/25/2010

Comments:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support the mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards. Most importantly, SB 2501 provides a greater level of confidence to the public and users of such financial statements, who currently, but incorrectly, believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review process or practice monitoring program to ensure that those statements comply with established professional standards.

Before the House Committee on Finance

Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308

Testimony of Tom Herman

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1
Relating to Public Accountancy


Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee and Committee Members:

I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards.

The benefits of mandatory peer review program will: (1) improve the quality of the financial statements being prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii; (2) enhance the credibility and reliability of financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii; (3) most importantly, better protect the unsuspecting public and users of such financial statements, who incorrectly believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review or practice monitoring program to ensure that they comply with established professional standards; and (4) place CPAs who prepare and issue financials statements in the State of Hawaii on an equal playing field and enhance their competitiveness.

For the above reasons, I urge you to support mandatory peer review for CPAs as it will provide the public with an improved level of assurance that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards and fulfill the public's expectations.

Sincerely,



T. HERMAN
1879 HALEKOA DR.
HONOLULU, HI 96821
808/256-8095

**House Committee on Finance
Friday, March 26, 2010
12:00 p.m.
Conference Room 308**

Testimony of Thomas C. Pearson

In Support of SB 2501, SD1, HD1, SD1, (HSCR828-10)
Relating to Public Accountancy

Dear Chair Oshiro, Vice-Chair Lee and Committee Members:

As an accounting educator, I strongly support the mandatory peer review requirement for CPAs. I support mandatory peer review in order to provide a level of assurance that financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii are uniformly prepared in accordance with established professional standards.

Additionally, I support mandatory peer review, which has been mandatory since 1988 for a majority of practicing CPAs who prepare and issue financial statements in the State of Hawaii and are members of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants ("AICPA"), as the current national debate is not whether peer review should be mandatory but should the peer review findings be made transparent and disclosed to better inform and protect the public's interest similar to the review results of the Public Company Oversight Accounting Board ("PCAOB") created under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act for publicly-held companies.

The benefits of mandatory peer review program will: (1) improve the quality of the financial statements being prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii; (2) enhance the creditability and reliability of financial statements prepared and issued by CPAs in the State of Hawaii; (3) most importantly, better protect us, the unsuspecting public and users of such financial statements, who incorrectly believe that all CPAs participate in a peer review or practice monitoring program to ensure that they comply with established professional standards; and (4) place CPAs who prepare and issue financial statements in the State of Hawaii on an equal playing field and enhance their competitiveness.

For the above reasons, I urge you to support mandatory peer review for CPAs as it will provide the public with an improved level of assurance that CPA-prepared financial statements are prepared pursuant to uniform professional standards and fulfill the public's expectations.

Respectfully,
Thomas C. Pearson

Andrew Kamikawa
94-553 Poloahilani Street
Miiilani, HI 96789

Before the House Committee on Finance

March 26, 2010
12 noon
Conference Room 308

IN SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENT OF SB 2501, SD1, HD1

Relating to Public Accountancy

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members:

I believe that it is important for Hawaii to have a mandatory peer review system. Peer review strengthens the quality of the audit and attest services provided by CPA firms, protecting those who purchase such services and those who use the financial statements resulting from such services. Peer review also provides for continuous quality improvements as CPAs make changes to their processes to improve the quality of their work.

Currently, over 30,000 CPA firms, including the four multistate firms with offices in Hawaii, participate in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants peer review program ("AICPA PRP"). The 45 states with mandatory peer review have determined that participation in the AICPA PRP is sufficient to meet each state's specific requirement. Under the provisions of the AICPA PRP, all offices of a multistate firm must be included in the scope of the firm's peer review. However, because peer review is focused on high-risk engagements, there is no requirement for every office of a multistate firm to be inspected during each three-year review cycle.

A requirement that the Hawaii office of a multistate firm be inspected during a peer review would be contrary to the risk-based AICPA PRP process, and would impose extra compliance burdens on CPA firms which are subject to peer review in multiple jurisdictions. Currently, no state requires that a peer review specifically address one or more of a firm's in-state offices as a condition of satisfying the state's peer review program. In addition, this requirement would create a significant cost to and burden on the State Board of Public Accountancy by requiring it to develop two peer review programs – an office peer review program covering only the four multistate firms in Hawaii and a firm peer review program covering the rest of the CPA firms in the state. This requirement should not be a condition of peer review in Hawaii.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.