



Proposed Revisions to the Conceptual Framework

1. Do respondents support the Board’s proposed revisions to the extant Code pertaining to the conceptual framework, including the proposed requirements and application material related to:
 - a) Identifying threat
 - b) Evaluating threats;
 - c) Addressing threats;
 - d) Re-evaluating threats; and
 - e) The overall assessment.

Yes, we support the Board’s proposed revisions. This to assist in applicability to all professional accountants.

Proposed Revised Descriptions of “Reasonable and Informed Third Party” and “Acceptable Level”

2. Do respondents support the proposed revisions aimed at clarifying the concepts of (a) “reasonable and informed third party;” and (b) “acceptable level” in the Code. If not, why not?

Yes, we support the Board’s proposed revisions aimed at clarifying the concepts of (a) “reasonable and informed third party;” and (b) “acceptable level” in the Code.

Proposed Revised Description of Safeguards

3. Do respondents support the proposed description of “safeguards?” If not, why not?

Yes, we support the Board’s proposed description of “safeguards”.

4. Do respondents agree with the IESBA’s conclusions that “safeguards created by the profession or legislation,” “safeguards in the work environment,” and “safeguards implemented by the entity” in the extant Code:
 - a) Do not meet the proposed description of safeguards in this ED?
 - b) Are better characterized as “conditions, policies and procedures that affect the professional accountant’s identification and potentially the evaluation of threats as discussed in paragraphs 26–28 of this Explanatory Memorandum?”

If not, why not?

Institute of Certified Public Accountants of Kenya
CPA Centre, Ruaraka, Thika Road.
P. O. Box 59963 – 00200 Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: (020) 2304226/7; 8068570/1
Mobile: (+254) 727531006 / 733856262 / 721469796
Fax: (020) 8562206
Drop in box no. 164 Revlon Professional Plaza



Yes, we support the Board's proposed revisions

Proposals for Professional Accountants in Public Practice

5. Do respondents agree with the IESBA's approach to the revisions in proposed Section 300 for professional accountants in public practice? If not, why not and what suggestions for an alternative approach do respondents have that they believe would be more appropriate?

Yes, we support the Board's proposed approach to the revisions in the proposed section 300 for professional accountants in public practice.