

# PRP Section 3400

## *Technical Reviewer's Checklists*

Technical reviews are required to be performed by administering entities (AE) on all peer reviews. The role of the AE's technical reviewer is to assist the report acceptance body (RAB) in its report acceptance and oversight functions. To carry out this role, a technical reviewer completes a Technical Reviewer's Checklist.

- Exhibit 1—SYSTEM REVIEW TECHNICAL REVIEWER'S CHECKLIST
- Exhibit 2—ENGAGEMENT REVIEW TECHNICAL REVIEWER'S CHECKLIST

**EXHIBIT 1—SYSTEM REVIEW TECHNICAL REVIEWER'S CHECKLIST**

Reviewed Firm:	
Review Number:	
Team Captain:	
Date Workpapers Submitted:	
Technical Reviewer:	
Date of Technical Review:	
Number of Matters for Further Consideration (MFCs):	
Number of Findings for Further Consideration (FFCs):	
Current Report Rating:	
Current Year-End:	
Prior Report Rating:	
Prior Year-End:	
Prior Team Captain:	
Prior Corrective Action (if applicable)	
Prior Implementation Plan (if applicable)	
Number of Prior FFCs:	

Technical Reviewer Recommendations	Check Box
Accept as Presented	<input type="checkbox"/>
Acceptance Delayed Subject To (See Comments Below)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Acceptance Deferred (See Comments Below)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accept with Implementation Plan (on FFCs)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Corrective/Follow Up Action (On Deficiencies/ Significant Deficiencies in Report)	<input type="checkbox"/>
RAB Consultation Needed (See Comments Below)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Feedback form or Deficiency Letter attached	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recommended for Oversight	<input type="checkbox"/>

Corrective Action <input type="checkbox"/>	Due Date
Implementation Plan <input type="checkbox"/>	

**Technical Reviewer Comments on Delay/Deferral and RAB Consultation:****Technical Reviewer Notes for RAB:**

## TECHNICAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

	Yes	No	N/A	Comments and/or Explanation
<b>Administrative</b>				
Consider information in PRIMA and the referral database when answering these questions.				
1. Based on a review of the administrative checklist, did the firm request any of the following? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due date extension</li> <li>• YE change</li> <li>• Scope limitation waiver</li> <li>• Off-site review</li> </ul> If yes, provide information for RAB consideration.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Have all team members been added and approved in PRIMA? If team member approvals are not appropriate, consider whether feedback should be issued to the team captain.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Do the review team members, review team firms or reviewed firm have entries included in the referral database? If yes, provide information for RAB consideration.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Have you reviewed and familiarized yourself with the team captain and team member(s) performance history from the last two years, with attention to the following significant performance weaknesses? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or more performance deficiency letter(s) (PDL)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Findings or deficiencies similar to performance weaknesses that required corrective action</li> </ul> </li> <li>• More than one performance deficiency on a reviewer performance feedback form</li> <li>• Pattern(s) of performance findings in the same subcategory (for example, reporting, completion of FFC forms, and so on)</li> <li>• Consistent tardiness resulting in reviewer suspension for submitting working papers or responding to technical reviewer or RAB requests (refer to the Reviewer Performance Dashboard to view monitoring action code 510-Late Document Filing on the “active cases” tab and “closed cases” tab)</li> </ul> Note: The recency, nature, and pervasiveness of the performance weaknesses should be considered, taking note of the volume of reviews performed by the reviewer.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. If the team captain or team member(s) have previously been issued a PDL, are any corrective action(s) currently outstanding that are applicable to the review? If yes, is the reviewer in compliance with the PDL requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. Have you reviewed the oversight flags in PRIMA and evaluated the impact (if any) on the review?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Yes	No	N/A	Comments and/or Explanation
<b>Planning</b>				
1. Did the team captain perform and document an appropriate risk assessment, including discussion of inherent and control risk factors and detection risk conclusions in compliance with paragraphs .46–.52 in the PRPM and Interpretation 52-1?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Does the Summary Review Memorandum (SRM) discuss firm changes since the prior review that may affect the risk assessment and engagement selection, such as, partner changes, rapid growth, loss of clients or mergers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. If the reviewed firm has more than one office, did the risk assessment include factors associated with individual offices that could impact the firm's ability to consistently maintain compliance with its quality control policies and procedures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. If a copy of a referral or Required Corrective Action (RCA) letter relating to allegations or restrictions was sent to the reviewer, did the reviewer appropriately address in the risk assessment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. Did the team captain perform appropriate procedures for reliance on quality control materials (QCM)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. Were there any "no" answers on the Explanation of No Answers page of the Quality Control Design checklist? If yes, did the team captain discuss the "no" answers in the risk assessment and engagement selection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7. Were there any "no" answers on the Explanation of No Answers page of the Government Auditing Standards Supplemental Quality Control Design checklist? If yes, did the team captain discuss the "no" answers in the risk assessment and engagement selection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
8. Were there any "no" answers on the Explanation of No Answers page of the Quality Control Compliance checklist?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Scope and Engagement Selections</b>				
1. Did the team captain reconcile discrepancies between the firm's engagement listing and the Peer Review Information (PRI) form?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Did the team captain select a reasonable cross-section of offices and engagements in compliance with paragraphs .56–.63 in the PRPM and related interpretations?  The scope of engagements should consider "must select" engagements, industry concentrations and other significant or high-risk areas of the firm's practice as well as other areas identified during the review.  Consider whether the following were addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• industries of the engagements in the "Other SAS" category</li> <li>• firm concentrations</li> <li>• partner selection</li> <li>• engagement selection by office location</li> <li>• selection of engagements outside of peer review year</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Yes	No	N/A	Comments and/or Explanation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• if the team captain chose not to select a level of service or type of engagement in a specialized industry, the team captain's basis for those decisions, including, the unique risks of each type of ERISA engagement</li> <li>• justification for selecting a small percentage of engagements or hours</li> </ul>				
3. Was the surprise engagement selected in accordance with the Standards and other related guidance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Does the firm perform must-select engagements? If yes, which of the following does it perform and was at least one of the applicable engagements selected?  <input type="checkbox"/> GAS <input type="checkbox"/> Single Audit <input type="checkbox"/> EBP <input type="checkbox"/> FDICIA <input type="checkbox"/> SOC 1 or SOC 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Checklists</b>				
1. Were the required checklists and forms current, and do they appear to have been completed in a professional manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Government Auditing Standards—Single Audit Engagements</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
1. Do you have the necessary CPE to review the Single Audit profiles and checklists? If not, another technical reviewer or RAB member should perform the review of the engagement profile and checklist.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. If only the compliance portion of the Single Audit was selected for review, was another full GAS audit, including the audit of the financial statements, selected for review?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Has attachment 1 of this checklist been completed for single audit engagement(s)? Please indicate if attachment 1 was completed by another technical reviewer or a RAB member.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Nonconforming Engagements</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
1. Did the firm appropriately consider AU-C 560 and 585, AR-C 60 to 90, and ET 1.298.010?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. If the firm chose not to recall the engagement, does the SRM, letter of response (LOR) or FFC indicate how the firm corrected, or will correct the nonconforming engagement?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Yes	No	N/A	Comments and/or Explanation
3. Did the reviewer consider the firm's planned or taken remediation and determine the potential impact to the review?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Did the reviewer consider expanding scope to determine the pervasiveness of the issue?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. Did the team captain include the engagement on an MFC form?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. If the nonconforming engagement(s) did not impact the peer review report, was the basis for that conclusion clearly documented? If no, provide information for RAB consideration.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Matters</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
1. Are the MFC forms complete and prepared in accordance with guidance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Do the MFC forms contain specific firm or client information? If yes, have the firm or team captain update their responses to remove these specific references.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Did the team captain expand the scope of the review when appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. If a matter was deemed "isolated," did the reviewer appropriately document that determination and how it was reached?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. Do matters appear to have been given appropriate consideration in the preparation of the report and FFCs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Findings</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
1. Does the finding description include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>reference to the applicable requirement of Statements on Quality Control Standards,</li> <li>the scenario that led to the finding, and</li> <li>reference to nonconforming engagements as a result of the finding, if applicable?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Is the underlying systemic cause appropriately identified?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Does the firm's response address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The firm's actions taken or planned to remediate nonconforming engagements, if applicable</li> <li>The firm's actions taken or planned to remediate findings in the firm's system of quality control</li> <li>The timing of the remediation</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. If the systemic cause is repeated from a finding or deficiency in the prior review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is it appropriately identified as a repeat in the finding description?</li> <li>Is the firm's current response different from its prior response?</li> <li>Is the firm's response comprehensive, genuine, and feasible?</li> <li>Was consideration given to whether the finding should be escalated to a higher level?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



	Yes	No	N/A	Comments and/or Explanation
5. Do you believe an implementation plan should be required? (Review RAB Handbook Exhibit 4-2 for allowable implementation plans.) If yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the FFC meet the requirements for when an implementation plan is allowed?</li> <li>Did the team captain recommend one?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>SRM</b>				
1. Was the SRM properly completed, including discussion of all significant issues, as applicable?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Do items discussed at the closing meeting or exit conference, which were not already elevated to MFCs or FFCs, appear appropriate as closing meeting or exit conference items?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Are the Scope and Results of Engagements, Nonconforming Summary, and Recommended Report Rating statistics correct in PRIMA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Is the information in the SRM consistent with other peer review documents, especially the report, and FFCs, if any? If no, provide information for RAB consideration.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. Did the team captain consult in the required situations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Representation Letter</b>				
1. Does the representation letter conform to the Standards and related guidance and include all required representations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Is the representation letter dated appropriately?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. If there are nonconforming engagements, does the representation letter include the appropriate representations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Is the representation letter signed by individual members of management?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Report</b>				
1. Does the report conform in format and language with the Standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Does the peer review year-end match the year-end in PRIMA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Is the report date appropriate and the same as the exit conference?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Are must-selects appropriately identified, including single vs. plural selections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. If the firm does not perform must-selects, was the must-select paragraph omitted from the "Required Selections and Considerations" section?  Note: It is not necessary to request a revision if the section heading has been tailored as "Required Considerations."	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. Was the appropriate type of report issued (i.e., pass, pass with deficiencies, or fail)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Yes	No	N/A	Comments and/or Explanation
<b>Pass with Deficiencies and Fail Reports</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
1. Does the deficiency or significant deficiency description include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to the applicable requirement of Statements on Quality Control Standards</li> <li>• The scenario that led to the deficiency or significant deficiency</li> <li>• Reference to nonconforming engagements as a result of the deficiency or significant deficiency, if applicable</li> <li>• Identification of the level of service</li> <li>• Identification of the applicable industry if industry specific or if related to a nonconforming engagement in a must-select industry or must-select practice area?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Is the underlying systemic cause appropriately identified?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Does the firm's LOR address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the firm's actions, taken or planned, to remediate nonconforming engagements, if applicable?</li> <li>• the firm's actions, taken or planned, to remediate deficiencies or significant deficiencies in the firm's system of quality control?</li> <li>• the timing of the remediation?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. If there are repeat deficiencies or significant deficiencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it appropriately identified as a repeat in the deficiency description?</li> <li>• Is the firm's current response different from its prior response?</li> <li>• Is the firm's response comprehensive, genuine, and feasible?</li> <li>• Was consideration given to whether the deficiency should be escalated to a significant deficiency?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. Do you believe corrective actions (COA) should be required? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on the working papers, determine timing that is feasible for the firm.</li> <li>• If the firm indicates in their LOR that they are no longer performing an engagement type or level of service, has a conditional COA been recommended to the RAB in case the firm later decides to perform that type of engagement?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Oversight</b>				
1. Was this review selected for enhanced oversight? If yes, have the results been appropriately considered by the team captain?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Do the team captain's documentation and responses to technical review questions indicate that oversight should be considered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Do you recommend this review for oversight?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Yes	No	N/A	Comments and/or Explanation
<b><i>Oversight Performed</i></b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
1. Was oversight performed? If so, what kind? <input type="checkbox"/> Full on-site oversight <input type="checkbox"/> Full off-site oversight <input type="checkbox"/> Engagement Oversight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Is the oversight report included in the RAB materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Technical Review Completion</b>				
1. Based upon the procedures performed and documented in these working papers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the review team meet the qualifications set forth in the Standards to perform the review?</li> <li>Does the scope of the review provide a sufficiently comprehensive basis to conclude on the adequacy of the firm's system of quality control and compliance with that system?</li> <li>Does the documentation by the review team provide satisfactory evidence of compliance with the Standards and support the conclusions reached?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Based on your review, do you believe that the report, LOR (if applicable) and FFC forms (if applicable) should be accepted as submitted?  If no, document your concerns and the reasons why you believe the documents should not be accepted, including any changes that are needed in the Technical Reviewer notes. Consider contacting RAB presenter before the RAB meeting if there are difficult or controversial issues, or open questions that require advance discussion.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Did the reviewed firm disagree with one or more of the review team's conclusions?  If "yes," refer to the disagreement guidance in Chapter 7 of the RAB Handbook. Consider whether the review should go to a disagreement panel prior to submission to the RAB.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Has the team captain or team member(s) received significant reviewer performance feedback during the past two years (refer to Administrative question number 4 for examples of significant performance weaknesses)?  If yes, summarize the relevant performance issues for RAB consideration.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. Does the team captain or team member(s) need feedback?  If yes, have you created a draft in PRIMA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. Based on the team captain or team member(s) performance on the current review and their performance history, do you recommend issuing a PDL or referral for hearing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Yes	No	N/A	Comments and/or Explanation
7. Are the following attached in PRIMA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior report, LOR, if necessary and applicable</li> <li>• FFC forms from the previous peer review, if applicable</li> <li>• Prior Representation Letter</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
8. Does the review meet all criteria to be included on the consent agenda? If applicable, provide additional explanation for RAB consideration if all criteria were met and you chose not to recommend it for the consent agenda.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
9. Will the current report rating cause the reviewed firm to receive consecutive non-pass reports? If yes, ensure the RAB is aware of its responsibilities to assess noncooperation outlined in Chapter 6, Section IV of the RAB Handbook.  Note: A firm must receive the REPEAT series letter with proof of delivery before a firm can be referred for a non-cooperation termination hearing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
10. Is there any other information to assist the RAB in its evaluation of the review?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

# Attachment 1

## ***REVIEW OF ENGAGEMENT PROFILE AND PART A-UG, PRP 22100, SUPPLEMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR REVIEW OF SINGLE AUDIT ENGAGEMENTS***

Reviewed Firm:	
Review Number:	
Team Captain:	
Name of Technical Reviewer or RAB member completing attachment:	

	Yes	No	N/A	Comments and/or Explanation
<b>Suggested Review Procedures</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
1. Did the firm complete the single audit data on the engagement profile(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. If the year-end of the engagement is outside of the peer review year, did the SRM discuss why the engagement was selected?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Does the engagement profile identify significant threats to independence? If so, does the profile properly refer to the documentation of the safeguards to sufficiently reduce the threat (such as self-review) to an acceptable level?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Review the single audit data on the engagement profile: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is the type A threshold computed correctly?</li> <li>b. If the auditee was considered low risk by the auditor, did the auditee meet the low risk auditee requirements?</li> <li>c. Did the auditor meet the percentage of coverage?</li> <li>d. Review the look-back information. Have all type A programs been audited in the current or prior two years?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Yes	No	N/A	Comments and/or Explanation
5. Review part A of the single audit checklist(s): a. Based on review of the engagement profile information, are the answers to the related part A questions appropriate? b. If there are "no" answers, did the reviewer appropriately expand scope? c. If a matter was deemed "isolated," did the reviewer appropriately document that determination? d. If there are any "no" answers, and the engagement was identified as conforming, did the review team clearly document why the engagement was not considered nonconforming? e. Do the reviewer's conclusions and recommendations on the matters (design and compliance) appear proper? f. Do the matters appear to have been given appropriate consideration in the preparation of the report and findings for further consideration?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. Do you think the review should be considered for oversight?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7. Is there any reason the report or response should be changed prior to acceptance of the report?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**EXHIBIT 2—ENGAGEMENT REVIEW TECHNICAL REVIEWER'S CHECKLIST**

Reviewed Firm:	
Review Number:	
Review Captain:	
Date Workpapers Submitted:	
Technical Reviewer:	
Date of Technical Review:	
Number of Matters for Further Consideration (MFCs):	
Number of Findings for Further Consideration (FFCs):	
Current Report Rating:	
Current Year-End:	
Prior Report Rating:	
Prior Year-End:	
Prior Review Captain:	
Prior Corrective Action (if applicable)	
Prior Implementation Plan (if applicable)	
Number of Prior FFCs:	

<b>Technical Reviewer Recommendations</b>	<b>Check Box</b>
Accept as Presented	<input type="checkbox"/>
Acceptance Delayed Subject To (See Comments Below)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Acceptance Deferred (See Comments Below)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accept with Implementation Plan (on FFCs)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Corrective/Follow Up Action (On Deficiencies/ Significant Deficiencies in Report)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Report Acceptance Body (RAB) Consultation Needed (See Comments Below)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Feedback form or Deficiency Letter attached	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recommended for Oversight	<input type="checkbox"/>

Corrective Action <input type="checkbox"/>	Due Date
Implementation Plan <input type="checkbox"/>	



**Technical Reviewer Comments on Delay/Deferral and RAB Consultation:**

**Technical Reviewer Notes for RAB:**

## TECHNICAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

	Yes	No	N/A	Comments and/or Explanation
<b>Administrative</b>				
Consider information in PRIMA and the referral database when answering these questions.				
1. Based on a review of the administrative checklist, did the firm request any of the following? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due date extension</li> <li>• YE change</li> </ul> If yes, provide information for RAB consideration.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Have you reviewed and familiarized yourself with the review captain's performance history from the last two years, with attention to the following significant performance weaknesses? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or more performance deficiency letter(s) (PDL)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Findings or deficiencies similar to performance weaknesses that required corrective action</li> </ul> </li> <li>• More than one performance deficiency on a reviewer performance feedback form</li> <li>• Pattern(s) of performance findings in the same subcategory (for example, reporting, completion of FFC forms, and so on)</li> <li>• Consistent tardiness resulting in reviewer suspension for submitting working papers or responding to technical reviewer or RAB requests (refer to the Reviewer Performance Dashboard to view monitoring action code 510-Late Document Filing on the "active cases" tab and "closed cases" tab)</li> </ul> Note: The recency, nature, and pervasiveness of the performance weaknesses should be considered, taking note of the volume of reviews performed by the reviewer.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. If the review captain has previously been issued a PDL, are any corrective action(s) currently outstanding that are applicable to the review? If yes, is the review captain in compliance with the PDL requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. If a copy of a referral or Required Corrective Action (RCA) letter relating to allegations or restrictions was sent to the reviewer, did the reviewer appropriately address in the review captain summary?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Scope and Engagement Selections</b>				
1. Do engagements selected for review conform to standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Checklists</b>				
1. Were the required questionnaires, checklists and forms current, and do they appear to have been completed in a professional manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Yes	No	N/A	Comments and/or Explanation
<b>Matters</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
1. Are the MFC forms complete and prepared in accordance with guidance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Do the MFC forms contain specific firm or client information? If yes, have the firm or review captain update their responses to remove these specific references.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Do matters appear to have been given appropriate consideration in the preparation of the report and FFCs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Findings</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
1. Does the firm's response address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The firm's actions taken or planned to remediate the findings</li> <li>The timing of the remediation</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Are any findings a repeat from the prior review and if so: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is it appropriately identified as a repeat on the FFC?</li> <li>Is the firm's current response different from its prior response?</li> <li>If the firm's response is the same, consider recommending an implementation plan.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Do you believe an implementation plan should be required? (Review RAB Handbook Exhibit 5-2 for allowable implementation plans.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Representation Letter</b>				
1. Does the representation letter conform to the Standards and related guidance and include all required representations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Is the representation letter dated appropriately?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. If there are nonconforming engagements, does the representation letter include the appropriate representations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Is the representation letter signed by individual members of management?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Report</b>				
1. Does the report conform in format and language with the Standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Does the peer review year-end match the year-end in PRIMA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Is the report date appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Yes	No	N/A	Comments and/or Explanation
4. Was the appropriate type of report issued (i.e., pass, pass with deficiencies, or fail)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Pass with Deficiencies and Fail Reports</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
1. Does the deficiency or significant deficiency description include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of repeat deficiencies or significant deficiencies if the specific types of reporting, presentation, disclosure or documentation deficiencies or significant deficiencies are substantially the same as the prior report</li> <li>• Identification of the level of service</li> <li>• Identification of the applicable industry if industry specific</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Does the firm's letter of response (LOR) address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The firm's actions, taken or planned, to remediate the deficiencies or significant deficiencies?</li> <li>• The timing of the remediation?</li> <li>• If there are repeat deficiencies or significant deficiencies, is the firm's current response different from its prior response?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Do you believe corrective actions (COA) should be required? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on the working papers, determine timing that is feasible for the firm.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Oversight</b>				
1. Do the review captain's documentation and responses to technical review questions indicate that oversight should be considered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Do you recommend this review for oversight?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Oversight Performed</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
1. Is the oversight report included in the RAB materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Technical Review Completion</b>				
1. Based upon the procedures performed and documented in these working papers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the review team meet the qualifications set forth in the Standards to perform the review?</li> <li>• Does the documentation by the review team provide satisfactory evidence of compliance with the Standards and support the conclusions reached?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Yes	No	N/A	Comments and/or Explanation
<p>2. Based on your review, do you believe that the report, LOR (if applicable) and FFC forms (if applicable) should be accepted as submitted?</p> <p>If no, document your concerns and the reasons why you believe the documents should not be accepted, including any changes that are needed in the Technical Reviewer notes.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>3. Did the reviewed firm disagree with one or more of the review team's conclusions? If "yes," refer to the disagreement guidance in Chapter 7 of the RAB Handbook. Consider whether the review should go to a disagreement panel prior to submission to the RAB.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>4. Has the review captain received significant reviewer performance feedback during the past two years (refer to Administrative question number 2 for examples of significant performance weaknesses)?</p> <p>If yes, summarize the relevant performance issues for RAB consideration.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>5. Does the review captain need feedback?</p> <p>If yes, have you created a draft in PRIMA?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>6. Based on the review captain's performance on the current review and their performance history, do you recommend issuing a PDL or referral for hearing?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>7. Are the following attached in PRIMA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior report, LOR, if necessary and applicable</li> <li>• FFC forms from the previous peer review, if applicable</li> <li>• Prior Representation Letter</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>8. Does this review meet the criteria to be accepted by the technical reviewer or committee within 60 days of receipt of the working papers and report from the review captain?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>9. Will the current report rating cause the reviewed firm to receive consecutive non-pass reports? If yes, ensure the RAB is aware of its responsibilities to assess noncooperation outlined in Chapter 6, Section IV of the RAB Handbook.</p> <p>Note: A firm must receive the REPEAT series letter with proof of delivery before a firm can be referred for a non-cooperation termination hearing.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>10. Is there any other information to assist the RAB in its evaluation of the review?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	