

King, LaShaun

From: PeerReviewOption.com [mailer@peerreviewoption.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2010 11:17 AM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: KENNETH
Last Name: LIPNER
Title: PARTNER
Company: LIPNER SOFFERMAN & CO., LLP
Address 1: 185 GREAT NECK ROAD
Address 2: SUITE 300
City: GREAT NECK
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: KLIPNER@LIPNERSOFFERMAN.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1:

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm\'s peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm\'s peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2:

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3:

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate

QUESTION 4:

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5:

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm\'s ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm\'s needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: PeerReviewOption.com [mailer@peerreviewoption.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2010 11:18 AM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: RANDY
Last Name: SOFFERMAN
Title: PARTNER
Company: LIPNER, SOFFERMAN & CO., LLP
Address 1: 185 GREAT NECK ROAD
Address 2: SUITE 300
City: GREAT NECK
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: RSOFFERMAN@LIPNERSOFFERMAN.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1:

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2:

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3:

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate

QUESTION 4:

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5:

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: PeerReviewOption.com [mailer@peerreviewoption.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2010 11:19 AM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: JAY
Last Name: LIPNER
Title: CPA
Company: LIPNER, SOFFERMAN & CO., LLP
Address 1: 185 GREAT NECK ROAD
Address 2: SUITE 300
City: GREAT NECK
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: JAYLIPNER@LIPNERSOFFERMAN.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1:

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm\'s peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm\'s peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2:

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3:

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate

QUESTION 4:

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5:

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: PeerReviewOption.com [mailer@peerreviewoption.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2010 11:26 AM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: ABRAHAM
Last Name: SILBER
Title: MANAGER
Company: LIPNER, SOFFERMAN & CO. LLP
Address 1: 185 GREAT NECK ROAD
Address 2: SUITE 300
City: GREAT NECK
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: ASILBER@LIPNERSOFFERMAN.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1:

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm\'s peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm\'s peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2:

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3:

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate

QUESTION 4:

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5:

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: PeerReviewOption.com [mailer@peerreviewoption.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2010 12:44 PM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: DAVID
Last Name: ROSENBLUM
Title: PARTNER
Company: ROSENBLUMMISHKIN & COMPANY LLP Address 1: 980 OLD COUNTRY RD Address 2:
City: PLAINVIEW
State: NY
Zip: 11803

Email: DMRCPA@HOTMAIL.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1:

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm\'s peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm\'s peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2:

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3:

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate

QUESTION 4:

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5:

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: PeerReviewOption.com [mailer@peerreviewoption.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2010 3:13 PM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Deborah
Last Name: Amelio
Title: CPA
Company: Urmston Forshee Plain & Amelio CPAs Address 1: 10 Silver Lake Scotchtown Road Address 2:
City: Middletown
State: NY
Zip: 10940

Email: damelio@ufpacpas.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1:

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm\'s peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm\'s peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2:

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3:

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate

QUESTION 4:

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5:

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: PeerReviewOption.com [mailer@peerreviewoption.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2010 7:12 PM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: PERRY
Last Name: DINTER
Title: STAFF ACCOUNTANT
Company: SOLOMON HIRSCH CPA PC
Address 1: 14 JOAN LANE
Address 2:
City: MONSEY
State: NY
Zip: 10952

Email: pdinter@hirschcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1:

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm\'s peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm\'s peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2:

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3:

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate

QUESTION 4:

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5:

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm\'s ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm\'s needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: PeerReviewOption.com [mailer@peerreviewoption.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2010 7:13 PM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: SOLOMON
Last Name: HIRSCH
Title: PARTNER
Company: SOLOMON HIRSCH CPA PC
Address 1: 14 JOAN LANE
Address 2:
City: MONSEY
State: NY
Zip: 10952

Email: SOLHIRSCH@HIRSCHCPA.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1:

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2:

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3:

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate

QUESTION 4:

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5:

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: STEPHEN RUSSO [SRR1099@AOL.COM]
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2010 2:10 PM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: STEPHEN
Last Name: RUSSO
Title: CPA
Company: RRC PRICE CPAs P.C.
Address 1: 55 OLD TURNPIKE ROAD SUITE 404 Address 2:
City: NANUET
State: NY
Zip: 10954

Email: SRR1099@AOL.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Eugene Price [karenprb@optonline.net]
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2010 2:16 PM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Eugene
Last Name: Price
Title: Partner
Company: RRC PRICE CPAs P.C.
Address 1: 133 Route 304
Address 2:
City: Bardonia
State: NY
Zip: 10954

Email: karenprb@optonline.net

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Sharyn Levine [karenprb@optonline.net]
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2010 2:19 PM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Sharyn
Last Name: Levine
Title: Associate
Company: RRC PRICE CPAs P.C.
Address 1: 133 Route 304
Address 2:
City: Bardonia
State: NY
Zip: 10954

Email: karenprb@optonline.net

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: William Carbonari [karenprb@optonline.net]
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2010 2:20 PM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: William
Last Name: Carbonari
Title: Partner
Company: RRC PRICE CPAs P.C.
Address 1: PO Box 569 Routes 22 & 138
Address 2:
City: Goldens Bridge
State: NY
Zip: 10526

Email: karenprb@optonline.net

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Joel Rosenberg [karenprb@optonline.net]
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2010 2:21 PM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Joel
Last Name: Rosenberg
Title: Partner
Company: RRC PRICE CPAs P.C.
Address 1: PO Box 569 - Routes 22 & 138
Address 2:
City: Goldens Bridge
State: NY
Zip: 10526

Email: karenprb@optonline.net

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Mark Kotlaroff [karenprb@optonline.net]
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2010 2:22 PM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Mark
Last Name: Kotlaroff
Title: Audit Manager
Company: RRC PRICE CPAs P.C.
Address 1: 55 Old Turnpike Road Suite 404 Address 2:
City: Nanuet
State: NY
Zip: 10954

Email: karenprb@optonline.net

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Harry White [hwhite@jwcpas.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 10:32 AM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Harry
Last Name: White
Title: Partner
Company: Joseph Warren & Co
Address 1: 144 East 44th Street
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10017

Email: hwhite@jwcpas.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Michael Kuslansky [kuslansky@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 11:30 AM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Kuslansky
Title: Partner
Company: Rosen Kuslansky, CPA, P.C.
Address 1: 156 Fifth Avenue # 901
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10010

Email: kuslansky@aol.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Stacy Koilor [skoilor@rkcpapc.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 11:35 AM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Stacy
Last Name: Koilor
Title: Manager
Company: Rosen Kuslansky
Address 1: 136 41st Street Unit 202
Address 2:
City: Union City
State: Nj
Zip: 07087

Email: skoilor@rkcpapc.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Jason Leibowitz [jleibowitz@rkcpapc.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 11:56 AM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jason
Last Name: Leibowitz
Title: Accountant
Company: Rosen Kuslansky CPA, P.C.
Address 1: 156 Fifth Avenue
Address 2: Suite 901
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10010

Email: jleibowitz@rkcpapc.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Annie Wong [awong@rkcpapc.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 11:56 AM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Annie
Last Name: Wong
Title: Accountant
Company: Rosen Kuslansky, CPA, P.C.
Address 1: 156 5th Ave
Address 2: #901
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10010

Email: awong@rkcpapc.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Stephanie Randazzo [gotmilk77n57@aim.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 11:56 AM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Stephanie
Last Name: Randazzo
Title: Senior Accountant
Company: Rosen Kuslansky, CPA, P.C.
Address 1: 156 Fifth Avenue
Address 2: #901
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10010

Email: gotmilk77n57@aim.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Stuart Rosen [Srosen@rkcpapc.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 12:42 PM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Stuart
Last Name: Rosen
Title: President
Company: Rosen Kuslansky CPA, PC
Address 1: 156 Fifth Avenue
Address 2: Suite 901
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10010

Email: Srosen@rkcpapc.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: A Elmaghrabi [bacco@jwcpas.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 12:01 PM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: A
Last Name: Elmaghrabi
Title: Partner
Company: Joseph Warren & Co.
Address 1: 144 East 44th Street
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10017

Email: bacco@jwcpas.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: JOHN APRILAKIS [JOHN@JMLEVY.COM]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 2:24 PM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: JOHN
Last Name: APRILAKIS
Title: PARTNER
Company: JACQUES M LEVY LLP
Address 1: 150 GREAT NECK ROAD
Address 2:
City: GREAT NECK
State: NY
Zip: 11791

Email: JOHN@JMLEVY.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Keri Gorsky [kgorsky@rkcpapc.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 8:05 PM
To: mlilling@lillingcpa.com; alilling@lillingcpa.com; PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Keri
Last Name: Gorsky
Title: Associate
Company: Rosen Kuslansky, CPA, PC
Address 1: 156 Fifth Avenue
Address 2: Suite 901
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10010

Email: kgorsky@rkcpapc.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: David Ashenfarb [dash@schallandashenfarb.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 8:52 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: David
Last Name: Ashenfarb
Title: Partner
Company: Schall & Ashenfarb, CPA's
Address 1: 350 Fifth Avenue
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10118

Email: dash@schallandashenfarb.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: ira schall [js@schallandashenfarb.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 9:03 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: ira
Last Name: schall
Title: ptr
Company: SCHALL & ASHENFARB
Address 1: 350 fith ave
Address 2:
City: ny
State: ny
Zip: 10118

Email: is@schallandashenfarb.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: JOSEPH BRUNO [jbruno@jmlevy.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 9:39 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: JOSEPH
Last Name: BRUNO
Title: CPA
Company: JM LEVY & COMPANY
Address 1: 150 GREAT NECK ROAD
Address 2:
City: GREAT NECK
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: jbruno@jmlevy.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Vincent Milito [vincemilito@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 9:39 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Vincent
Last Name: Milito
Title: Partner
Company: Sarowitz Milito & Co.
Address 1: 169 West End Avenue
Address 2:
City: Brooklyn
State: NY
Zip: 11235

Email: vincemilito@comcast.net

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material to perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material be peer reviewed is more than adequate. The developer of Quality Control Material merely develops materials to assist the auditors in documenting adherence to auditing standards. The auditors use their professional judgement in making audit decisions and forming conclusions based on audit results.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. If the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight then the material meets auditing standards. As previously stated, the auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions, not the peer reviewer. The author of the Quality Control Material in no way influences the the decisions and conclusions reached by the auditor.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

I do not believe that the proposed revisions are necessary. I believe the current Peer Review Program meets the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. If the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and is subject to AICPA oversight then it is deemed to meet accounting and auditing standards.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

I believe it is more appropriate to have proper safeguards than prohibition. The current requirement of having the Quality Control Material peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight means that the material developed meets current accounting and auditing standards. The developer of such material in no way influences the decisions and conclusions made by the auditor.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain QCM programs and find a qualified peer reviewer. It will require our firm to change the QCM programs or peer reviewer we currently use. We prefer having a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to author Quality Control Material programs that meet peer review standards.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Harvey Glick [hrgcpa@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 9:24 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Harvey
Last Name: Glick
Title: Owner
Company: Harvey R Glick, CPA
Address 1: 106 Donnybrook Road
Address 2:
City: Scarsdale
State: NY
Zip: 10583

Email: hrgcpa@aol.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Francis M Danisi [fdanisi@jmlevy.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 9:42 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Francis M
Last Name: Danisi
Title: CPA
Company: Jacques M Levy & Company, LLP
Address 1: 150 Great Neck Road
Address 2:
City: Great Neck
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: fdanisi@jmlevy.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: DAVID ARON [daron@rifkincpa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 10:12 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: DAVID
Last Name: ARON
Title: PARTNER
Company: RIFKIN & CO LLP
Address 1: 445 RT 304
Address 2:
City: BARDONIA
State: NY
Zip: 10954

Email: daron@rifkincpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Kevin Francis [kfrancis@rifkincpa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 10:09 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Kevin
Last Name: Francis
Title: Partner
Company: Rifkin & Company, LLP
Address 1: 445 Route 304
Address 2:
City: Bardonia
State: NY
Zip: 10954

Email: kfrancis@rifkincpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Laurence Scot [Laurence@skodyscot.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 11:19 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Laurence
Last Name: Scot
Title: VP & COO
Company: Skody Scot & Co., CPA, P.C.
Address 1: 352 Seventh Avenue
Address 2: Suite 907
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10001

Email: Laurence@skodyscot.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

In my opinion, the current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate. The current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. The developer and maintainer is simply making suggestions and is not responsible for final audit decisions and conclusions. This is no different that an auditor providing suggestions for improving internal controls and performing a subsequent audit.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight. Again, the Quality Control Material is only a suggestion and there exists other sources of material that a reviewd firm can use if so desired.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any substantive evidence documenting and supporting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. As such, I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate and shouldn't be changed.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is more than adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary and will have the unintended result of adding time and possibly cost to the reviewed CPA firm.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there probably will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs or find a qualified, and cost appropriate, peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material. Prior to receiving this material we used other sources which proved to be inadequate.

OTHER COMMENTS:

Our current reviewer has been a source of guidance at various times and has assisted us in meeting all required auditing standards. I believe the proposed rule is in a way redundant. If the material provided is approved, there is no reason it shouldn't be used by any firm. If there is a concern, the peer review firm should be required to substantiate and support that its material (or other material) being used by a client CPA firm is adequate and appropriate.

King, LaShaun

From: Philip Mintz [pmintz@sdmcpa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 11:38 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Philip
Last Name: Mintz
Title: Partner
Company: Stein deVisser & Mintz
Address 1: 29 West 38th Street
Address 2: 14th Floor
City: New York,
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: pmintz@sdmcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Joseph Albano [jalbano@schallandashenfarb.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 11:11 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Joseph
Last Name: Albano
Title: Senior Accountant
Company: Schall & Ashenfarb CPAs LLC
Address 1: 350 Fifth Avenue
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: jalbano@schallandashenfarb.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Bruce Lange [Blange@mlgwllp.cpm]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 12:38 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Bruce
Last Name: Lange
Title: Partner
Company: MLGW LLP
Address 1: 462 Seventh Avenue
Address 2: 22nd Floor
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: Blange@mlgwllp.cpm

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: LISA LEFAVI [LISA@KEEPYOURGREEN.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 1:22 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: LISA
Last Name: LEFAVI
Title: CPA
Company: MARCIANTE & LEFAVI CPAS PC
Address 1: 18 MARKET ST
Address 2:
City: CENTEREACH
State: NY
Zip: 11720

Email: LISA@KEEPYOURGREEN.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

There is no one better to produce quality control materials than an experienced peer reviewer. This proposal is an anti-small-CPA-firm proposal, and it limits our choice of materials to the largest quality-control-material publishers, most of which provide checklists that are way too complex for small-business audits. We do not need these proposed revisions.

King, LaShaun

From: JAMES MARCIANTE [MARLEFCPAS@AOL.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 1:24 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: JAMES
Last Name: MARCIANTE
Title: PRESIDENT
Company: MARCIANTE & LEFAVI, C.P.A.'S, P.C.
Address 1: 18 MARKET ST
Address 2:
City: CENTEREACH
State: NY
Zip: 11720

Email: MARLEFCPAS@AOL.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

There is already plenty of oversight on quality control materials and peer reviewers. I am opposed to the proposed changes.

King, LaShaun

From: Joshua Roth [kkcpas@optonline.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 1:28 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Joshua
Last Name: Roth
Title: Accountant
Company: Kreitzman & Kreitzman
Address 1: 898 Veterans Hwy
Address 2:
City: Hauppauge
State: NY
Zip: 11788

Email: kkcpas@optonline.net

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: dan rifkin [drifkin@rifkincpa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 1:35 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: dan
Last Name: rifkin
Title: Senior Managing Partner
Company: Rifkin & Company, LLP
Address 1: 445 Route 304
Address 2:
City: Bardonia
State: NY
Zip: 10954

Email: drifkin@rifkincpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: lester weingarten [lweingarten@mlgwllp.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 4:26 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: lester
Last Name: weingarten
Title: partner
Company: MLGW LLP
Address 1: 462 Seventh ave
Address 2: 22nd floor
City: New York
State: ny
Zip: 10018

Email: lweingarten@mlgwllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Anthony Justic [ajj@mgroupusa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 4:36 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Anthony
Last Name: Justic
Title: Partner
Company: Maier Markey & Justic
Address 1: 222 Bloomingdale Road
Address 2:
City: White Plains
State: NY
Zip: 10605

Email: ajj@mgroupusa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: LEONARD BLUM [LENNY@GLASSANDBLUMCPA.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 4:51 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: LEONARD
Last Name: BLUM
Title: PARTNER
Company: GLASS AND BLUM PC CPAS
Address 1: 585 STEWART AVENUE
Address 2:
City: GARDEN CITY
State: NY
Zip: 11530

Email: LENNY@GLASSANDBLUMCPA.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: RICHARD GLASS [RICK@GLASSANDBLUMCPA.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 4:52 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: RICHARD
Last Name: GLASS
Title: PARTNER
Company: GLASS AND BLUM PC CPAS
Address 1: 585 STEWART AVENUE
Address 2:
City: GARDEN CITY
State: NY
Zip: 11530

Email: RICK@GLASSANDBLUMCPA.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Gayle Stephens [gstephens@gstephens.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 5:05 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Gayle
Last Name: Stephens
Title: President
Company: G T Stephens Consulting Services Inc.
Address 1: 3036 Brownbirds Nest Drive
Address 2:
City: Henderson
State: NV
Zip: 89052

Email: gstephens@gstephens.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Abraham Haspel [chaspel@nyc.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 5:11 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Abraham
Last Name: Haspel
Title: Owner
Company: Abraham E. Haspel CPA
Address 1: 25 Plaza Street
Address 2:
City: Brooklyn
State: NY
Zip: 11217

Email: chaspel@nyc.rr.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Peter Marx [pmarx@mlgwllp.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 5:05 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Peter
Last Name: Marx
Title: CPA Partner
Company: MLGW LLP
Address 1: 462 Seventh Avenue
Address 2: 22nd FL
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: pmarx@mlgwllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: William Skody [william@skodyscot.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 5:35 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: William
Last Name: Skody
Title: President
Company: Skody Scot & Company
Address 1: 352 7th Avenue 9FL
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10001

Email: william@skodyscot.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Alfred Jacob [al@skodyscot.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 5:38 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Alfred
Last Name: Jacob
Title: Secretary
Company: Skody Scot & Company CPAS PC
Address 1: 352 7th Avenue
Address 2: 9th Floor
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10001

Email: al@skodyscot.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

Let me know if this response is not complete

King, LaShaun

From: Martha Vail [Marti1949@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 6:59 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Martha
Last Name: Vail
Title: CPA
Company: Martha E. Vail, CPA
Address 1: 39 Ronkonkoma Blvd
Address 2:
City: Centereach
State: NY
Zip: 11720

Email: Marti1949@aol.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Navy Djonovic [ned@mgroupusa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 7:16 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Navy
Last Name: Djonovic
Title: Partner
Company: Maier Markey & Justic LLP
Address 1: Suite 400
Address 2: 222 Bloomingdale Road
City: White Plains
State: NY
Zip: 10605

Email: ned@mgroupusa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

Our experience has been that there is no one better qualified than the firms that perform peer reviews to prepare QC Material. These firms are exposed to all that can go wrong in a public accounting firm...giving them the advantage to provide solutions.

King, LaShaun

From: Michael Walker [mjw@mgroupusa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 7:27 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Walker
Title: Manager
Company: Maier Markey & Justic LLP
Address 1: 222 Bloomingdale Road
Address 2: Suite 400
City: White Plains
State: NY
Zip: 10605

Email: mjw@mgroupusa.com

CPA: No
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Jennifer Mazza [JMM@mgroupusa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 7:28 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jennifer
Last Name: Mazza
Title: Staff Accountant
Company: Maier Markey & Justic LLP
Address 1: 222 Bloomingdale Road
Address 2: Suite 400
City: White Plains
State: NY
Zip: 10605

Email: JMM@mgroupusa.com

CPA: No
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Christian Niforos [cdn@mgroupusa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2010 7:36 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Christian
Last Name: Niforos
Title: Staff Accountant
Company: Maier, Markey & Justic LLP
Address 1: 222 Bloomingdale Road
Address 2: Suite 400
City: White Plains
State: New York
Zip: 10605

Email: cdn@mgroupusa.com

CPA: No
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: KENNETH ZWEIBEL [KJZCPA@AOL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 7:48 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: KENNETH
Last Name: ZWEIBEL
Title: PRES
Company: KENNETH J ZWEIBEL CPA PC
Address 1: 6 STONEHENGE LANE
Address 2:
City: EAST NORTHPORT
State: NY
Zip: 11731

Email: KJZCPA@AOL.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: KENNETH ZWEIBEL [KJZCPA@AOL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 7:49 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: KENNETH
Last Name: ZWEIBEL
Title: PRES
Company: KENNETH J ZWEIBEL CPA PC
Address 1: 6 STONEHENGE LANE
Address 2:
City: EAST NORTHPORT
State: NY
Zip: 11731

Email: KJZCPA@AOL.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Keith deVisser [kdevisser@sdmcpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 7:52 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Keith
Last Name: deVisser
Title: Partner
Company: Stein deVisser & Mintz, P.C.
Address 1: 29 West 38th Street
Address 2: 14th Floor
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: kdevisser@sdmcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: John Rizzolo [jrizzolo@mlgwllp.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 8:47 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: John
Last Name: Rizzolo
Title: Manager
Company: MLGW LLP
Address 1: 462 Seventh Avenue
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: jrizzolo@mlgwllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Rich Berretta [rvb@mgroupusa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 9:02 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Rich
Last Name: Berretta
Title: Accountant
Company: Maier Markey & Justic LLP
Address 1: 222 Bloomingdale Road
Address 2: Suite 400
City: White Plains
State: NY
Zip: 10605

Email: rvb@mgroupusa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Richard Rosenkrantz [rrosenkrantz@jpopkin.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 10:02 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Richard
Last Name: Rosenkrantz
Title: CPA Partner
Company: Joel Popkin & Co
Address 1: 1430 Broadway
Address 2:
City: NYC
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: rosenkrantz@jpopkin.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Jay Lerner [jlerner@lernalersipkin.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 10:17 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jay
Last Name: Lerner
Title: Partner
Company: Lerner & Sipkin CPAS LLP
Address 1: 132 Nassau Street Suite 1023
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10038

Email: jlerner@lernalersipkin.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: David Frey [dfrey@freywagner.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 10:45 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: David
Last Name: Frey
Title: CPA
Company: Frey & Wagner, CPA's, PC
Address 1: 811 Old Country Rd
Address 2:
City: Plainview
State: NY
Zip: 11803

Email: dfrey@freywagner.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Gordon Weiss [gweiss@weisspllc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 10:53 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Gordon
Last Name: Weiss
Title: Owner
Company: Weiss CPA PLLC
Address 1: 614 Corporate Way
Address 2: Suite 3-M
City: Valley Cottage
State: NY
Zip: 10989

Email: gweiss@weisspllc.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Michael Frey [mwagner@freywagner.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 10:45 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Frey
Title: CPA
Company: Frey & Wagner, CPA's, PC
Address 1: 811 Old Country Rd
Address 2:
City: Plainview
State: NY
Zip: 11803

Email: mwagner@freywagner.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Philip Goldfarb [pgoldfarb@weisbergmole.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 11:52 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Philip
Last Name: Goldfarb
Title: Partner
Company: WMKG
Address 1: 185 Crossways Park Drive
Address 2:
City: Woodbury
State: NY
Zip: 11797

Email: pgoldfarb@weisbergmole.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

It is ludicrous for us to be precluded from hiring a peer reviewer who is competent enough to generate practice aids worthy of using for our audits and other attest functions.

King, LaShaun

From: Lawrence ceasar [lceasar@ceasarsmilow.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 11:57 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Lawrence
Last Name: ceasar
Title: Partner
Company: Ceasar & Smilow, LLP
Address 1: 60 cuttermill Road
Address 2:
City: Great Neck
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: lceasar@ceasarsmilow.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Alvin Smilow [asmilow@ceasarsmilow.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 11:59 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Alvin
Last Name: Smilow
Title: Partner
Company: Ceasar & Smilow, LLP
Address 1: 60 Cuttermill Rd.
Address 2:
City: Great Neck
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: asmilow@ceasarsmilow.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Ronald Schaus [rschaus@weisbergmole.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 12:00 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Ronald
Last Name: Schaus
Title: Staff
Company: Wesiberg, Mole\, Krantz & Goldfarb. LLP Address 1: 185 Crossways Park Drive Address 2:
City: Woodbury
State: Ny
Zip: 11779

Email: rschaus@weisbergmole.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: JOHN LALL [jlall@mlgwllp.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 12:48 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: JOHN
Last Name: LALL
Title: AUDIT MANAGER
Company: MLGW, LLP
Address 1: 462 TH AVE
Address 2:
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: jlall@mlgwllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Gina Manente [gina@randmcpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 1:35 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Gina
Last Name: Manente
Title: Partner
Company: Rosenberg & Manente, PLLC
Address 1: 1 Linden Place, Ste 301
Address 2:
City: Garden City
State: NY
Zip: 10021

Email: gina@randmcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Leslie Creed [Leslie@randmcpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 1:36 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Leslie
Last Name: Creed
Title: Manager
Company: Rosenberg & Manente, CPA
Address 1: 1 Linden Place, Ste 301
Address 2:
City: Great Neck
State: ny
Zip: 10021

Email: Leslie@randmcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Paul Adest [Paul@randmcpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 1:38 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Paul
Last Name: Adest
Title: Consultant
Company: Rosenberg & Manente
Address 1: 1 Linden Place, Ste 302
Address 2:
City: Great Neck
State: NY
Zip: 10021

Email: Paul@randmcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Paul Adest [Paul@randmcpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 1:38 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Paul
Last Name: Adest
Title: Consultant
Company: Rosenberg & Manente
Address 1: 1 Linden Place, Ste 302
Address 2:
City: Great Neck
State: NY
Zip: 10021

Email: Paul@randmcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Philip Rosenberg [Philip@randmcpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 1:38 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Philip
Last Name: Rosenberg
Title: Partner
Company: Rosenberg & Manente, PLLC
Address 1: 1 Linden Place, Ste 302
Address 2:
City: Great Neck
State: ny
Zip: 10021

Email: Philip@randmcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Joel Gutterman [jgutterman@mlgwllp.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 1:44 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Joel
Last Name: Gutterman
Title: partner
Company: MLGW, LLP
Address 1: 462 seventh ave
Address 2:
City: New York
State: ny
Zip: 10018

Email: jgutterman@mlgwllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1
Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1
The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2
Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2
No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: NIKKI KAUR [NIKKI@RANDMCPA.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 2:05 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: NIKKI
Last Name: KAUR
Title: ACCOUNTANT
Company: ROSENBERG & MANENTE, CPA, PLLC
Address 1: 1 LINDEN PLACE, SUITE 302
Address 2:
City: GREAT NECK
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: NIKKI@RANDMCPA.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: SARBJEET KAUR [SARA@RANDMCPA.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 2:06 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: SARBJEET
Last Name: KAUR
Title: ACCOUNTANT
Company: ROSENBERG & MANENTE, PLLC
Address 1: 1 LINDEN PLACE, SUITE 302
Address 2:
City: GREAT NECK
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: SARA@RANDMCPA.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Mary.E.Tarter@p3nlh032.shr.prod.phx3.secureserver.net
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 2:06 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Mary E
Last Name: Tarter, CPA
Title: Manager
Company: Rosenberg & Manente CPA
Address 1: 1 Linden Place
Address 2: Suite 302
City: Great Neck
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: marybeth@randmcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Kathleen Baum [Kate@baumtax.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 2:15 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Kathleen
Last Name: Baum
Title: CPA
Company: Baum & Baum CPA's PC
Address 1: 240 West 102 Street
Address 2:
City: NY
State: NY
Zip: 10025

Email: Kate@baumtax.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: JAMES DALE [JIM.DALE@PERLSONTOUHY.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 2:18 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: JAMES
Last Name: DALE
Title: PARTNER
Company: PERLSON TOUHY & CO LLP
Address 1: 977 NORTH BROADWAY
Address 2:
City: NORTH MASSAPEQUA
State: NY
Zip: 11758

Email: JIM.DALE@PERLSONTOUHY.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Paul Chumsky [pchumsky@weisbergmole.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 2:39 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Paul
Last Name: Chumsky
Title: Partner
Company: Weisberg, Mole\, Krantz & Goldfarb, LLP Address 1: 185 Crossways Park Drive Address 2:
City: Woodbury
State: NY
Zip: 11797

Email: pchumsky@weisbergmole.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: richard mole [rmole@weisbergmole.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 2:50 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: richard
Last Name: mole
Title: partner
Company: weisberg mole krantz & goldfarb Address 1: 185 crossways park drive Address 2:
City: woodbury
State: ny
Zip: 11797

Email: rmole@weisbergmole.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Benjamin Daria [bdaria@weisbergmole.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 2:50 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Benjamin
Last Name: Daria
Title: Senior Staff
Company: Weisberg, Mole\, Krantz & Goldfarb LLP Address 1: 185 Crossways Park Drive Address 2:
City: Woodbury
State: NY
Zip: 11797

Email: bdaria@weisbergmole.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Mukesh Shah [mshah@jpopkin.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 3:07 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Mukesh
Last Name: Shah
Title: Staff Accountant
Company: Joel popkin & Co P.C.
Address 1: 1430 Broadway
Address 2:
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: mshah@jpopkin.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Lawrence Slater [larry@randmcpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 3:10 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Lawrence
Last Name: Slater
Title: C P A
Company: Rosenberg & Manente, PLLC
Address 1: 1 Linden Place
Address 2:
City: Great Neck
State: NY
Zip: 07024

Email: larry@randmcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Jeffrey Baum [Jeff@Baumtax.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 2:20 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jeffrey
Last Name: Baum
Title: Partner
Company: Baum & Baum CPA's PC
Address 1: 240 West 102 Street #31
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10025

Email: Jeff@Baumtax.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: DAVID GUTWETTER [DGUTWETTER@YAHOO.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 3:30 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: DAVID
Last Name: GUTWETTER
Title: CPA/PARTNER
Company: CATANIO, MOSKOWITZ, & GUTWETTER CPAs Address 1: 70 GRAND AVE Address 2: STE 105
City: RIVER EDGE
State: NJ
Zip: 07661

Email: DGUTWETTER@YAHOO.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Gary Lewis [glewis@klncpas.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 4:00 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Gary
Last Name: Lewis
Title: Partner
Company: Kamler, Lewis & Noreman LLP
Address 1: One Linden Place
Address 2: Great Neck
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: glewis@klncpas.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

What a pleasure to have a peer reviewer capable of writing and publishing CPE Programs. These programs have improved the quality of our audits and enabled our staff to complete the required areas in an efficient manner.

King, LaShaun

From: Thomas Catanio Jr. [Tcatanio@cmgcpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 4:04 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Thomas
Last Name: Catanio Jr.
Title: CPA
Company: Catanio, Moskowitz & Gutwetter
Address 1: 70 Grand Avenue Suite 105
Address 2:
City: River Edge
State: NJ
Zip: 07661

Email: Tcatanio@cmgcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: michael moskowitz [mmcpaesq@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 4:13 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: michael
Last Name: moskowitz
Title: partner
Company: catanio, moskowitz and gutwetter Address 1: 70 grand ave Address 2:
City: river edge
State: nj
Zip: 07661

Email: mmcpaesq@aol.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: JONG HONG [JHONG@SAMWOOCPA.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 4:33 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: JONG
Last Name: HONG
Title: PARTNER
Company: SAMWOO LLP
Address 1: 120 WEST 31TH STREET, 5TH FL.
Address 2:
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10001

Email: JHONG@SAMWOOCPA.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Patrick Byrne [peb@mgroupusa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 4:43 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Patrick
Last Name: Byrne
Title: Senior Staff Accountant
Company: Maier Markey & Justic LLP
Address 1: 222 Bloomingdale Rd
Address 2: Suite 400
City: White Plains
State: NY
Zip: 10605

Email: peb@mgroupusa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material to perform peer reviews is appropriate as the auditors perform audits with no input from the QCM provider - these materials are merely a tool used in order to perform an audit more efficiently. Auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer or QCM provider.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, since the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Paul Siegel [paul.siegel@perlsontouhy.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 4:47 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Paul
Last Name: Siegel
Title: Partner
Company: Perlson Touhy & Co LLP
Address 1: 977 North Broadway
Address 2:
City: North Massapequa
State: NY
Zip: 11758

Email: paul.siegel@perlsontouhy.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: HAROLD ZOREF [HZOREF@ZOREF.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 4:53 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: HAROLD
Last Name: ZOREF
Title: MANAGING MEMBER
Company: HAROLD ZOREF LLP
Address 1: 733 THIRD AVE
Address 2: 21ST FLOOR
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10017

Email: HZOREF@ZOREF.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Seong Ho Jeong [shjesq@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 4:53 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Seong Ho
Last Name: Jeong
Title: Partner
Company: Samwoo LLP
Address 1: 120 W. 31st Street 5th Floor
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10001

Email: shjesq@gmail.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: STUART JASPHY [SJASPHY@ZOREF.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 4:54 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: STUART
Last Name: JASPHY
Title: RISK MANAGER
Company: HAROLD ZOREF LLP
Address 1: 733 THIRD AVE
Address 2: 21ST FLOOR
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10017

Email: SJASPHY@ZOREF.COM

CPA: No
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Min Ho Choi [mchoi@samwoocpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 4:55 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Min Ho
Last Name: Choi
Title: Supervisor
Company: Samwoo LLP
Address 1: 120 W. 31st Street 5th Floor
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10001

Email: mchoi@samwoocpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Jeffrey Kamler [jkamler@klncpas.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 4:56 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jeffrey
Last Name: Kamler
Title: Partner
Company: Kamler,Lewis and Noreman LLP
Address 1: 1 Linden Place
Address 2:
City: Great Neck
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: jkamler@klncpas.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Paul Touhy [paul.touhy@perlsontouhy.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 5:35 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Paul
Last Name: Touhy
Title: Partner
Company: Perlson, Touhy & Co. LLP
Address 1: 977 North Broadway
Address 2:
City: North Massapequa
State: NY
Zip: 11758

Email: paul.touhy@perlsontouhy.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: DAVE COHEN [DAVE@JMLEVY.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 5:47 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: DAVE
Last Name: COHEN
Title: PARTNER
Company: JACQUES M LEVY LLP
Address 1: 150 GREAT NECK ROAD
Address 2:
City: GREAT NECK
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: DAVE@JMLEVY.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: MORTON OFSIE [MORTY@jmlevy.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 5:49 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: MORTON
Last Name: OFSIE
Title: PARTNER
Company: JACQUES M LEVY LLP
Address 1: 150 GREAT NECK ROAD
Address 2:
City: GREAT NECK
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: MORTY@jmlevy.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: jeff isaacson [isaacson@zapkenandloeb.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 6:00 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: jeff
Last Name: isaacson
Title: cpa
Company: zapken & loeb, llc
Address 1: 99 woodbury road
Address 2:
City: hicksville
State: ny
Zip: 11801

Email: isaacson@zapkenandloeb.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Norman Pearlman [Peanor@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 6:09 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Norman
Last Name: Pearlman
Title: CPA
Company: Norman Pearlman CPA
Address 1: 836 Hempstead Avenue
Address 2:
City: West Hempstead
State: NY
Zip: 11552

Email: Peanor@aol.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

I want to have a peer reviewer who is professional enough to write quality control material.

King, LaShaun

From: Jeffrey Shlefstein [jshlefstein@tantoncpas.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 7:22 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jeffrey
Last Name: Shlefstein
Title: Head of Accounting and Auditing
Company: Tanton and Company LLP
Address 1: 37 West 57th Street
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10019

Email: jshlefstein@tantoncpas.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: April Quartarone [atq@mgroupusa.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 9:24 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: April
Last Name: Quartarone
Title: Senior
Company: Maier, Markey & Justic, LLP
Address 1: 222 Bloomingdale Rd
Address 2:
City: White Plains
State: NY
Zip: 10605

Email: atq@mgroupusa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: JACK GOLD [JGOLD@AKMCPA.COM]
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 11:06 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: JACK
Last Name: GOLD
Title: PARTNER
Company: ADELMAN KATZ & MOND LLP
Address 1: 230 W 41ST ST
Address 2:
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10036

Email: JGOLD@AKMCPA.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: John Andiola [jandiola@skpny.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 11:13 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: John
Last Name: Andiola
Title: Senior Accountant
Company: Spielman Koenigsberg & Parker LLP Address 1: 888 7th Avenue Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10106

Email: jandiola@skpny.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: elise huang [ehuang@lernalersipkin.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 11:31 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: elise
Last Name: huang
Title: cpa
Company: lerner&sipkin cpa
Address 1: 132 nassau street
Address 2:
City: new york
State: ny
Zip: 10038

Email: ehuang@lernalersipkin.com

CPA: No
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: william tam [cpa@billtam.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 11:50 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: william
Last Name: tam
Title: cpa
Company: william tam CPA
Address 1: 132 Nassau Street, suite 515
Address 2:
City: new york
State: NY
Zip: 10038

Email: cpa@billtam.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Felice Mergruen [fmergruen@optonline.net]
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 12:17 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Felice
Last Name: Mergruen
Title: CPA
Company: Felice Mergruen CPA
Address 1: 34 Melanie Lane
Address 2:
City: Syosset
State: NY
Zip: 11791

Email: fmergruen@optonline.net

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Barry Sprung [Barry@cohenandsprung.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 1:16 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Barry
Last Name: Sprung
Title: Member
Company: Cohen & Sprung Assoc
Address 1: 1250 Union Turnpike
Address 2:
City: New Hyde Park
State: NY
Zip: 11040

Email: Barry@cohenandsprung.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: MARGO KANE [mkanecpa@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2010 2:32 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: MARGO
Last Name: KANE
Title: CPA
Company: MARGO KANE, CPA
Address 1: 10 BRIGHTON RD SOUTH
Address 2:
City: MANHASSET
State: NY
Zip: 11030

Email: mkanecpa@aol.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Peter Markey [pbm@mgroupusa.com]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 9:40 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Peter
Last Name: Markey
Title: Partner
Company: Maier Markey & Justic LLP
Address 1: 222 Bloomingdale Road
Address 2: Suite 400
City: White Plains
State: NY
Zip: 10605

Email: pbm@mgroupusa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Lisa McNicol [lmcnicol@skpny.com]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 10:05 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Lisa
Last Name: McNicol
Title: Senior Accountant
Company: Spielman Koenigsberg & Parker LLP Address 1: 888 Seventh Avenue Address 2: 35th Floor
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10106

Email: lmcnicol@skpny.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: John Stanik [jstanik@skpny.com]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 10:07 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: John
Last Name: Stanik
Title: Auditor
Company: SKP, LLP
Address 1: 888 7th Avenue
Address 2: 35 floor
City: New York
State: ny
Zip: 10106

Email: jstanik@skpny.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Shane Hogan [shogan@skpny.com]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 10:34 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Shane
Last Name: Hogan
Title: Accountant
Company: Spielman Koenigsberg & Parker, LLP Address 1: 888 Seventh Avenue Address 2: 35th Floor
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10106

Email: shogan@skpny.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Michael Bonaiuto [mbonaiuto@cmdrco.com]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 10:46 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Bonaiuto
Title: Partner
Company: Catenacci Markowitz DeLandri Rosner & Co Address 1: 37 Saw Mill River Rd Address 2:
City: Hawthorne
State: NY
Zip: 10532

Email: mbonaiuto@cmdrco.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: ANTHONY FERNANDES JR [TFERNANDES@CMDRCO.COM]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 10:58 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: ANTHONY
Last Name: FERNANDES JR
Title: CPA
Company: CATENACCI MARKOWITZ,ETAL
Address 1: 37 SAW MILL RIVER RD
Address 2:
City: HAWTHORNE
State: NY
Zip: 10532

Email: TFERNANDES@CMDRCO.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Larry Feldman [larryf@shcpa.com]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 12:39 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Larry
Last Name: Feldman
Title: Partner
Company: Schwartz & Horfflich LLP
Address 1: 37 North Avenue
Address 2:
City: Norwalk
State: CT
Zip: 06851

Email: larryf@shcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Gilbert Watkins [gwatins@shcpa.com]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 12:57 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Gilbert
Last Name: Watkins
Title: Partner
Company: Schwartz & Hofflich LLP
Address 1: 37 North Avenue
Address 2:
City: Norwalk
State: CT
Zip: 06851

Email: gwatins@shcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: ERIC PRESCOTT [EPRESCOTT@SHCPA.COM]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 1:06 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: ERIC
Last Name: PRESCOTT
Title: PARTNER
Company: SCHWARTZ & HOFFLICH LLP
Address 1: 37 NORTH AVE
Address 2:
City: NORWALK
State: CT
Zip: 06851

Email: EPRESCOTT@SHCPA.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: BARRY NEWMAN [bnewman@shcpa.com]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 1:11 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: BARRY
Last Name: NEWMAN
Title: PARTNER
Company: SCHWARTZ & HOFFLICH LLP
Address 1: 37 NORTH AVENUE
Address 2:
City: NORWALK
State: CT
Zip: 06851

Email: bnewman@shcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Jeffrey Thomas [jthomas@cmdrco.com]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 1:33 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jeffrey
Last Name: Thomas
Title: Partner
Company: Catenacci Markowitz delandri Rosner & Co.
Address 1: 37 Saw Mill River Road
Address 2:
City: Hawthorne
State: NY
Zip: 10532

Email: jthomas@cmdrco.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Richard Peterson [rpeterson@cmdrco.com]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 1:35 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Richard
Last Name: Peterson
Title: Partner
Company: CMDR & Co
Address 1: 5 Old Penny Rd.
Address 2: 37 Saw Mill River Rd.
City: Pawling
State: NY
Zip: 12564

Email: rpeterson@cmdrco.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: BRIAN RAFFERTY [BRAFFERTY@CMDRCO.COM]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 4:07 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: BRIAN
Last Name: RAFFERTY
Title: PARTNER
Company: CATENACCI MARKOWITZ DELANDRI ROSNER Address 1: 37 SAW MILL RIVER ROAD Address 2:
City: HAWTHORNE
State: NY
Zip: 10532

Email: BRAFFERTY@CMDRCO.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Carl Cesarano [carl.cesarano@ck-cpas.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 27, 2010 10:51 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Carl
Last Name: Cesarano
Title: P.C. Principal
Company: Cesarano & Khan, CPAs, PC
Address 1: 249-02 Jericho Turnpike
Address 2: Suite 207
City: Floral Park
State: NY
Zip: 11001

Email: carl.cesarano@ck-cpas.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Alexander Rosenfeld [alex@arosenfeldcpa.com]
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 12:15 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Alexander
Last Name: Rosenfeld
Title: Owner
Company: Alexander Rosenfeld CPA
Address 1: 25 East Spring Valley Avenue
Address 2: Suite 310
City: Maywood
State: NJ
Zip: 07607

Email: alex@arosenfeldcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: harvey tanton [harvey@tantoncpas.com]
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 12:30 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: harvey
Last Name: tanton
Title: partner
Company: tanton and company llp
Address 1: 37 west 57th st
Address 2:
City: new york
State: ny
Zip: 10019

Email: harvey@tantoncpas.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Lawrence Katz [lkatz@akmcpa.com]
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 2:18 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Lawrence
Last Name: Katz
Title: CPA
Company: Adelman Katz & Mond LLP
Address 1: 230 West 41 Street
Address 2: 15th Floor
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10036

Email: lkatz@akmcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Jonathan Taylor [Jtaylor@skpny.com]
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 2:45 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jonathan
Last Name: Taylor
Title: Partner
Company: Spielman Koenigsberg & Parker LLP Address 1: 888 Seventh Ave.
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10106

Email: Jtaylor@skpny.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Daniel Lipman [Dlipman@skpny.com]
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 5:10 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Daniel
Last Name: Lipman
Title: Partner
Company: Spielman Koenigsberg & Parker LLP Address 1: 888 Seventh Ave.
Address 2: 35th Floor
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10106

Email: Dlipman@skpny.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Donna Naveo [DNAVEO@SKPNY.COM]
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 5:14 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Donna
Last Name: Naveo
Title: Partner
Company: Spielman Koenigsberg & Parker LLP Address 1: 888 Seventh Ave.
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10106

Email: DNAVEO@SKPNY.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Marilyn Schneider [MSchneider@klncpas.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 7:39 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Marilyn
Last Name: Schneider
Title: Manager
Company: Kamler, Lewis & Noreman LLP
Address 1: 1 Linden Plaza
Address 2:
City: Great Neck
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: MSchneider@klncpas.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Gary Parker [Gparker@skpny.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 9:46 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Gary
Last Name: Parker
Title: Partner
Company: Spielman Koenigsberg & Parker LLP Address 1: 888 Seventh Ave.
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10106

Email: Gparker@skpny.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Richard Koenigsberg [Rkoenigsberg@skpny.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 9:47 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Richard
Last Name: Koenigsberg
Title: Partner
Company: Spielman Koenigsberg and Parker Address 1: 888 Seventh Avenue Address 2: 35th Floor
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10106

Email: Rkoenigsberg@skpny.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Whitney Ibarra [wibarra@skpny.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 9:48 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Whitney
Last Name: Ibarra
Title: Accountant
Company: Spielman, Koenigsberg & Parker, LLP Address 1: 888 Seventh Avenue - 35th Floor Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10106

Email: wibarra@skpny.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: ANTHONY BEFI [TBEFI@CMDRCO.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 9:49 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: ANTHONY
Last Name: BEFI
Title: PTR
Company: CATENACCI MARKOWITZ DELANDRI
Address 1: 37 SAW MILL RIVER RD
Address 2:
City: HAWTHORNE
State: NY
Zip: 10532

Email: TBEFI@CMDRCO.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Jolene Langer [jlanger@skpny.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 9:49 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jolene
Last Name: Langer
Title: Senior Accountant
Company: Spielman, Koenigsberg, & Parker, LLP Address 1: 888 7th Ave, 35th Fl Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10106

Email: jlanger@skpny.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Catherine Loch [cloch@skpny.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 10:08 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Catherine
Last Name: Loch
Title: CPA
Company: Spielman, Koenigsberg & Parker, LLP Address 1: 888 Seventh Avenue, 35th Floor Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10106

Email: cloch@skpny.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Frank Pellegrino [fpellegrino@pscparfirm.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 1:09 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Frank
Last Name: Pellegrino
Title: Partner
Company: Pellegrino & Sherwin, LLP
Address 1: 22 Saw Mill River Road
Address 2:
City: Hawthorne
State: NY
Zip: 10532

Email: fpellegrino@pscparfirm.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

As a practitioner I want the ability to choose a peer review firm that is competent in dealing with issues as they relate to our size firm and practice. The understanding to perform of how to perform an examination of financial statements for relatively small, closely held businesses in an efficient yet technically competent manner is vital for the successful completion of a peer review.

King, LaShaun

From: Susan Barossi [sbarossi@odmd.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 1:16 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Susan
Last Name: Barossi
Title: Partner
Company: O' Connor Davies Munns & Dobbins LLP Address 1: One Barker Avenue Address 2:
City: White Plains
State: NY
Zip: 10601

Email: sbarossi@odmd.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be not be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Susan Barossi [sbarossi@odmd.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 1:16 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Susan
Last Name: Barossi
Title: Partner
Company: O' Connor Davies Munns & Dobbins LLP Address 1: One Barker Avenue Address 2:
City: White Plains
State: NY
Zip: 10601

Email: sbarossi@odmd.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be not be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Qinghua Chen [qchen@pscparfirm.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 1:34 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Qinghua
Last Name: Chen
Title: Staff
Company: Pellegrino & Sherwin, LLP
Address 1: 22 Saw Mill River Road
Address 2:
City: Hawthorne
State: NY
Zip: 10532

Email: qchen@pscparfirm.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Helena Choi [hchoi@pscparfirm.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 1:36 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Helena
Last Name: Choi
Title: Accountant
Company: Pellegrino & Sherwin, LLp
Address 1: 22 Saw Mill River Road
Address 2:
City: Hawthorne
State: NY
Zip: 10532

Email: hchoi@pscparfirm.com

CPA: No
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Craig Venokur [cvenokur@akmcpa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 1:46 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Craig
Last Name: Venokur
Title: Partner
Company: Adelman Katz & MOnd, LLP
Address 1: 230 West 41st -15th floor
Address 2:
City: new york
State: ny
Zip: 10036

Email: cvenokur@akmcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

We want the ability to hire a peer reviewer that has the experience and confidence to write quality control material.

King, LaShaun

From: DENNIS WILLIAMS [dwilliams@pscparfirm.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 2:12 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: DENNIS
Last Name: WILLIAMS
Title: ACCOUNTANT
Company: PELLEGRINO & SHERWIN, LLP
Address 1: 22 SAW MILL RIVER RD
Address 2:
City: HAWTHORNE
State: NY
Zip: 10532

Email: dwilliams@pscparfirm.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

I believe the current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material to perform peer reviews is appropriate. The current safeguards for maintaining Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Moreover, it is the auditors responsibility for audit decisions and conclusions and not the firms peer reviewer, Quality Control Material or the relationship between the firms peer reviewer and the Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

I have no independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. No additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

Our firm must have the ability to choose a peer reviewer that is competent and experienced in dealing with issues as they relate to our size firm and practice. Their understanding of how to perform an examination of financial statements for small, closely held businesses in an efficient and competent manner is vital for the successful completion of peer review.

King, LaShaun

From: Kenneth Katzman [kkatzman@kwco-cpa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 2:36 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Kenneth
Last Name: Katzman
Title: CPA
Company: Katzman, Weinstein & Co LLP
Address 1: 131 Jericho Tpke
Address 2:
City: Jericho
State: NY
Zip: 11753

Email: kkatzman@kwco-cpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: GARY ADLER [ADLER@BASSLEMER.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 2:37 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: GARY
Last Name: ADLER
Title: PARTNER
Company: BASS & LEMER LLP
Address 1: 836 HEMPSTEAD AVENUE
Address 2:
City: WEST HEMPSTEAD
State: NY
Zip: 11552

Email: ADLER@BASSLEMER.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Allen Weinstein [aweinstein@kwco-cpa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 5:14 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Allen
Last Name: Weinstein
Title: CPA
Company: Katzman,Weinstein & Co, LLP
Address 1: 131 Jericho Turnpike
Address 2:
City: Jericho
State: NY
Zip: 11753

Email: aweinstein@kwco-cpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Allen Weinstein [aweinstein@kwco-cpa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 5:19 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Allen
Last Name: Weinstein
Title: CPA
Company: Katzman,Weinstein & Co,LLP
Address 1: 131 Jericho Turnpike
Address 2:
City: Jericho
State: NY
Zip: 11753

Email: aweinstein@kwco-cpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Bernard Dorfman [bdorfman@jpopkin.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2010 10:05 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Bernard
Last Name: Dorfman
Title: Audit Manager
Company: Joel Popkin & Company, P.C.
Address 1: 1430 Broadway
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: bdorfman@jpopkin.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Joseph Boyce [jboyce@boyce-cpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2010 12:39 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Joseph
Last Name: Boyce
Title: CPA
Company: Joseph G Boyce CPA PC
Address 1: 1010 Franklin Avenue
Address 2: 2nd Floor
City: Garden City
State: NY
Zip: 11530

Email: jboyce@boyce-cpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Richard Bosco [rbosco@boscojohnn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2010 12:42 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Richard
Last Name: Bosco
Title: CPA
Company: Bosco, Johnn & Company, CPA, P.C.
Address 1: 90 Columbus Avenue
Address 2:
City: Valhalla
State: NY
Zip: 10595

Email: rbosco@boscojohnn.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Laurence Bloom [larry@katzbloomcpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2010 1:35 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Laurence
Last Name: Bloom
Title: Member
Company: Katz Bloom & Schon CPAs LLC
Address 1: 500 North Broadway #145
Address 2:
City: Jericho
State: ny
Zip: 11753

Email: larry@katzbloomcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

Our firm works with the Advantage Audit programs in conjunction with other practice aid materials. Our staff has become confident in using these materials. The decision to use the Advantage Audit program was our firm's choice and not at the insistence of the supplier of the materials who also performs our peer review. We find it more user friendly than the PPC approach. The Advantage Audit program itself is peer reviewed by a firm independent of the producer of the program

King, LaShaun

From: Laurie Konecky-Watt [laurie@katzbloomcpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2010 1:52 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Laurie
Last Name: Konecky-Watt
Title: CPA
Company: Katz Bloom & Schon CPAs LLC
Address 1: 500 North Broadway
Address 2:
City: Jericho
State: NY
Zip: 11753

Email: laurie@katzbloomcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Lawrence Spirio II [LSpirio2@kwco-cpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2010 5:52 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Lawrence
Last Name: Spirio II
Title: Partner
Company: Katzman, Weinstein & Co, LLP
Address 1: 131 Jericho Turnpike
Address 2:
City: Jericho
State: NY
Zip: 11753

Email: LSpirio2@kwco-cpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: David Hentoff [dhentoff@khp-cpa.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 01, 2010 11:23 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: David
Last Name: Hentoff
Title: Partner
Company: Kennedy, Hentoff & Patterson, LLP Address 1: 181 Wells Avenue Address 2: Suite 301
City: Newton
State: Ma
Zip: 02459

Email: dhentoff@khp-cpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

No. I do not believe there would be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs or to find a qualified peer reviewer.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Carole Newman [cnewman@nnkllp.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 01, 2010 11:33 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Carole
Last Name: Newman
Title: Partner
Company: Newman, Newman & Kaufman, LLP
Address 1: 575 Underhill Blvd.
Address 2: 575 Underhill Blvd., Suite 100
City: Syosset
State: NY
Zip: 11791

Email: cnewman@nnkllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

We prefer to have a peer reviewer with enough professional experience to be able to write Quality Control material.

King, LaShaun

From: Neil Kaufman [nkaufman@nnkllp.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 01, 2010 11:44 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Neil
Last Name: Kaufman
Title: Partner
Company: Newman Newman & Kaufman LLP
Address 1: 575 Underhill Blvd
Address 2:
City: Syosset
State: NY
Zip: 11791

Email: nkaufman@nnkllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

It is important to have a peer reviewer with the knowledge and professional experience to write quality control material.

King, LaShaun

From: Darren Newman [dnewman@nnkllp.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 01, 2010 11:48 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Darren
Last Name: Newman
Title: Partner
Company: Newman, Newman & Kaufman, LLP
Address 1: 575 Underhill Blvd.
Address 2: Suite 100
City: Syosset
State: NY
Zip: 11791

Email: dnewman@nnkllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

Our peer reviewer should have the professional experience and expertise to be able to write Quality Control Material.

King, LaShaun

From: Jason Kaylie [jkaylie@nknllp.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 01, 2010 11:52 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jason
Last Name: Kaylie
Title: Manager
Company: Newman, Newman and Kaufman, LLP Address 1: 575 Underhill Blvd Address 2: Suite 100
City: Syosset
State: Ny
Zip: 11021

Email: jkaylie@nknllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

Our peer reviewer should have enough professional experience to be able to write quality control material.

King, LaShaun

From: Toby Hall [thall@nknllp.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 01, 2010 11:56 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Toby
Last Name: Hall
Title: Manager, CPA
Company: Newman, Newman & Kaufman LLP
Address 1: 575 Underhill Blvd.
Address 2:
City: Syosset
State: NY
Zip: 11791

Email: thall@nknllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

We want our peer reviewer to have sufficient experience to write Quality Control material.

King, LaShaun

From: Dina Morabito [dmorabito@auzzo.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 01, 2010 12:41 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Dina
Last Name: Morabito
Title: CPA
Company: A. Uzzo & Company, CPA's, PC
Address 1: 287 Bowman Avenue
Address 2:
City: Purchase
State: NY
Zip: 10577

Email: dmorabito@auzzo.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

I want a peer review competent enough to write quality control materials.

King, LaShaun

From: Mitchell Tanner [mrt1@optonline.net]
Sent: Thursday, July 01, 2010 1:40 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Mitchell
Last Name: Tanner
Title: CPA
Company: M R Tanner, CPA
Address 1: 168 Woodlands Drive
Address 2:
City: Tuxedo Park
State: NY
Zip: 10987

Email: mrt1@optonline.net

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Ross Kass [ross@cpasrus.com]
Sent: Friday, July 02, 2010 12:10 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Ross
Last Name: Kass
Title: CPA/Presidnt
Company: Jablons Kass and Company CPAs
Address 1: 40 Marcus Drive - Ste 202
Address 2:
City: Melville
State: NY
Zip: 11747

Email: ross@cpasrus.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Steven Greenberg [sgcpa@islandtax.com]
Sent: Friday, July 02, 2010 12:16 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Steven
Last Name: Greenberg
Title: CPA
Company: Steven Greenberg & Co, CPAs, PC Address 1: 40 Marcus Drive Ste 202 Address 2:
City: Melville
State: NY
Zip: 11747

Email: sgcpa@islandtax.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Steven Markovits [smarkovi@pscherer.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 8:48 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Steven
Last Name: Markovits
Title: Partner
Company: Paul Sherer & Company LLP
Address 1: 1440 Broadway
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: smarkovi@pscherer.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Bernard Rothbort [brothbor@pscherer.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 9:58 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Bernard
Last Name: Rothbort
Title: Partner
Company: Paul Scherer &Company
Address 1: 1440 Broadway
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 11746

Email: brothbor@pscherer.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Jim Vella [jvella@pscherer.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 10:09 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jim
Last Name: Vella
Title: Partner
Company: Paul Scherer & Co. LLP
Address 1: 1440 Broadway
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: jvella@pscherer.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Catherine Strick [cstrick@pscherer.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 10:11 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Catherine
Last Name: Strick
Title: Partner
Company: Paul Scherer & Company LLP
Address 1: 1440 Broadway
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: cstrick@pscherer.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Annis La Malfa [alamalfa@pscherer.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 10:14 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Annis
Last Name: La Malfa
Title: Audit Partner
Company: Paul Scherer & Co LLP
Address 1: 1440 Broadway
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: alamalfa@pscherer.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: William Minoff [wminoff@pscherer.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 11:14 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: William
Last Name: Minoff
Title: Partner
Company: Paul Scherer & Company LLP
Address 1: 1440 Broadway 12th Fl.
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: wminoff@pscherer.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Mark Risco [mrisco@pscherer.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 10:31 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Mark
Last Name: Risco
Title: Manager
Company: Paul Scherer & Company LLP
Address 1: 1440 Broadway
Address 2: 12th Floor
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: mrisco@pscherer.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: JAMES MARTIN [jmartin@pscherer.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 11:16 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: JAMES
Last Name: MARTIN
Title: PARTNER
Company: PAUL SCHERER & COMPANY LLP
Address 1: 1440 BROADWAY, 12TH FL
Address 2:
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 07661

Email: jmartin@pscherer.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: I-Mei Wang [iwang@pscherer.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 3:35 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: I-Mei
Last Name: Wang
Title: Accountant
Company: Paul Scherer & Company LLP
Address 1: 1440 Broadway, 12FL
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: iwang@pscherer.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: blaise fredella [bfredella@auzzo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 5:38 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: blaise
Last Name: fredella
Title: C.P.A.
Company: A. Uzzo & Company, C.P.A.'s, P.C.
Address 1: 287 bowman avenue
Address 2:
City: Purchase
State: ny
Zip: 10577

Email: bfredella@auzzo.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

I want a peer reviewer competent enough to write quality control materials

King, LaShaun

From: Michael Pollack [mpollack@kbl.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 6:40 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Pollack
Title: Partner
Company: KBL, LLP
Address 1: 110 Wall Street
Address 2: 11th Floor
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10005

Email: mpollack@kbl.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: STANLEY MALAGA [smalagacpa@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 2010 2:28 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: STANLEY
Last Name: MALAGA
Title: PRESIDENT
Company: STANLEY MALAGA CPA, P.C.
Address 1: 2805 VETERANS MEMORIAL HWY
Address 2:
City: RONKONKOMA
State: NY
Zip: 11779

Email: smalagacpa@gmail.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

I think that it would be most appropriate for those who are involved in the development and maintenance of QMC or CPE programs to serve on review teams to peer review firms that use those QCM or CPE programs. The people involved can then determine how the programs are working and if any modifications or revisions are necessary.

King, LaShaun

From: Anthony Uzzo [auzzo@auzzo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 2010 3:48 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Anthony
Last Name: Uzzo
Title: President
Company: A. Uzzo & Company, CPA's PC
Address 1: 287 Bowman Ave
Address 2:
City: Purchase
State: NY
Zip: 10577

Email: auzzo@auzzo.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

I want a peer reviewer competent enough to write quality control materials.

King, LaShaun

From: Michael Carlon [mcarlon@geltrude.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 2010 4:04 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Carlon
Title: Partner
Company: Geltrude & COmpany, LLC
Address 1: 517 Franklin Ave
Address 2:
City: Nutley
State: NJ
Zip: 07110

Email: mcarlon@geltrude.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

I appreciate my peer reviewer having the knowledge and background to publish Quality control material

King, LaShaun

From: Maria Geltrude [mgeltrude@geltrude.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 2010 4:16 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Maria
Last Name: Geltrude
Title: Manager
Company: Geltrude& Company
Address 1: 245 Whitford Avenue
Address 2:
City: Nutley
State: NJ
Zip: 07110

Email: mgeltrude@geltrude.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Daniel Geltrude [DGeltrude@Geltrude.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 2010 4:29 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Daniel
Last Name: Geltrude
Title: Managing Partner
Company: Geltrude & Company
Address 1: 517 Franklin Ave.
Address 2:
City: Nutley
State: NJ
Zip: 07110

Email: DGeltrude@Geltrude.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Monali Patel [mpatel@geltrude.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 08, 2010 8:52 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Monali
Last Name: Patel
Title: Senior Accountant
Company: Geltrude & Co.
Address 1: 517 Franklin avenue
Address 2:
City: Nutley
State: NJ
Zip: 07110

Email: mpatel@geltrude.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: curtis granet [cgranet@granetandassoc.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 08, 2010 4:13 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: curtis
Last Name: granet
Title: partner
Company: granet & associates
Address 1: 350 seventh ave
Address 2:
City: nyc
State: ny
Zip: 10001

Email: cgranet@granetandassoc.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: ROY HOFFMANN [RHOFFMANN@GRANETANDASSOC.COM]
Sent: Thursday, July 08, 2010 4:38 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: ROY
Last Name: HOFFMANN
Title: CPA
Company: GRANET AND ASSOCIATES, CPA'S
Address 1: 350-7TH AVENUE
Address 2: SUITE 402
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10001

Email: RHOFFMANN@GRANETANDASSOC.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: paul rappoport [prappoport@granetandassoc.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 08, 2010 4:28 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: paul
Last Name: rappoport
Title: partner
Company: granet and associates cpa
Address 1: 350 7th ave #402
Address 2:
City: new york
State: ny
Zip: 1001

Email: prappoport@granetandassoc.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Cary Lange [LangeCPA@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, July 09, 2010 12:54 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Cary
Last Name: Lange
Title: Owner
Company: Cary D. Lange, CPA
Address 1: 12 Drury Court
Address 2:
City: Holtsville
State: NY
Zip: 11742

Email: LangeCPA@aol.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: DEEPAK DOSHI [SDDOSHI@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Friday, July 09, 2010 5:48 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: DEEPAK
Last Name: DOSHI
Title: OWNER
Company: DOSHI CPA
Address 1: 78 BOGART AVENUE
Address 2:
City: PORT WASHINGTON
State: NY
Zip: 11050

Email: SDDOSHI@HOTMAIL.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight. Any independence in appearance issues may be addressed by providing some safeguards.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. As mentioned in response to question 2, additional safeguards may be instituted.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Jeffery Frega [jfrega@ramsey-cpa.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 12:01 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jeffery
Last Name: Frega
Title: Partner
Company: Fulton, Timmes, Frega & Straubinger, PA Address 1: 6 Arrow Rd Address 2:
City: Ramsey
State: NJ
Zip: 07446

Email: jfrega@ramsey-cpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Jeffrey Fulton [jfulton@ramsey-cpa.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 12:12 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jeffrey
Last Name: Fulton
Title: CPA
Company: Fulton Timmes Frega & Straubinger PA CPA's Address 1: 6 Arrow Road Address 2: Suite 200
City: Ramsey
State: nj
Zip: 07446

Email: jfulton@ramsey-cpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Martin Berkowitz [mberkowitz@lutzandcarr.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 10:32 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Martin
Last Name: Berkowitz
Title: Partner
Company: Lutz and Carr
Address 1: 300 East 42nd St
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10017

Email: mberkowitz@lutzandcarr.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: JEFFERY Frega [jfrega@ramsey-cpa.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 11:59 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: JEFFERY
Last Name: Frega
Title: Partner
Company: Fulton, Timmes, Frega & Straubinger, PA Address 1: 6 Arrow Rd Address 2:
City: Ramsey
State: NJ
Zip: 07446

Email: jfrega@ramsey-cpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Robert Timmes [rtimmes@ramsey-cpa.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 1:07 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Robert
Last Name: Timmes
Title: Partner
Company: Fulton, Timmes, Frega & Straubinger Address 1: 6 Arrow Road Address 2: Suite 200
City: Ramsey
State: NJ
Zip: 07446

Email: rtimmes@ramsey-cpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Robert Timmes [rtimmes@ramsey-cpa.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 1:10 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Robert
Last Name: Timmes
Title: Partner
Company: Fulton, Timmes, Frega & Straubinger Address 1: 6 Arrow Road Address 2: Suite 200
City: Ramsey
State: NJ
Zip: 07446

Email: rtimmes@ramsey-cpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Jeffrey Fulton [jfulton@ramsey-cpa.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 12:10 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jeffrey
Last Name: Fulton
Title: CPA
Company: Fulton Timmes Frega & Straubinger PA CPA's Address 1: 6 Arrow Road Address 2: Suite 200
City: Ramsey
State: NJ
Zip: 07446

Email: jfulton@ramsey-cpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: arthur yorkes [arthuryorkes@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 2:23 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: arthur
Last Name: yorkes
Title: partner
Company: arthur yorkes & company llp
Address 1: 520 8th Ave
Address 2:
City: New york
State: ny
Zip: 10018

Email: arthuryorkes@aol.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Steven Straubinger [sstraubinger@ramsey-cpa.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 3:08 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Steven
Last Name: Straubinger
Title: Partner
Company: Fulton Timmes Frega and Straubinger Address 1: 6 Arrow Rd Address 2:
City: Ramsey
State: nj
Zip: 07446

Email: sstraubinger@ramsey-cpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Ben Milchman [bapeg5@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 5:45 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Ben
Last Name: Milchman
Title: CPA
Company: same as above
Address 1: 147-26 70th Avenue
Address 2:
City: Flushing
State: ny
Zip: 11367

Email: bapeg5@yahoo.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: ANDREW MUHLSTOCK [ANDY@M-ACPASNY.COM]
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2010 12:08 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: ANDREW
Last Name: MUHLSTOCK
Title: CPA, PARTNER
Company: MUHLSTOCK & ASSOCIATES, CPA'S PLLC Address 1: 21 PENN PLAZA #1006 Address 2:
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10001

Email: ANDY@M-ACPASNY.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: NITYA PRABHU [prabhcpa@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2010 12:37 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: NITYA
Last Name: PRABHU
Title: PARTNER/MANAGER
Company: MUHLSTOCK ASSOCIATES, LLP
Address 1: 21 PENN PALZA-10TH FLOOR
Address 2:
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10001

Email: prabhcpa@gmail.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: John Patrizio [jpatrizio@pzcpa.com]
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2010 2:21 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: John
Last Name: Patrizio
Title: Partner
Company: Patrizio & Zhao, LLC
Address 1: 322 Route 46 West
Address 2:
City: Parsippany
State: NJ
Zip: 07054

Email: jpatrizio@pzcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

Yes, It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Ather Ahmed [aahmed@pzcpa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2010 1:01 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Ather
Last Name: Ahmed
Title: Manager
Company: Patrizio & Zhao, LLC
Address 1: 322 Route 46 West
Address 2: Suite L100
City: Parsippany
State: NJ
Zip: 07054

Email: aahmed@pzcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Sarah Haar [shaar@basslemer.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2010 2:08 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Sarah
Last Name: Haar
Title: manager
Company: Bass & Lemer
Address 1: 836 Hempstead Avenue
Address 2:
City: West Hempstead
State: NY
Zip: 11552

Email: shaar@basslemer.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material. The quality control material we had used from a previous provider was too vague and we feel that the material we now use is very comprehensive &

OTHER COMMENTS:

question 5 continued: and tailored to our types of clients.

King, LaShaun

From: Michael Mansbach [mmansbach@pzcpa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2010 1:16 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Mansbach
Title: Tax Manager
Company: Patrizio & Zhao, LLC
Address 1: 322 Route 46 West - Suite L100 Address 2:
City: Parsippany
State: NJ
Zip: 07054

Email: mmansbach@pzcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Joel Quirk [jqquirk@edlllp.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2010 2:33 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Joel
Last Name: Quirk
Title: Partner
Company: Ernest D Loewenwarter & Co LLP
Address 1: 200 Old Country Road, Ste 274 Address 2:
City: Mineola
State: NY
Zip: 11572

Email: jqquirk@edlllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: William Kolbert [wkolbert@edllp.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2010 2:35 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: William
Last Name: Kolbert
Title: Partner
Company: ERnest D Loewenwarter & Co LLP
Address 1: 200 Old Country Raod, Ste 274 Address 2:
City: Mineola
State: NY
Zip: 11572

Email: wkolbert@edllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Joseph Brophy [jbrophy@edlllp.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2010 2:37 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Joseph
Last Name: Brophy
Title: Manager
Company: Ernest D Loewenwarter & Co LLP
Address 1: 200 Old Country Road, Ste 274 Address 2:
City: Mineola
State: NY
Zip: 11572

Email: jbrophy@edlllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: STANLEY ROTH [SROTH@STERNBACHCPA.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2010 2:38 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: STANLEY
Last Name: ROTH
Title: PARTNER
Company: LOUIS STERNBACH & CO., LLP
Address 1: 1333 BROADWAY
Address 2:
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10018

Email: SROTH@STERNBACHCPA.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Evan Whitacre [ewhitacre@edlllp.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2010 2:38 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Evan
Last Name: Whitacre
Title: Manager
Company: Ernest D Loewenwarter & Co LLP
Address 1: 200 Old Country Road, Ste 274 Address 2:
City: Mineola
State: NY
Zip: 11572

Email: ewhitacre@edlllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: INNA EARLEY [IEARLEY@PZCPA.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2010 3:22 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: INNA
Last Name: EARLEY
Title: SENIOR ACCOUNTANT
Company: PATRIZIO & ZHAO LLC
Address 1: 322 ROUTE 46 WEST
Address 2:
City: PARSIPPANY
State: NJ
Zip: 07054

Email: IEARLEY@PZCPA.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: JANI MIRCHANDANI [JMIRCHANDANI@PZCPA.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2010 3:30 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: JANI
Last Name: MIRCHANDANI
Title: SUPERVISING SR.
Company: PATRIZIO & ZHAO, LLC
Address 1: 322 ROUTE 46W
Address 2:
City: PARSIPPANY
State: NJ
Zip: 07054

Email: JMIRCHANDANI@PZCPA.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: LAWRENCE F GALLO [LGALLOSR@HOTMAIL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 8:35 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: LAWRENCE F
Last Name: GALLO
Title: CPA
Company: ROCHLIN GREENBLATT GALLO LLP
Address 1: 600 OLD COUNTRY RD SUITE 300
Address 2:
City: GARDEN CITY
State: NY
Zip: 11530

Email: LGALLOSR@HOTMAIL.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Wililam DeLuccio [DELUCCIOW@AOL.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 12:09 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Wililam
Last Name: DeLuccio
Title: CPA
Company: WILLIAM P. DeLUCCIO,CPA
Address 1: 440 Leverett Avenue
Address 2:
City: Staten Island
State: NY
Zip: 10308

Email: DELUCCIOW@AOL.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: James Garry [jim.garry@mcgovern-garryllc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 4:13 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: James
Last Name: Garry
Title: Partner
Company: McGovern Garry LLC
Address 1: 786 Mountain Blvd
Address 2: Suite 100
City: Watchung
State: NJ
Zip: 07069

Email: jim.garry@mcgovern-garryllc.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Michael Pucci [michael.pucci@mcgovern-garryllc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 3:51 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Pucci
Title: Partner
Company: McGovern Garry, LLC
Address 1: 786 Mountain Blvd
Address 2:
City: Watchung
State: NJ
Zip: 07069

Email: michael.pucci@mcgovern-garryllc.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Frank Hazen [frank.hazen@mcgovengarryllc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 4:11 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Frank
Last Name: Hazen
Title: Partner
Company: McGovern Garry LLC
Address 1: 786 Mountan Blvd
Address 2: Suite 100
City: Watchung
State: NJ
Zip: 07069

Email: frank.hazen@mcgovengarryllc.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Gary Kleiman [gary@garykleimancpa.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 9:56 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Gary
Last Name: Kleiman
Title: CPA
Company: Gary Kleiman, CPA, P.C.
Address 1: 1120 6th Ave
Address 2: 4th Floor
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10036

Email: gary@garykleimancpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

I am sure I speak on behalf of most of the CPA firms when I say that I strive to maintain the highest level of quality and compliance in terms of my accounting services. In connection with the above, I am thoroughly satisfied with my current peer reviewer because in addition to performing his peer review tasks, he provides me with excellent professional and intuitive feedback as it relates to the type of clients that I have.

King, LaShaun

From: Constance Glaser [connie@rosenandglaser.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 2:14 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Constance
Last Name: Glaser
Title: CPA
Company: Rosen and Glaser CPA's PC
Address 1: 60 Cuttermill Road
Address 2: Suite 310
City: Great Neck
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: connie@rosenandglaser.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

This proposed exposure draft will put an undue burden on small CPA firms who are trying to do a good job!

King, LaShaun

From: Jeffrey Glaser [jeff@rosenandglaser.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 2:25 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jeffrey
Last Name: Glaser
Title: President
Company: Rosen and Glaser CPA's PC
Address 1: 60 Cuttermill Road
Address 2: Suite 310
City: Great Neck
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: jeff@rosenandglaser.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

I feel small CPA firms will be affected the most by this proposed revision to peer reviews. The materials are a guide that help us to work more efficiently and allow us to do a professional job. This will end up costing small firms thousands of dollars-did anyone think of that!

King, LaShaun

From: Joel Schleifer [theschleif@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 8:09 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Joel
Last Name: Schleifer
Title: Partner
Company: Perlman Schleifer & Perrone CPA's Address 1: 1398 Deer Park Av Address 2:
City: No Babylon
State: NY
Zip: 11703

Email: theschleif@aol.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

I feel that there should be an opportunity for firms to be able to select practice aids that best suit their specific needs as long as these practice aids are peer reviewed. The market place should not be dominated by a single source vendor; rather there should be healthy competition to insure that firms have an opportunity to obtain practice aids that will enable them to serve their clients in an efficient a manner as possible and still be able to control costs.

King, LaShaun

From: Paul Naumann [pnaumann@edlllp.com]
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 4:04 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Paul
Last Name: Naumann
Title: CPA
Company: Loewenwarter & Co, LLP
Address 1: 200 Old Country Road
Address 2:
City: Mineola
State: NY
Zip: 11501

Email: pnaumann@edlllp.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Janet Bebry [bebry@rlvgcpa.com]
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 4:23 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Janet
Last Name: Bebry
Title: QC Mgr
Company: Rosenblatt, Levittan, Vulpis, Goetz Address 1: 1700 Jericho Tpke Address 2:
City: New Hyde Park
State: NY
Zip: 11040

Email: bebry@rlvgcpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: No

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: ira10017 strassberg [istrassberg@rogoff.com]
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2010 10:40 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: ira10017
Last Name: strassberg
Title: cpa
Company: rogoff & company pc
Address 1: 355 lexington ave
Address 2:
City: new york
State: ny
Zip: 10017

Email: istrassberg@rogoff.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Phillip Laycock [phillip.laycock@rogoff.com]
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2010 10:41 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Phillip
Last Name: Laycock
Title: Quality Control Director
Company: Rogoff & Company, P.C.
Address 1: 355 Lexington Avenue
Address 2: Sixth Floor
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10017

Email: phillip.laycock@rogoff.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Gerard Esposito [gerard.esposito@rogoff.com]
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2010 11:36 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Gerard
Last Name: Esposito
Title: Partner
Company: Rogoff & Company PC
Address 1: 355 Lexington Avenue
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10017

Email: gerard.esposito@rogoff.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: SAMUEL HERZOG [twozogs@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2010 9:03 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: SAMUEL
Last Name: HERZOG
Title: CPA
Company: SAMUEL A. HERZOG, CPA
Address 1: 1 FULTON PLACE
Address 2:
City: JERICHO
State: NY
Zip: 11753

Email: twozogs@yahoo.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Kenneth Mersel [ken@merselklein.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2010 11:53 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Kenneth
Last Name: Mersel
Title: Member
Company: Mersel, Klein & Company, LLP
Address 1: 450 Seventh Avenue, Suite 609 Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10123

Email: ken@merselklein.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Roy Goldstein [rgoldstein@rmgcpa.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2010 11:17 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Roy
Last Name: Goldstein
Title: Owner
Company: Roy M Goldstein
Address 1: 1 Crossways Park Drive West
Address 2:
City: Woodbury
State: NY
Zip: 11797

Email: rgoldstein@rmgcpa.net

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: John Grady [jgrady@hvc.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 03, 2010 1:29 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: John
Last Name: Grady
Title: Partner
Company: Bogush & Grady, CPA's, LLP
Address 1: 48 West Market Street
Address 2:
City: Rhinebeck
State: NY
Zip: 12572

Email: jgrady@hvc.rr.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Sandra Chin [sandra.chin8@verizon.net]
Sent: Friday, August 06, 2010 10:56 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Sandra
Last Name: Chin
Title: Partner
Company: Sarowitz Milito & Co.
Address 1: 169 West End Avenue
Address 2:
City: Brooklyn
State: NY
Zip: 11235

Email: sandra.chin8@verizon.net

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material to perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material be peer reviewed is more than adequate. The developer of Quality Control Material merely develops materials to assist the auditors in documenting adherence to auditing standards. The auditors use their professional judgement in making audit decisions and forming conclusions based on audit results.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. If the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight then the material meets auditing standards. As previously stated, the auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions, not the peer reviewer. The author of the Quality Control Material in no way influences the the decisions and conclusions reached by the auditor.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

I do not believe that the proposed revisions are necessary. I believe the current Peer Review Program meets the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. If the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and is subject to AICPA oversight then it is deemed to meet accounting and auditing standards.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

I believe it is more appropriate to have proper safeguards than prohibition. The current requirement of having the Quality Control Material peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight means that the material developed meets current accounting and auditing standards. The developer of such material in no way influences the decisions and conclusions made by the auditor.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain QCM programs and find a qualified peer reviewer. It will require our firm to change the QCM programs or peer reviewer we currently use. We prefer having a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to author Quality Control Material programs that meet peer review standards.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Jayson Prisand [jprisand@pmucpa.com]
Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 11:58 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Jayson
Last Name: Prisand
Title: Partner
Company: Prisand, Mellina, Unterlack & Co., LLP Address 1: 131 Sunnyside Blvd., Suite 106 Address 2:
City: Plainview
State: NY
Zip: 11803

Email: jprisand@pmucpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Edward L Monaco [elmcpa@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 11:37 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Edward L
Last Name: Monaco
Title: Owner
Company: Edward L Monaco CPA
Address 1: 111 John Street
Address 2: Suite 1205
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10038

Email: elmcpa@verizon.net

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Norman Prisand [nprisand@pmucpa.com]
Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 2:18 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Norman
Last Name: Prisand
Title: Partner
Company: Prisand, Mellina, Unterlack & Co., LLP Address 1: 131 Sunnyside Boulevard, Suite 106 Address 2:
City: Plainview
State: NY
Zip: 11803

Email: nprisand@pmucpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material to perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: NEIL ROTH [NROTH@WFRKCPAS.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, August 10, 2010 12:01 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: NEIL
Last Name: ROTH
Title: VP
Company: WOHL
Address 1: 1775 BROADWAY
Address 2:
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10019

Email: NROTH@WFRKCPAS.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: STEVEN FRIED [SFRIED@WFRKCPAS.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, August 10, 2010 12:02 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: STEVEN
Last Name: FRIED
Title: VP
Company: WOHL FRIED ROTH & KIRCHENBERG
Address 1: 1775 BROADWAY
Address 2:
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10019

Email: SFRIED@WFRKCPAS.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: PAUL KIRCHENBERG [PKIRCHENBERG@WFRKCPAS.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, August 10, 2010 11:45 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: PAUL
Last Name: KIRCHENBERG
Title: MANAGING SHAREHOLDER
Company: WOHL FRIED ROTH & KIRCHENBERG
Address 1: 1775 BROADWAY
Address 2: SUITE 720
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10019

Email: PKIRCHENBERG@WFRKCPAS.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: PAUL KIRCHENBERG [PKIRCHENBERG@WFRKCPAS.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, August 10, 2010 11:45 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: PAUL
Last Name: KIRCHENBERG
Title: MANAGING SHAREHOLDER
Company: WOHL FRIED ROTH & KIRCHENBERG
Address 1: 1775 BROADWAY
Address 2: SUITE 720
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10019

Email: PKIRCHENBERG@WFRKCPAS.COM

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Matthew Kleiger [ftkleiger@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2010 4:55 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Matthew
Last Name: Kleiger
Title: CPA
Company: F.T. Kleiger and Company
Address 1: 80 Cuttermill Road
Address 2: Suite 306
City: Great Neck
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: ftkleiger@aol.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Howard Kleiger [howard@kleigerandkleiger.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2010 5:13 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Howard
Last Name: Kleiger
Title: CPA
Company: F.T. Kleiger and Company
Address 1: 80 Cuttermill Road
Address 2: Suite 306
City: Great Neck
State: NY
Zip: 11021

Email: howard@kleigerandkleiger.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Robert Werner [Rwerner@rnkcpas.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 12, 2010 9:38 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Robert
Last Name: Werner
Title: Principal
Company: Rosenberg, Neuwirth & Kuchner
Address 1: 2 Penn Plaza
Address 2: Floor 4
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10121

Email: Rwerner@rnkcpas.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Hsien Chung Elliot Yang [eyangcpa@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 12, 2010 10:14 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Hsien Chung Elliot
Last Name: Yang
Title: CPA
Company: J & E Company
Address 1: 109 Sayre Drive
Address 2:
City: Princeton
State: NJ
Zip: 08540

Email: eyangcpa@comcast.net

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Ronald DeSoiza [rdesoiza@grafrepetti.com]
Sent: Monday, August 16, 2010 10:04 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Ronald
Last Name: DeSoiza
Title: Partner
Company: Graf Repetti & Co. LLP
Address 1: 15 Raymond Street
Address 2:
City: Darien
State: CT
Zip: 06820

Email: rdesoiza@grafrepetti.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight. If the board believes that there are independence concerns here, why did they not prohibit reviewer firms from doing follow up monitoring or consulting for peer reviewed firms.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate. As far as I know, there have no abuses found in the peer review program from reviewers supplying quality control materials.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary. Peer reviews are already oversighted and quality control materials are already peer reviewed. How many additional layers of control are needed?

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

If the peer review oversight process and peer review of quality control materials is functioning correctly, I do not see the need for additional layers of oversight. I think this is overkill instead of oversight.

King, LaShaun

From: Michael Duffalo [mduffalo@sdcpas.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 3:47 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Duffalo
Title: Partner
Company: Shapiro & Duffalo PC
Address 1: 110 East 59th Street
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10022

Email: mduffalo@sdcpas.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Michael Duffalo [Mduffalo@sdcpas.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 3:52 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Duffalo
Title: Partner
Company: Shapiro & Duffalo PC
Address 1: 110 East 59 th Street
Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10022

Email: Mduffalo@sdcpas.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: KENNETH SHAPIRO [kennyshap@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 3:57 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: KENNETH
Last Name: SHAPIRO
Title: PARTNER
Company: SHAPIRO & DUFFALO
Address 1: 110 EAST 59TH ST
Address 2:
City: NEW YORK
State: NY
Zip: 10022

Email: kennyshap@aol.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: David Agoglia [dagoglia@pmucpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 4:10 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: David
Last Name: Agoglia
Title: Manager
Company: Prisant Mellina Unterlack & Co., LLP Address 1: 131 Sunnyside Boulevard Address 2:
City: Plainview
State: NY
Zip: 11791

Email: dagoglia@pmucpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Frederickew York Martens [fmartens@lutzandcarr.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2010 1:14 PM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Frederickew York
Last Name: Martens
Title: Partner
Company: Lutz & Carr CPA's LLP
Address 1: 300 East 42nd Street
Address 2: 8th Floor
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10017

Email: fmartens@lutzandcarr.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

King, LaShaun

From: Michael Ferber [michael@wffacpa.com]
Sent: Friday, August 20, 2010 8:38 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Ferber
Title: Partner
Company: Wagner Ferber Fine & Ackerman, PLLC Address 1: 237 west 35th street Address 2:
City: NYC
State: NY
Zip: 10001

Email: michael@wffacpa.com

CPA: Yes
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate as the current safeguard of mandating Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed is more than adequate. Additionally, auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

No revision to the Peer Review Program is necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. The Exposure Draft does not give any empirical evidence documenting the need to change the existing standard that relates to the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material performing peer reviews. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate. I believe that no additional safeguards or restrictions are necessary.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, there will be a negative impact on our firm's ability to obtain the Quality Control Material that best fits our firm's needs and find a qualified peer reviewer. Additionally, we want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material.

OTHER COMMENTS:

It is about time someone new entered this field and provided more practical aids.
If this aids have been approved by the AICPA, then what is the issue????

King, LaShaun

From: Alice Criswell [acriswell@grafrepetti.com]
Sent: Monday, August 30, 2010 11:33 AM
To: PR_expdraft
Subject: Response to Exposure Draft

This message was sent in response to the exposure draft:

First Name: Alice
Last Name: Criswell
Title: Senior Accountant
Company: Graf Repetti & Co, LLP
Address 1: 1114 Avenue of the Americas, 17th Fl Address 2:
City: New York
State: NY
Zip: 10036

Email: acriswell@grafrepetti.com

CPA: No
AICPA Member: Yes

#####

Opposed: YES

#####

QUESTION 1

Do you believe that the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159 is appropriate?

RESPONSE 1

The current relationship of allowing the developer and maintainer of Quality Control Material perform peer reviews is appropriate. Auditors are responsible for audit decisions and conclusions - not the firm's peer reviewer, Quality Control Material, or the relationship between the firm's peer reviewer and Quality Control Material.

QUESTION 2

Are there any independence concerns that arise as a result of the peer review relationship currently permitted by paragraph 159? a) If no, please explain why you do not have any independence concerns. b) If yes, please list your concerns and discuss whether you believe they represent an impairment of independence in fact, appearance, or both. c) If yes, do the proposed revisions appropriately address your independence concerns?

RESPONSE 2

No, I do not have any independence concerns. I believe there is adequate independence on Quality Control Material and having the developer and maintainer perform peer reviews, if the Quality Control Material is peer reviewed and subject to AICPA oversight.

QUESTION 3

Do you believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program (promoting quality in the accounting and auditing services provided by AICPA members and their CPA firms in order to serve the public interest and enhance the significance of AICPA membership)?

RESPONSE 3

I do not believe that the proposed revisions are necessary to serve the main goal of the AICPA Peer Review Program. I believe the current Peer Review Program is adequate.

QUESTION 4

Is it more appropriate to have safeguards instead of prohibition? For example, using the scenario in question #1 between Firms A and B, would independence concerns be mitigated if the peer reviewers from Firm A were not involved in any way in the development or maintenance of the QCM or CPE programs? Or if there were periodic oversight of reviews performed by Firm A when the reviewed firm uses Firm A's materials or programs? Please provide your suggestions as to any appropriate safeguards you believe mitigate independence concerns.

RESPONSE 4

It is more appropriate to have adequate safeguards than prohibition. The current safeguard of requiring the Quality Control Material to be peer reviewed along with the enhanced AICPA oversight established in 2009 is adequate.

QUESTION 5

If the proposed revisions are implemented, do you believe there will be a negative impact on your firm's ability to obtain QCM or CPE programs and/or ability to find qualified peer reviewers?

RESPONSE 5

We want the ability to choose a peer reviewer who has the professional experience and expertise to write Quality Control Material. It just makes sense!

OTHER COMMENTS: