


NONATTEST SERVICES INDEPENDENCE CHECKLIST

[Beginning of Form](#)

PURPOSE

This practice aid has been designed to help the auditor document considerations of auditor independence regarding the provision of nonattest/nonaudit services (hereinafter referred to as nonattest services) to the audit client pursuant to auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAS) and generally accepted [Government Auditing Standards \(GAGAS\)](#). In addition to the independence considerations related to nonattest services, professional standards also address a number of other independence considerations, including those related to client relationships, external impairments, and organization impairments. This checklist is limited to those considerations related to the provision of nonattest services to the audit client. Other independence considerations should be evaluated as part of the process of determining whether to accept or continue the audit engagement or client relationship and be documented on [KBA-201 Client/Engagement Acceptance and Continuance Form](#).

This checklist may be completed just prior to being engaged to provide attest services that require independence for an existing client, in order to determine whether the auditor may accept the attest engagement. It may also be used as a guide when deciding whether to accept a nonattest engagement for an existing attest client, for which independence must be maintained, and completed before the decision whether to continue the attest engagement is made. 

INSTRUCTIONS

[ET Section 1.295](#), Nonattest Services, of the AICPA Code of Professional Conduct and [Chapter 3 of Government Auditing Standards—2018 Revision \(the Yellow Book\)](#) establish specific professional standards and provide guidance regarding maintaining auditor independence in the conduct of a financial statement audit when the auditor also provides certain nonattest services to the audit client. The AICPA Professional Ethics Division staff have also provided answers to members' inquiries in a frequently asked questions (FAQ) document. Although nonauthoritative, these FAQs do provide guidance in applying the interpretations of [ET Section 1.295](#) and have been incorporated to the extent that additional types of services are identified that staff believe create threats to independence that would not be at an acceptable level and could not be reduced to an acceptable level by the application of safeguards.

This form may be used to supplement the information gathered and considered on [KBA-201](#) to allow the auditor to determine whether the audit engagement should be accepted or continued.

This checklist is separated into the following four sections:

- Section I: Nature of Nonattest Services Provided;
- Section II: Independence Considerations;
- Section III: Threats to Independence and Safeguards; and
- Section IV: Conclusion.

Section I: Nature of Nonattest Services Provided

In this section, all nonattest services as defined in [ET Section 1.295](#) of the AICPA Code of Professional Conduct and Chapter 3 of the Yellow Book, when applicable, should be listed and described by type of service: advisory services; appraisal, valuation, and actuarial services; benefit plan administration; bookkeeping, payroll, and other disbursements; business risk consulting; corporate finance consulting; executive or employee recruiting; forensic accounting; hosting services; information system services; internal audit; investment advisory or management services; and tax services. This section should include a brief description of each nonattest service provided.

[ET Section 1.295](#) includes various examples of nonattest services that individually would not impair independence because the appropriate safeguards are in place and management participation reduces threats to an acceptable level. However, performing multiple nonattest services can increase the significance of these threats as well as other threats to independence. Before agreeing to perform nonattest services, the auditor should evaluate whether the performance of multiple nonattest services in the aggregate by the auditor or the auditor's firm creates a significant threat to the auditor's independence that cannot be reduced to an acceptable level by the application of the safeguards. In circumstances where threats are not at an acceptable level, the auditor should apply additional safeguards to eliminate the threats, or reduce them to an acceptable level. Notwithstanding, if the threats cannot be eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level, the auditor's independence will be impaired. These rules apply during the period of the professional engagement and the period covered by the financial statements to which the attest services relate. 💡

Section II: Independence Considerations

In this section, the table contains the basic independence requirements regarding the provision of nonattest services to audit clients. It also lists nonattest services for which the AICPA Code of Professional Conduct has specifically stated that threats to compliance with the Independence Rule would not be at an acceptable level and could not be reduced to an acceptable level by the application of safeguards. These nonattest services cannot be provided without impairing the auditor's independence. The auditor should answer the questions and use the column provided to describe the specific items that were considered regarding each listed independence requirement. If applicable, the auditor should indicate "Yes," "No," or "N/A," as to whether the requirement was met.

Section III: Threats to Independence and Safeguards

In this section, nonattest services that are not specifically prohibited are evaluated. The auditor should indicate whether each component of a threat to independence has been considered and whether or not that threat is at an acceptable level. For those threats that are not at an acceptable level, the auditor should indicate the safeguards implemented, or to be implemented, by the auditor to eliminate those threats or reduce them to an acceptable level.



Section IV: Conclusion

This section should be used to document the auditor's overall conclusion regarding independence related to nonattest services provided to the audit client. If the auditor concludes independence impairments exist, the auditor should not accept the engagement to perform the financial statement audit.

The auditor should refer to [Chapter 3, "Preliminary Engagement Activities and Audit Planning,"](#) for further guidance on preliminary engagement activities for the financial statement audit.

NONATTEST SERVICES INDEPENDENCE CHECKLIST

[Purpose and Instructions](#)

CLIENT NAME:	Town of Los Gatos
BINDER NAME:	Town of Los Gatos
DATE OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS:	June 30, 2024

TAILORING QUESTION SUMMARY

The below tailoring question(s) affect this workpaper. To complete this workpaper, these tailoring questions should be answered. Please note that only applicable questions will show here. Drill down in the response cell to **AUD-100 Engagement Level Tailoring Questions** to provide an answer or change an existing answer.

Will the audit be performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS)?	▶ Yes
---	-------

SECTION I: NATURE OF NONATTEST SERVICES PROVIDED

<i>Type of Nonattest Service</i>	<i>Description of Service</i>	<i>Firm Personnel Overseeing the Service</i>	<i>Client Personnel Overseeing the Service</i>
Financial Statement Preparation and Related Notes	▶ Preparation of ACFR Statements, note disclosures, RSI, SI, Stats Section, GANN agreed upon procedures.	SDC	Finance Director
ACFR Prep, Related Notes, Stat Tables, RSI, SI.	We prepare the financial statements from the audited TB and supporting audited schedules, prepared by client (PBC). All information in the TB is subject to the auditing process and none of the information included in the TB is prepared by C&A. None of the information included in the ACFR or the TB is created or sourced by C&A.	Engagement Partner	Finance Director
SEFA and FAC	We prepare the SEFA and FAC data collections form as presented in the single audit from client prepared schedules included in the audit.	Engagement Partner	Finance Director

<i>Type of Nonattest Service</i>	<i>Description of Service</i>	<i>Firm Personnel Overseeing the Service</i>	<i>Client Personnel Overseeing the Service</i>
	None of the information included in the SEFA or FAC is created by C&A.		
Annual Financial Transactions Report and Compensation Report	The client has the option to have us prepare the AFTR and Comp report due to the SCO from the audited trial balance and audited payroll reports	Engagement Partner	Finance Director
<i>Type to add new item.</i>			

SECTION II: INDEPENDENCE CONSIDERATIONS

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Document Specific Considerations</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
General Considerations 💡	Yes	We prepare the above reports from the audited TB and supporting audited schedules, PBC. All information in the financials, TB, and supporting schedules is subject to the auditing process and none of the information included in the TB is prepared by C&A. None of the information included in the ACFR or the TB is created or sourced by C&A. We make no decisions related to the numbers and all numbers provided by the client or third parties and included in the audit plan. The financial statements are reviewed, accepted and approved by management with SKE. Finally, we have an independent Partner, CPA, or qualified audit associate review all nonattest services.	Yes
1. For all nonattest services provided, has the auditor (the auditor’s firm) avoided assuming any management responsibilities involving leading or directing the entity, including making significant decisions regarding the acquisition, deployment, and control of human, financial,		Requirement met. We did not assume any management responsibilities involving these areas.	Yes

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Document Specific Considerations</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
physical, and intangible resources? (However, the auditor may provide advice, research materials, and recommendations to assist the entity's management in performing its functions and making decisions.)			
2. Has the entity agreed to perform and is the entity capable of performing the following functions in accordance with the engagement to perform the nonattest services: 🧐		Based on review of management history, resumes, longevity with client or in the industry and previous interaction with management, management appears to have the appropriate Skills, Knowledge and Experience (SKE). In addition, management has utilized the services of consultants with SKE to review the ACFR.	Yes
a. Making all management decisions and assuming all management responsibilities?		See above	Yes
b. Designating an individual (preferably within senior management) who possesses suitable skill, knowledge, and/or experience to oversee the services? (The firm should be satisfied that the individual understands the services performed sufficiently to oversee them, make an informed judgment on the results of the nonattest services, and accept responsibility for making significant judgments and decisions. Factors to be consider include: (1) Understanding of the nature of the service; (2) Knowledge of the attest client's operations; (3) Knowledge of the attest client's industry; (4) General business knowledge; (5) Level of education; and		See 2 above Finance Director and Previous Finance Director as consultant All areas listed in 2.b have been met.	Yes

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Document Specific Considerations</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
(6) Position at the attest client.) ?			
c. Evaluating the adequacy and results of the services provided?		FINANCE DIRECTOR Consultant	Yes
d. Accepting responsibility for the results of the services?		FINANCE DIRECTOR	Yes
3. Has the following understanding been established and documented in writing with the attest client (management and those charged with governance) regarding the nonattest services to be provided: a. The objectives of the engagement? b. The services to be provided? c. Management’s acceptance of its responsibilities? d. The auditor’s responsibilities? e. Any limitations of the engagement? ?		RFP process, contract and engagement letter	Yes
4. Has the auditor considered the independence requirements of professional standards applicable to the engagement promulgated by standard setting bodies other than the AICPA [for example, GAO]?		GAO (GAGAS)	Yes
General Activities That Would Impair the Auditor’s Independence	Yes	We have not performed any of the following activities.	Yes
5. Has the auditor avoided the following general activities that would impair independence:		na	Yes
a. Setting policy or strategic direction for the entity?		na	Yes
b. Directing or accepting responsibility for actions of the entity’s employees, except to the extent permitted when using internal auditors to provide assistance for services performed under auditing or attestation standards?		na	Yes

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Document Specific Considerations</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
c. Authorizing, executing, or consummating a transaction, or otherwise having or exercising authority on behalf of the entity?		na	Yes
d. Preparing source documents, in any form, evidencing the occurrence of a transaction?		No source documents are prepared by C&A	Yes
e. Having custody of entity assets?		na	Yes
f. Determining which auditor or third party recommendations the entity should implement or prioritize?		na	Yes
g. Reporting to those charged with governance on behalf of management?		na	Yes
h. Serving as the entity's general counsel or agent in any capacity?		na	Yes
i. Accepting responsibility for the management of a project of the entity?		na	Yes
j. Accepting responsibility for the preparation and fair presentation of the entity's financial statements in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework?		Management is capable and is willing to accept this responsibility.	Yes
k. Accepting responsibility for designing, implementing, or maintaining internal controls?		na	Yes
l. Performing ongoing evaluations of the entity's internal control as part of its monitoring activities?		na	Yes
m. Accepting responsibility for designing, developing, or implementing the entity's policies and procedures for cybersecurity threats and practices? 💡		na	Yes
n. Performing attack and penetration testing of the		na	Yes

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Document Specific Considerations</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
entity's cybersecurity that involves ongoing evaluations of the entity's controls as part of the entity's monitoring activities?			
o. Serving as a voting member of the entity's management committee or board of directors.		na	Yes
<p>6. Has the auditor avoided lending firm personnel (augmented staff) to an attest client unless all of the following safeguards are met:</p> <p>a. The staff augmentation arrangement is being performed due to an unexpected situation that would create a significant hardship for the attest client to make other arrangements.</p> <p>b. The augmented staff arrangement is not expected to reoccur.</p> <p>c. The augmented staff arrangement is performed only for a short period of time. There is a rebuttable presumption that a short period of time would not exceed 30 days.</p> <p>d. The augmented staff neither participates in, nor is in a position to influence, an attest engagement covering any period that includes the staff augmentation arrangement.</p> <p>e. The augmented staff performs only activities that would not be prohibited by the <u>"Nonattest Services" subtopic (ET Section 1.295)</u> of the <u>"Independence Rule" (ET Section 1.200.001)</u>.</p> <p>f. The auditor is satisfied that management of the attest client designates an individual or individuals who possess suitable skill, knowledge, and experience, preferably within</p>		na	Yes

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Document Specific Considerations</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
senior management, to be responsible for: i. Determining the nature and scope of the activities to be provided by the augmented staff; ii. Supervising and overseeing the activities performed by the augmented staff; and iii. Evaluating the adequacy of the activities performed by the augmented staff and the findings resulting from the activities. 🧐			
Advisory Services	No		N/A
Bookkeeping, Payroll, and Other Disbursements	No	na	N/A
Benefit Plan Administration	No		N/A
Executive or Employee Recruiting	No		N/A
Investment Advisory or Management Services	No		N/A
Corporate Finance Consulting	No		N/A
Business Risk Consulting	No		N/A
Information System Services (prior to revisions effective January 1, 2023)	No		N/A
Information System Services (revisions effective January 1, 2023)	No		N/A
Appraisal, Valuation, or Actuarial Services	No		N/A
Forensic Accounting Services	No		N/A
Internal Audit Services	No		N/A
Hosting Services	No		N/A
Additional Considerations Under GAGAS	Yes	All of the following requirements have been met	Yes
7. For engagements to be conducted in accordance with GAGAS , has the auditor avoided the following additional general activities that would impair independence:		None of the following have been performed by C&A	Yes

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Document Specific Considerations</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
a. Providing services that are intended to be used as management's primary basis for making decisions that are significant to the financial statements?		Services not provided by C&A	Yes
b. Developing the entity's performance measurement system when that system is material or significant to the financial statements?		Services not provided by C&A	Yes
c. Serving as a voting member of the entity's management committee or board of directors (such as a school board) even on a volunteer basis?		Services not provided by C&A	Yes

SECTION III: THREATS TO INDEPENDENCE AND SAFEGUARDS

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Consideration/Documentation of Threats and Safeguards</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
Threats to Independence	Yes	na	Yes
1. Has the auditor evaluated nonattest services to be provided by considering whether each nonattest service, individually or combined with other nonattest services, would create a threat to auditor independence? Document the nature of any threat(s) identified (i.e., self-review, management participation, or advocacy threat).		We evaluated the preparation of the reporting packages noted above and concluded the threat was mitigated by management with SKE taking responsibility for the nonattest services provided. In addition, the threat was mitigated by having a qualified professional not assigned to the audit team, review all nonattest services. A qualified professional would include Partner, Independent CPA, or other qualified employee of the firm.	Yes
2. For engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS , did the evaluation of nonattest services include the following:		See following	Yes
a. Consideration of management's ability to		Finance Director and Consultants were considered.	Yes

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Consideration/Documentation of Threats and Safeguards</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
effectively oversee the nonattest services to be performed?			
b. Determination of whether the entity has designated an individual who possesses suitable skill, knowledge, experience, and sufficient understanding to oversee the nonattest service(s) and the auditor must document the skills, knowledge, and experience of that individual?		Finance Director and consultant We reviewed resumes, social media, length of employment at client or similar clients and inquired about recent training without exception.	Yes
c. When preparing financial statements in their entirety from a client-provided trial balance or underlying accounting records, documentation of the significant threat to auditors' independence created by doing so and documentation of the safeguards applied to eliminate and reduce that threat to an acceptable level? (If the threat cannot be reduced to an acceptable level, the auditor should decline to provide the service)		The threat has been reduced to an acceptable level because our evaluation of management concluded that management has the SKE to accept responsibility of financial statements. The threat has also been reduced to an acceptable level because we have a qualified professional not assigned to the audit team review all nonattest services. A qualified professional would include a Partner, Independent CPA, or other qualified employee of the firm. The evidence of the mitigation of the self review threat is provided via password protected sign-offs in our audit software by the person performing the review.	Yes
3. For engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS , did the evaluation of nonattest services include the following:		See below	Yes
a. Consideration of management's ability to effectively oversee the nonattest services to be performed?		Client rep letter, engagement letter and emails document management's acceptance of these responsibilities, section 2000. We also review each nonattest service with management in person during our entrance and exit conferences. Based on the information obtained, management's history, resume, experience, we believe	Yes

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Consideration/Documentation of Threats and Safeguards</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
		management has the SKE needed to meet this requirement for all nonattest services.	
b. Determination of whether the entity has designated an individual who possesses suitable skill, knowledge, experience, and sufficient understanding to oversee the nonattest service(s) and the auditor must document the skills, knowledge, and experience of that individual?		Finance Director Consultant We review each nonattest service with management in person during our entrance and exit conferences. Based on the information obtained, management's history, resume, experience, we believe management has the SKE needed to meet this requirement for all nonattest services.	Yes
4. Has the auditor determined the significance of the potential threats identified above both individually and in the aggregate? 💡		The individual nonattest services and the aggregate of all nonattest services were evaluated during engagement planning, team planning meetings, exit conferences, WP review and phase III of the audit without exception (woe).	Yes
5. For engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS , did the consideration of significance include the following:		See below	Yes
a. Consideration of the specific facts and circumstances of the threat(s) individually and in the aggregate?		The individual nonattest services and the aggregate of all nonattest services were evaluated during engagement planning, team planning meetings, exit conferences, WP review and phase III of the audit, woe.	Yes
b. Consideration of both independence of mind and independence of appearance?		Evaluated during engagement planning, team planning meetings, exit conferences, WP review and phase III of the audit, woe	Yes
c. Evaluation of both qualitative and quantitative factors?		Evaluated during engagement planning, team planning meetings, exit conferences, WP review and phase III of the audit, woe	Yes
6. For engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS , did		na	Yes

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Consideration/Documentation of Threats and Safeguards</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
the consideration of significance include the following:			
a. Consideration of the specific facts and circumstances of the threat(s) individually and in the aggregate?		Self review threat related to preparation of ACFR deemed most significant. Whether client had SKE	Yes
b. Consideration of both independence of mind and independence of appearance?		Discussed during planning meetings and client meetings	Yes
c. Evaluation of both qualitative and quantitative factors?		Considered those who may rely on the financial statements and material transactions in relation to the ACFR. Determined that self review threat is the area of highest and concluded that having a person not on the team review the nonattest services would suffice in reducing the risk to an acceptable level.	Yes
7. For Engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS did the practitioner include the following factors when assessing threats created due to providing services related to preparing accounting records and financial statements that do not automatically impair independence:		C&A does not prepare accounting records.	Yes
a. The extent to which the outcome of the service could have a material effect on the financial statements;		The preparation of the financial statements, AFTR and SEFA did not include any changes to the audited TB. Management made all decisions and prepared all supporting schedules related to the preparation of the financial statements. Any adjustments identified as a result of the audit, are included in a proposed adjustment list and reviewed with management for acceptance or rejection. If material adjustments proposed and posted, material weakness findings will be identified in our management letters. This is a result of the audit process and not the financial statement preparation process. Thus, the	Yes

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Consideration/Documentation of Threats and Safeguards</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
		nonattest services identified, could not have a material effect on the financial statements.	
b. The degree of subjectivity involved in determining the appropriate amounts or treatment for those matters reflected in the financial statements; and		There is no subjectivity included in the nonattest services provided by C&A. Management makes all decisions related to the preparation of the financial statements and other nonattest services. The financial statements are prepared from final audited numbers, TB, Schedules.	Yes
c. The extent of the audited entity's involvement in determining significant matters of judgment.		Management makes all decisions related to the preparation of the financial statements and other nonattest services. The financial statements are prepared from final audited numbers, TB, Schedules.	Yes
Safeguards	Yes	na	Yes
8. For threats that are not at an acceptable level, has the auditor applied safeguards that address the specific facts and circumstances of the threat(s) individually and in the aggregate, such that the threats have been eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level? 💡		To ensure that the self review threat is reduced to an acceptable level, we have a partner, independent CPA or qualified team member that is not a part of the audit team review all nonattest services.	Yes
9. For engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS , has the auditor documented all potential threats identified and any safeguards applied to eliminate or reduce the threats to an acceptable level?		Evaluated during engagement planning, team planning meetings, exit conferences, WP review and phase III of the audit, woe. Safeguard against financial statement preparation, SEFA(if applicable), RSI, SI. All information was provided by the client and/or third parties and either subjected to the audit plan or was unaudited and identified as unaudited in the reporting packages. We also review each nonattest service with management in person during our entrance and exit conferences. Based on the information obtained,	Yes

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Consideration/Documentation of Threats and Safeguards</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
		management’s history, resume, experience, longevity we believe management has the SKE needed to meet this requirement for all nonattest services. Finally, we have an independent CPA or qualified team member review all nonattest services.”	
10. For threats to independence initially identified after the auditor’s reports have been issued, has the auditor evaluated the threat’s impact on the audit, the auditor’s report(s), and on GAGAS compliance?		n/a	N/A
11. For threats to independence identified after the auditor’s reports have been issued that, had they been known during the audit, would have resulted in the audit report(s) being different than from the report(s) issued, has the auditor:		n/a	N/A
a. Communicated in the same manner as that used to originally distribute the report(s) to those charged with governance, the appropriate officials of the audited entity and organizations requiring or arranging for the audit, and other known users, so that they do not continue to rely on findings or conclusions that were impacted by the threat to independence?		n/a	N/A
b. Removed any reports posted to publicly accessible websites and posted a notification that the reports have been removed?		n/a	N/A
c. Determined whether additional audit work was necessary to reissue a revised report (including any revised findings or conclusions) or repost the		n/a	N/A

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Consideration/Documentation of Threats and Safeguards</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
original report, and performed any procedures needed in the circumstances?			
12. For engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS , has the auditor documented all potential threats identified and any safeguards applied to eliminate or reduce the threats to an acceptable level?		See above	Yes
13. For threats to independence initially identified after the auditor's reports have been issued, has the auditor evaluated the threat's impact on the audit, the auditor's report(s), and on GAGAS compliance?		na	N/A
14. For threats to independence identified after the auditor's reports have been issued that, had they been known during the audit, would have resulted in the audit report(s) being different than from the report(s) issued, has the auditor:		na	N/A
a. Communicated in the same manner as that used to originally distribute the report(s) to those charged with governance, the appropriate officials of the audited entity and organizations requiring or arranging for the audit, and other known users, so that they do not continue to rely on findings or conclusions that were impacted by the threat to independence?		na	N/A
b. Removed any reports posted to publicly accessible websites and posted a notification that the reports have been removed?		na	N/A
c. Determined whether additional audit work was necessary to reissue a revised report (including any		na	N/A

	<i>Applicable?</i>	<i>Consideration/Documentation of Threats and Safeguards</i>	<i>Independence Requirement Met?</i>
revised findings or conclusions) or repost the original report, and performed any procedures needed in the circumstances?			

SECTION IV: CONCLUSION

<i>Question</i>	<i>Conclusion</i>
Conclusion as to whether the firm and audit team members are free from independence impairments with regards to nonattest services provided to the audit client.	No impairments noted

Below is a description of significant issues considered and their resolution regarding the above conclusion.

<i>Significant Issue</i>	<i>Resolution</i>
Preparation of ACFR, GANN, SEFA, FAC forms, Notes and other reports noted above.	At various phases of the audit, reviewed and analyzed that management had the SKE to oversee, approve and take responsibility for these items. Also, none of the numbers included in any of the packages were calculated by C&A, C&A made no judgments involving the preparation of the financial statements. All data entry from source documents prepared by the client or third parties. Finally, we have an independent CPA or team members review all nonattest services.
<i>Type to add new item.</i>	