



Dear Assignment/News/Business Section Editor

Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants takes disciplinary action against a certified public accountant (practising)

(HONG KONG, 29 February 2016) - A Disciplinary Committee of the Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants ordered cancellation of the practising certificate of Chan Bing Chung (membership number A17643) beginning 14 March 2016 with no issuance of a practising certificate to him for nine months. In addition, Chan was ordered to pay a penalty of HK\$50,000 and costs of the disciplinary proceedings of HK\$125,966.70, which included costs of the Financial Reporting Council ("FRC").

Chan was previously a practising director of a corporate practice, K.M. Choi & Au Yeung Limited, which is now de-registered. The corporate practice issued an unmodified auditor's report on the financial statements of a Hong Kong listed company for 2009. Chan was the engagement quality control reviewer ("EQCR") for the 2009 audit.

The company failed to correctly account for issued share options in its 2009 financial statements in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standard 2 "Shared-based Payment". The Institute received a referral from the FRC about deficiencies in the work carried out by Chan as the EQCR in the 2009 audit. After considering the information available, the Institute lodged complaints against Chan under sections 34(1)(a)(vi) of the Professional Accountants Ordinance.

The Disciplinary Committee found that Chan failed to maintain or otherwise apply paragraphs 100.4(c) and 130.1 of the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants for his failure to act diligently when carrying out the work as an EQCR in the audit of the company's 2009 financial statements.

Having taken into account the circumstances of the case, the Disciplinary Committee made the above order against Chan under section 35(1) of the Ordinance.

Under the Ordinance, if Chan is aggrieved by the order, he may give notice of an appeal to the Court of Appeal within 30 days after he is served the order.

The order and findings of the Disciplinary Committee are available at the Institute's website under the "Compliance" section at www.hkicpa.org.hk.

Disciplinary proceedings of the Institute are conducted in accordance with Part V of the ordinance by a five-member Disciplinary Committee. Three members of each committee, including a chairman, are non-accountants chosen from a panel appointed by the Chief Executive of the HKSAR, and the other remaining two members are CPAs.

Disciplinary hearings are held in public unless the Disciplinary Committee directs otherwise in the interest of justice. A hearing schedule is available at the Institute's website. A CPA who feels aggrieved by an order made by a Disciplinary Committee may

appeal to the Court of Appeal, which may confirm, vary or reverse the order.

Disciplinary Committees have the power to sanction members, member practices and registered students. Sanctions include temporary or permanent removal from membership or cancellation of a practicing certificate with (where appropriate) an order that a practice certificate shall not be issued either permanently or temporarily, a reprimand, a penalty of up to \$500,000, and payment of costs and expenses of the proceedings.

- End -

About the Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants

The Hong Kong Institute of CPAs is the only body authorized by law to register and grant practising certificates to certified public accountants in Hong Kong. The Institute has more than 39,000 members and 18,000 registered students. Members of the Institute are entitled to the description *certified public accountant* and to the designation CPA.

The Hong Kong Institute of CPAs evolved from the Hong Kong Society of Accountants, which was established on 1 January 1973.

The Institute operates under the Professional Accountants Ordinance and works in the public interest. The Institute has wide-ranging responsibilities, including assuring the quality of entry into the profession through its postgraduate qualification programme and promulgating financial reporting, auditing and ethical standards in Hong Kong. The Institute has responsibility for regulating and promoting efficient accounting practices in Hong Kong to safeguard its leadership as an international financial centre.

The Hong Kong Institute of CPAs is a member of the Global Accounting Alliance – an alliance of the world's leading professional accountancy bodies, which was formed in 2005. The GAA promotes quality services, collaborates on important international issues and works with national regulators, governments and stakeholders.

Hong Kong Institute of CPAs' contact information:

Stella To
Head of Corporate Communications
Phone: 2287 7209
Mobile: 9027 7323
Email: stella@hkicpa.org.hk



致：編採主任／新聞／財經版編輯

香港會計師公會對一名執業會計師作出紀律處分

(香港，二零一六年二月廿九日) — 香港會計師公會轄下一紀律委員會，命令由二零一六年三月十四日起吊銷陳秉中先生(會員編號：A17643)的執業證書，並在九個月內不給他另發執業證書。此外，陳先生須支付罰款港幣五萬元，以及公會的紀律程序及財務匯報局(「財匯局」)的費用合共港幣十二萬五千九百六十六元零七角。

陳先生曾在一執業法團蔡國文歐陽會計師事務所有限公司任職執業董事，該執業法團現已除名。該執業法團就一間香港上市公司2009年度的財務報表發出無保留意見的核數師報告。陳先生是2009年度審計的項目質量控制覆核人員(「EQCR」)。

該公司沒有根據 International Financial Reporting Standard 2 "Shared-based Payment"，將其發出的購股權正確地在 2009 年度的財務報表中入帳。公會收到財匯局的轉介，指陳先生在 2009 年度審計中以 EQCR 身份進行的工作有缺失。公會經考慮所得的資料，根據《專業會計師條例》第 34(1)(a) (vi)條對陳先生作出投訴。

紀律委員會裁定陳先生未能維持或以其他方式應用公會頒布的 Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants 第 100.4(c) 段及第 130.1 段，因他在審核有關公司 2009 年度的財務報表過程中，未能盡責做好其 EQCR 的工作。

經考慮有關情況後，紀律委員會根據《專業會計師條例》第35(1)條向陳先生作出上述的命令。

根據《專業會計師條例》，如答辯人不服紀律委員會對他作出的命令，可於命令文本送達後30天內向上訴法庭提出上訴。

紀律委員會的書面判決可於公會網頁內Compliance 部分查閱，網頁為 www.hkicpa.org.hk。

公會的紀律程序是根據《專業會計師條例》第V部份，由五位成員組成的紀律委員會執行。每個紀律委員會的大多數成員，即包括主席在內的三名成員，是從業外人士組成的紀律小組中選派，該紀律小組的成員是由香港特別行政區行政長官委任的；另外兩名成員由專業會計師出任。

除非負責的紀律委員會因公平理由認為不恰當，否則紀律聆訊一般以公開形式進行。紀律聆訊的時間表可於公會網頁查閱。如當事人不服紀律委員會的裁判，可向上訴法庭提出上訴，上訴法庭可確定、修改或推翻紀律委員會的裁判。

紀律委員會有權向公會會員、執業會計師事務所會員及註冊學生作出處分。紀律處分範圍包括永久或有限期地將違規者從會計師註冊紀錄冊中除名或吊銷其執業證書及在適當情況下命令永久或有限期地不向其發出執業證書、對其作出譴責、下令罰款不多於五十萬港元，以及支付紀律程序的費用。

關於香港會計師公會

香港會計師公會是香港唯一獲法例授權負責專業會計師註冊兼頒授執業證書的組織，會員人數超過三萬九千，註冊學生人數逾一萬八千。公會會員可採用「會計師」稱銜（英文為 **certified public accountant**，簡稱 **CPA**）。

公會(**Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants**)於一九七三年一月一日成立，當時的英文名稱為 **Hong Kong Society of Accountants**。

公會根據《專業會計師條例》履行職責，以公眾利益為依歸。其職能廣泛，包括開辦專業資格課程(**Qualification Programme**)以確保會計師的入職質素，以及頒布香港的財務報告、審計及專業操守準則。此外，公會亦負責在香港監管和推動優良而有效的會計實務，以鞏固香港作為國際金融中心的領導地位。

香港會計師公會是全球會計聯盟 (**Global Accounting Alliance, GAA**) 的成員之一。全球會計聯盟於二零零五年成立，聯合了全球頂尖的專業會計團體，推動優質服務，並積極與各地監管機構、政府及關連人士就國際重要議題共同合作。

香港會計師公會聯絡資料

杜幼儀

傳訊部主管

直線電話：2287 7209

手提電話：9027 7323

電子郵箱：stella@hkicpa.org.hk

IN THE MATTER OF

A Complaint made under section 34(1) of the Professional Accountants Ordinance, Cap 50

BETWEEN

The Registrar of the Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants
COMPLAINANT

AND

Chan Bing Chung
(Membership No. A17643)

RESPONDENT

Before a Disciplinary Committee of the Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants

Members: Mr. Kwong Chi Ho Cecil (Chairman)
Mr. Ko Ming Tung Edward
Mr. Ngai Tak Sing Alfred
Mr. Chow Tak Sing Peter
Mr. Warren Peter Phillips

Date of Hearing: 18 November 2015

Date of Order & Reasons for Decision: 3 February 2016

ORDER & REASONS FOR DECISION

1. This is a complaint made by the Registrar of the Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants (the “**Institute**”) as Complainant against Mr. Chan Bing Chung (the “**Respondent**”).
2. The particulars of the complaint are set out in a letter dated 27 May 2015 (the “**Complaint**”) from the Registrar of the Institute to the Council of the Institute for referral to the Disciplinary Committee. A hearing was conducted by the Disciplinary Committee on 18 November 2015.

BACKGROUND

3. Sing Lee Software (Group) Limited (the "Company") was incorporated in Bermuda and its shares are listed on the Growth Enterprise Market (stock code: 08076) of the Stock Exchange of Hong Kong Limited.
4. The financial statements of the Company and its subsidiaries (the "Group") for each of the years ended 31 December 2007, 2008 and 2009 ("**2007, 2008 and 2009 Financial Statements**") were stated to have been prepared in accordance with the International Financial Reporting Standards ("**IFRS**").
5. On 9 October 2007, the Company granted 47,550,000 share options to employees of the Group (the "**Share Options**"), at an exercisable price of HK\$0.368 per share. It was subject to vesting scale in tranches on 8 April 2008 (5%), 8 October 2008 (10%), 8 October 2009 (35%), and 8 October 2010 (50%), with a vesting period of 3 years. The exercise period is from 9 April 2008 to 8 October 2017.
6. The Group did not recognize any share-based payment expenses in the 2007, 2008 and 2009 Financial Statements, in accordance with IFRS 2 *Share-based Payment* ("**IFRS 2**").
7. K.M. Choi & Au Yeung Limited (the "**Corporate Practice**") was appointed as auditor of the Company and issued auditor's reports on the 2007, 2008 and 2009 Financial Statements. Mr. KM Choi ("**Choi**") was the engagement director. The auditor's report for each relevant year stated that the audit was conducted in accordance with International Standards on Auditing ("**ISA**").
8. Notwithstanding that the Group did not follow IFRS 2 to account for the Share Options, the Corporate Practice did not qualify the audit opinions on these financial statements to reflect the non-compliance.
9. The Corporate Practice subsequently resigned as the auditor of the Company. The financial statements for year ended 31 December 2010 ("**2010 Financial Statements**") of the Group stated that the Group failed to follow IFRS 2 and retrospective restatements were made to correct the prior period errors.
10. In July 2012, the Audit Investigation Board ("**AIB**") of the Financial Reporting Council ("**FRC**") investigated the conduct of the Corporate Practice and the engagement director, who admitted that they were not aware of the requirements of IFRS 2. The matter against the Corporate Practice and the engagement director was concluded by another Disciplinary Committee on 10 October 2013 (Case no. D12-0711F).

11. The Disciplinary Committee in that case accepted that the determination of the fair value of the Share Options in the 2007, 2008 and 2009 Financial Statements did not comply with IFRS 2. As a result, there was concern that the engagement quality control reviewer ("EQCR") might not have performed proper reviews on the relevant audits according to ISA 220 *Quality Control for Audits of Historical Financial Information* ("ISA 220").
12. The Respondent was a practising director of the Corporate Practice who acted as the EQCR for the 2009 audit.
13. On 7 October 2014, the FRC referred another report of the AIB dated 12 August 2014 to the Institute pursuant to section 9(f) of the FRC Ordinance (Cap.588).
14. The AIB found that the Respondent was aware of the judgment made by the engagement team in respect of the Share Options, but failed to identify that such measurement was not in accordance with IFRS 2. They concluded that the Respondent did not properly perform the engagement quality control review in accordance with paragraphs 38 and 39 of ISA 220, and therefore, he did not comply with paragraphs 100.4(c) and 130.1 of the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants ("COE").
15. Responding to the Institute's enquiries in a letter dated 11 November 2014, the Respondent reiterated his reply to the FRC which expressed his disagreement that he had failed to perform appropriate quality control review because the Share Options were not identified as a significant matter in the audit.

THE COMPLAINT

16. Section 34(1)(a)(vi) of the Professional Accountants Ordinance (Cap. 50) ("PAO") applies to the Respondent in that he has failed or neglected to observe, maintain or otherwise apply a professional standard, namely paragraph 100.4(c) as elaborated in paragraph 130.1 of the Code, as a result of his failure to maintain professional knowledge or skill and/or failure to act diligently, as the EQCR of the audit of the Company and the Group for the year ended 31 December 2009.

RELEVANT PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

17. Relevant paragraphs of ISA 220:

"38. An engagement quality control review should include an objective evaluation of:

- (a) The significant judgments made by the engagement team; and*
- (b) The conclusions reached in formulating the auditor's report.*

39. An engagement quality control review ordinarily involves discussion with the engagement partner, a review of the financial information and the auditor's report, and, in particular, consideration of whether the auditor's report is appropriate. It also involves a review of selected audit documentation relating to the significant judgments the engagement team made and the conclusions they reached. The extent of the review depends on the complexity of the audit engagement and the risk that the auditor's report might not be appropriate in the circumstances...."

18. Relevant paragraphs of the then applicable COE:

"100.4 A professional accountant is required to comply with the following fundamental principles:

- (c) Professional Competence and Due Care*
... A professional accountant should act diligently and in accordance with applicable technical and professional standards when providing professional services."

"130.1 The principle of professional competence and due care imposes the following obligations on professional accountants:

- (a) To maintain professional knowledge and skill at the level required to ensure that clients or employers receive competent professional service; and*
- (b) To act diligently in accordance with applicable technical and professional standards when providing professional services."*

"130.4 Diligence encompasses the responsibility to act in accordance with the requirements of an assignment, carefully, thoroughly and on a timely basis."

FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES IN SUPPORT OF THE COMPLAINT

19. Apparently, the Group did not follow IFRS 2 in accounting for the Share Options in the 2009 Financial Statements:
- (a) Note 3 of the 2010 Financial Statements of the Company, stated that *"the Group did not follow IFRS 2 Share-based Payment to account for share options granted to employees after 7 November 2002 and vested on or after 1 January 2005. The prior period errors are corrected by retrospective restatement to increase share options reserve and accumulated losses as at 1 January 2009 by RMB5,392,000 and to restate the result for the year ended 31 December 2009 from profit for the year of RMB1,302,000 to loss for the year of RMB1,547,000 with the recognition of share-based payment expenses amounting to RMB2,849,000...."*
 - (b) The Corporate Practice and the engagement director who audited the 2009 Financial Statements did not dispute that the determination of the fair value of the Share Options did not follow IFRS 2. In fact, they admitted ignorance of IFRS 2.
 - (c) The Disciplinary Committee of the previous case accepted that the determination of the fair value of the Share Options of the Company in its financial statements for the years 2007 to 2009 did not follow IFRS 2.
20. The same Disciplinary Committee also found that the Corporate Practice failed to evaluate the fair value measurement of the Share Option and did not obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to enable them to conclude that the fair value measurement of the Share Options complied with IFRS 2 in the audit of the 2009 Financial Statements.
21. **The non-recognition of share-based payments expenses by RMB2,849,000 in the 2009 Financial Statements, which represented more than two-folds of the consolidated profit for that year, had a material effect on the consolidated profit or loss of the Group for 2009.** The Corporate Practice should have expressed a qualified audit opinion in this respect.
22. In 2011, the AIB investigated the Corporate Practice and Choi in relation to the above audit deficiencies. Choi admitted in letters to the AIB that he was not aware of the existence and requirements of IFRS 2. The investigation resulted in a disciplinary proceeding - D-12-0711 F - being instituted against Choi and the Corporate Practice. The disciplinary committee found that there was a breach of IFRS 2 for the years 2007-09, and ordered (inter alia) that Choi be removed as a member for 18 months. Paragraph 13 of the decision of the Disciplinary Committee stated as follows:-

“The Respondents, [ie Choi and the Corporate Practice] admitted ignorance of IFRS 2 shows that they failed to attain or maintain the requisite professional knowledge to conduct an audit of the Company’s Financial Statements and in particular with regard to the Share Options.”

23. A further investigation was carried out by AIB into the Respondent’s role as EQCR in the 2009 audit, and a report dated 12 August 2014 was issued (the “AIB Report”). The Executive Summary stated (inter alia) the following (at p iii):

“... Notwithstanding that there were various clues indicating that the engagement team’s assessment on financial statement risks and its conclusion reached in relation to the share options might not be appropriate, [the Respondent] failed to identify the accounting of the share options in the 2009 Financial Statements as a risky area susceptible to misstatements and that the measurement and recognition of the share options in the 2007 Financial Statements, the 2008 Financial Statements and the 2009 Financial Statements did not comply with IFRS 2. [The Respondent], as the EQCR for the 2009 Audit, indicated that he was satisfied with the audit evidence obtained and procedures performed by the audit team and that the 2009 Financial Statements complied with IFRSs. Therefore the evidence strongly suggests that [the Respondent] did not properly perform his engagement quality control review in this respect according to the requirements under paragraphs 38 and 39 of ISA 220.

The above audit failure demonstrates that [the Respondent] did not comply with section 130.1 of the COE as he did not act diligently according to the applicable technical and professional standards when providing professional services in the 2009 Audit relating to the performance of the engagement quality control review.”

24. In the Engagement Quality Control Review Risk Tolerance Worksheet (the “**Risk Worksheet**”) [annex 2H, AIB Report], the Respondent ticked a box indicating “low risk” and the absence of any “very complex specialized transactions”. The same worksheet states that stock-based compensation should be considered as “high risk”
25. In another audit document “Appendix K Engagement Quality Control Review Worksheet” [annex 2G, AIB Report], which was signed by the Respondent using his initial “JC”, the last page included the following statement:-

“Based on my review of the engagement file, discussions with engagement personnel and the responses to my review comments, I am satisfied that the engagement report can be released.”

26. The Respondent, under the name of his own practice JP Union & Co., addressed to the Corporate Practice a memo with subject "EQCR - Sing Lee Software (Group) Limited for the year ended 31/12/09" ("EQCR Memo") [annex 2I, AIB Report]. It contains "Audit Highlights", including one section entitled "Share option". That section included the following statements:

"Certain share options are expired and forfeited. Echo with your audit team's opinion, there is no any financial effect because no share option reserve was recognized in the prior years and hence no subsequent elimination of share option reserve."

27. The Respondent failed to identify that the measurement and recognition of the Share Options in the 2009 Financial Statements did not comply with IFRS 2. In the EQCR Memo, it was recorded that the fair value of the Share Options on the grant date was nil because the exercise price is higher than the market price on that date.

28. Further, the Respondent stated in his letter dated 27 April 2015 to the Institute:-

"The Audit Highlight [ie the EQCR Memo] prepared by the audit team together with the Practice Review Report made me believed that the value of share options at the grant date in 2007 is Nil in accordance with IFRS 2."

THE ISSUES AND THE FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

29. According to IFRS 2, for share options granted to employees, an entity should measure the fair value of share options granted at the measurement date based on market prices of those share options. If the market prices of the share options granted are not available, the entity should estimate their fair value using a valuation technique to estimate what the price of those share options would have been on the measurement date in an arm's length transaction between knowledgeable, willing parties.

30. As the Company is a listed company in Hong Kong, it is apparent that the market price of the shares underlying the Share Options were available at the measurement date.

31. **The Respondent should have identified that the engagement team's acceptance of the exercise price of the Share Options as the only consideration in determining fair value did not follow the provisions as set out in IFRS 2.**

32. The Respondent contested that there was no violation of IFRS 2 throughout the proceedings, the hearing and even after the hearing. His major line of argument was it was fair for the Company to treat the valuation of the Share Options as zero. In support of his argument, he made various submissions citing different examples, valuation models, research papers, journals, authorities citing scenarios where valuation of options can be treated as zero.
33. The Committee fully considered all arguments and submissions (even those submissions that were not properly admitted in the proceedings) put forward by the Respondent. The Committee is of the view that all these arguments are either irrelevant, speculative or unauthoritative. Needless to say, the Respondent's arguments shows his lack of understanding of IFRS 2.
34. In light of the above, the Respondent, as the EQCR for the 2009 audit, failed to perform an objective evaluation of the identification of audit risks, the audit procedures conducted and the conclusions reached relating to the Share Options by the engagement team, in accordance with paragraph 38 of ISA 220.
35. Even if the Respondent genuinely believes, whether rightly or wrongly, that the Share Options should be treated as zero under IFRS 2, the Committee have serious doubt whether the Respondent had such belief during the material time when the 2009 audit was reviewed by him.
36. In addition, the Committee is of the view that the Respondent did not have an effective discussion with the engagement director in accordance with paragraph 39 of ISA 220 because had he done so, he would realize that the engagement director was not aware of the requirements under IFRS 2. In fact, the Respondent admitted in the hearing that he did not discuss with the audit team in relation to the 2009 audit.
37. The above failures show that the Respondent did not properly perform the engagement quality control review according to the requirements under paragraphs 38 and 39 of ISA 220. These failures demonstrate that the Respondent did not comply with paragraphs 100.4(c) and 130.1 of COE as he did not act diligently according to the applicable technical and professional standards when carrying out the engagement quality control review as EQCR in the 2009 audit.
38. Based on the above, the Committee is satisfied that the Complaint against the Respondent is proven.

39. The Committee observed that the Respondent had repeatedly claimed that the subsequent 2010 Financial Statements were “Deloitte’s valuation” and that such valuation was “wrong” and should be evaluated by the Committee. It clearly shows the Respondent’s lack of understanding of (i) the role of auditors to the Company; and (ii) the irrelevance of subsequent financial statements of the Company to the necessary duties and work done needed by an EQCR in the base year.

DECISION

40. In arriving at the proper sanctions to be imposed on the Respondent, the Committee considered the following facts and matters specific to this case:

- (a) The Complaint relates to the audit and the review of the audit of a company listed in Hong Kong. Whilst the Committee is unaware of any civil claims from the public, market manipulation allegations or collaboration with the Company allegations resulting from the Respondent’s transgressions, the Committee is aware of the need to safeguard public interests which is often unmeasurable in monetary terms.
- (b) Expectations by the public that practising accountants should discharge their duties and conduct their work to the highest standards, and if the public expectations are shaken then the price to be paid by the profession as a whole can be high.
- (c) The conduct of the Respondent throughout the proceedings, and his understanding of the relevant accounting standards and principles (or the lack of).

41. Having considered the above facts and matters and all other factors the Committee deem appropriate, including a Statement of Costs dated 25 November 2015 submitted by the Institute totalling HK\$125,966.70 which include HK\$20,075.70 costs incurred by the Financial Reporting Council and which the Committee is satisfied were reasonably and necessarily incurred, we make the following orders:

- (a) The Respondent pay a penalty of HK\$50,000 under section 35(1)(c) of the PAO;
- (b) The Respondent pay the costs of and expenses incidental to the proceedings of the Institute and the Financial Reporting Council in the total sum of HK\$125,966.70 under section 35(1)(iii) and section 35(1)(d)(ii) of the PAO;

- (c) The practising certificate issued to the Respondent in 2016 be cancelled on the 40th day from the date of this order under section 35(1)(da) of the PAO; and
- (d) A practising certificate shall not be issued to the Respondent for a period of 9 months on the 40th day from the date of this order under section 35(1)(db) of the PAO.