The Decision and Reasons of the Regulatory Assessor for the case of Mr Mark Evans FCCA referred to her by ACCA on 22 July 2026.

Introduction

1. Mark Evans is the sole practice of ACCA member, Mr M A Evans FCCA.

Basis and Reasons for the Decision

2. I have considered the Report, including ACCA's recommendation, together with related correspondence concerning Mr Evans' conduct of audit work, including correspondence prepared and submitted by the firm since the monitoring visit.

3. In reaching my decision, I have made the following findings of fact:

   a. Mr Evans has had nine audit monitoring reviews, four of the nine reviews had unsatisfactory outcomes.

   b. The first monitoring review was on 27 May 1993, where the Compliance Officer found that the standard of the audit work on the files inspected was satisfactory.

   c. At the second review on 22 April 2002, the Compliance Officer informed the firm of serious deficiencies in audit work which had resulted in the audit opinion on one of three files inspected not being adequately supported by the work performed and recorded. As a result, the overall outcome of the review was not satisfactory.

   d. The third review was carried out on 20 July 2004, where the firm's audit work had improved, and the outcome of the visit was satisfactory, although some deficiencies were reported.

   e. At the fourth review, on 12 April 2011, the Compliance Officer found that the firm had not maintained a consistent satisfactory standard of audit work. On one of the three files inspected the audit opinion was not adequately supported by the work performed and recorded. As a result, the overall outcome of the review was unsatisfactory.

f. At the fifth visit, on 9 May 2013, the Compliance Officer found that the firm appeared to have deteriorated since the previous visit. On all the files examined the audit opinion was not adequately supported by the work performed and recorded. As a result, the overall outcome of the review was unsatisfactory, and ACCA referred the findings to the Regulatory Assessor, where conditions were placed on the firm and an accelerated monitoring visit ordered.

g. The sixth monitoring review, as imposed by the Assessor, took place on 24 August 2015. The Compliance Officer found that the firm had made improvements in the performance and recording of its audit work, although some deficiencies remained. The outcome was graded satisfactory and the firm was released from the terms of the Regulatory Assessors order.

h. At the seventh and the eighth review conducted on 8 May 2018 and 10 June 2022, respectively the Compliance Officers found that the firm had not maintained a consistent standard of audit work. Although the overall outcome of the reviews were satisfactory, in one of the four files inspected at the seventh review and one of the three files inspected regarding at the eighth review, the opinions issued were not adequately supported by the work performed and documented. The deficiencies identified were set out in a report issued to the firm on 11 May 2018 and 21 July 2022 respectively. In the concluding paragraphs the compliance officers cautioned that failure to maintain a consistent satisfactory standard could place the firm’s audit registration at risk. The firm acknowledged receipt of the report and provided an action plan on 11 June 2018 and 11 August 2022 respectively to address the deficiencies identified. There are serious concerns about Mr Evans’ ability and willingness to achieve and maintain a satisfactory standard of audit work despite the advice and warnings given at the previous reviews.

i. Following the ninth review, Mr Evans has confirmed that he has relinquished his firm’s auditing certificate and his Responsible Individual (RI) status.

The Decision

4. ACCA recommends that the Assessor imposes conditions on any future re-application for RI status by Mr Evans, or by any firm in which he is a principal indicating that Guideline Decision B8 would appear appropriate. However, while I agree with ACCA's recommendation that conditions on future re-application be imposed, I consider Guideline Decision B4 to be the appropriate decision for the Regulatory Assessor.

5. I note that Mr Evans has relinquished his practising certificate with audit qualification and his firm's auditing certificate. On the basis of the above I have decided pursuant to Authorisation Regulations 7(2)(f), 7(3)(b) and 7(4) that any future re-application for audit registration by Mr Evans, or by a firm in which he is a principal, must be referred to the Admissions and Licensing Committee, which will not consider the application until he has provided an action plan, including appropriate audit related CPD, which ACCA regards as satisfactory, setting out how Mr Evans intends to prevent a recurrence of the previous deficiencies and, following the date of this decision, passed the advanced audit and assurance paper of ACCA's professional qualification.

Publicity

6. Authorisation Regulation 7(6) indicates that all conditions relating to the certificates of Mr Evans and his firm made under Regulation 7(2) may be published as soon as practicable, subject to any directions given by me.

7. I have considered the submissions, if any, made by Mr Evans regarding publicity of any decision I may make pursuant to Authorisation Regulation 7(2). I do not find that there are exceptional circumstances in this case that would justify non-publication of my decision to impose conditions and/or the omission of Mr Evans name from that publicity.

8. I therefore direct pursuant to Authorisation Regulation 7(6)(a), that a news release be issued to ACCA's website referring to Mr Evans by name.

Fiona MacNamara
Regulatory Assessor
27 July 2026