



Professional Liability Risks for CPA Firms in 2026: A White Paper on the Professional Standards Implicated by Audit, Tax, Cyber, AI, M&A, and Third-Party Reliance Risk

By Glenn E. Davis

Abstract

CPA firms operate in an increasingly hostile liability environment in which civil claims, regulatory expectations, and professional standards overlap, and at times conflict.¹ The most important current exposures include undetected fraud or material misstatement claims, cyber incidents, generative AI-related errors, successor risk arising from firm acquisitions, and third-party claims brought by non-clients who say they relied on the firm's audit report.² This paper identifies the principal AICPA and related standards implicated by those risks and offers practical risk-management steps for firms to reduce exposure.³

Introduction

Although CPA firms are litigation targets, professional-liability analysis is largely professional standards-driven rather than litigation-driven.⁴ Plaintiffs, regulators, and peer reviewers investigate the same basic questions: what level of service and professional duty applied, and did the firm not only comply but document compliance with applicable professional standards, which often define the standard of care.⁵ Proper framing matters because the same factual error can produce different consequences depending on whether it is viewed as a tax mistake, an audit failure, a confidentiality lapse, a quality-management failure, or a third-party reliance claim.⁶

The context of current risks reveals several recurring issues: audit-fraud allegations, cyber and confidentiality incidents, reliance on generative AI, transaction-related successor exposure, and third-party claims by lenders, investors, or other nonclients who say they relied on an audit report.⁷ The practical challenge for firms is compliance with the correct standards in each setting, and implementation of a system to document the firm identified, addressed, and monitored those risks.⁸

Professional Standards Framework

The AICPA Code of Professional Conduct is the foundation for most of the analysis.⁹ The AICPA requires members to act with integrity, objectivity, due care, competence, disclose conflicts of interest, maintain client confidentiality, and serve the public interest.¹⁰ For auditing and other attestation services, independence in fact and appearance is also required.¹¹

The AICPA's Statements on Quality Management Standards (SQMS) require firms to design, implement, and operate a proactive, risk-based quality management system applicable to accounting and audit services. SQMS No. 1 is a firm-level quality-management framework that is directly relevant to liability prevention.¹² According to AICPA guidance, quality control systems should be risk-based and documented to show who is responsible for the system, what the quality objectives are, what risks exist, what responses are in place, how the firm monitors and remediates issues, and the basis for an annual evaluation of the system's effectiveness.¹³ The

point is to create a defensible record that reflects how the firm actually operates, not binders on the shelf.¹⁴

For audit work, Auditing Standards-Clarified (AU-C) provide core AICPA guidelines on how CPAs must plan, conduct and report on financial audits for private companies, nonprofits and other non-issuers. AU-C 240 and related fraud-risk standards are central because they require professional skepticism and a structured response to fraud indicators.¹⁵ For public-company audits, PCAOB standards similarly emphasize skepticism, due professional care, and fraud procedures.¹⁶ For reviews and compilations, the applicable Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services (SSARS) framework governs the scope and reporting consequences of the engagement.¹⁷

Audit Fraud Exposure

Audit-related fraud claims remain among the highest-risk claims against CPA firms.¹⁸ The familiar theory is that the auditor failed to detect what now appears to be a significant fraud, embezzlement, revenue manipulation, or other material misstatement that should have been identified through proper risk assessment, additional audit steps, and skeptical inquiry.¹⁹ In those cases, the liability issue usually turns on whether the auditor followed the standards governing fraud risk, skepticism, and documentation.²⁰

AU-C 240 is especially important because it requires auditors to consider the risk of material misstatement due to fraud and to respond appropriately to identified risks.²¹ PCAOB materials describe professional skepticism as a questioning mind and critical assessment of audit evidence.²² Plaintiffs often use those standards to argue that the auditor ignored red flags, relied too heavily on management, performed inadequate testing or confirmation steps, failed to corroborate explanations, or did not follow up on anomalies that should have triggered additional procedures.²³ One of the strongest defenses in these cases is a well-documented risk process.²⁴ The file should show a thoughtful audit plan design, the identified risks, the responses chosen, the procedures performed, and the reasons the team accepted or rejected competing explanations.²⁵ Without that record, the case often becomes a 20/20 hindsight dispute over whether the auditor should have "seen" what later appears obvious.

Tax And Advisory Claims

Tax and advisory claims are often more common than audit claims, even if they are not always as large in dollar value.²⁶ These matters typically involve missed elections, late filings, incorrect basis or transaction advice, penalties, interest, or downstream business consequences.²⁷ The standards most often implicated are due care, competence, and the obligation to observe technical and ethical standards.²⁸ These claims become especially dangerous when the scope of the engagement was informal or the advice was delivered orally. If the firm did not clearly define assumptions, client responsibilities, or limitations on reliance, a plaintiff may argue that the firm undertook a broader role than it did.²⁹ Accordingly, appropriately crafted engagement letters and written advice are not merely administrative conveniences; they are vital liability controls.³⁰

Cyber And Confidentiality Exposure

Cyber incidents now rank among the most important non-audit risks facing CPA firms because firms hold highly sensitive client data.³¹ A phishing event, ransomware attack, or wire-fraud incident can quickly become a claim that the firm failed to safeguard confidential information or

maintain adequate procedures.³² These claims often blend negligence, confidentiality, operational failure, and client-trust theories into one lawsuit.³³

The professional standards most commonly implicated are confidentiality, due care, competence, and quality management.³⁴ SQMS No. 1 is relevant because it requires the firm to identify quality risks and design responses that fit the firm's operations and services.³⁵ In a modern practice, that includes information security defenses, access controls, vendor management, secure and encrypted communications, incident response planning, and training on suspicious payment changes or unusual client instructions.³⁶ Firm standards and policies should make clear that cyber risk is not simply an IT issue. It is part of the firm's professional obligation to operate a system of quality management that addresses foreseeable service-delivery risks.³⁷ When firms fail to align their security practices with client-facing obligations, plaintiffs can frame the breach as both a systems failure and a professional lapse.³⁸

Generative AI Risks

Generative AI adds a new layer of risk because firms may rely on machine-generated output without sufficient human verification or may expose confidential data by entering client information into AI platforms.³⁹ The central professional standards implicated are due care, competence, confidentiality, and quality management.⁴⁰ If AI is used in audit, tax, or advisory workflows, the issue becomes whether the firm maintained appropriate supervision and review so the output was accurate, appropriate, and properly safeguarded.⁴¹

AICPA guidance on generative AI emphasizes the need to protect client trust and careful assessment of quality and data handling.⁴² The practical litigation risk is that a firm may use AI to draft a memo, tax analysis, or client communication based on unverified assumptions or hallucinated authorities, then face a claim that it failed to exercise due care.⁴³ If confidential client information is exposed in the process, the confidentiality issue can become equally serious.⁴⁴ Use of open AI platforms may also create disclosure obligations on AI usage.

The best controls are firmwide and written. A policy should identify permitted use cases, require review before reliance, prohibit or restrict input of confidential data into external tools, and explain when escalation or client disclosure is needed.⁴⁵ In litigation, those controls help show that AI was used as a tool, not as a substitute for professional judgment.⁴⁶

Generative AI Governance and Risk Mitigation

Liability exposure from AI use is not inevitable and may be avoided if firms implement a deliberate governance framework. The most effective risk controls are a written AI-usage policy, human review of AI-assisted work, strict data-input limits, use of closed platforms when possible, vendor diligence, training, and ongoing monitoring.⁴⁷ Because AI use can implicate professional duties of due care, competence, confidentiality, and quality management, the firm should document, and follow, its governance decisions and oversight procedures.⁴⁸

A firm-level AI policy should define approved use cases, prohibited activities, data-input restrictions, review requirements, and escalation procedures.⁴⁹ The policy should prohibit or tightly limit the input of confidential client information into public generative models, require legal or compliance review of vendor terms before adoption, and specify when client consent or disclosure is needed.⁵⁰ It should also require personnel to inform a supervisor when AI was used to help create deliverables so the work can be properly reviewed and documented.⁵¹

A human-in-the-loop requirement is essential to reduce reliance risk. Guidance on AI risk mitigation repeatedly emphasizes that AI-generated output should be validated before it is delivered, especially when the output may affect a client, a filing, or a professional judgment.⁵² In practice, direct reliance on AI output for legal, tax, audit, or advisory conclusions without independent review and corroboration should not occur.⁵³ AI may be used as a drafting or research aid, but it should not replace professional judgment or the firm's obligation to obtain and verify information.

Before rollout, the firm should perform due diligence on the platform and its terms of service. That includes understanding what data the model uses, whether prompts or outputs are retained, whether the provider may use the data for training, and whether the contractual terms shift risk to the user.⁵⁴ The vendor review should also address security features, encryption, access controls, breach-notification procedure, data retention settings, and whether the tool is appropriate for sensitive client information.⁵⁵ For a CPA firm, this is part of the obligation to maintain a system of quality management that addresses foreseeable risks.⁵⁶

AI tools should be implemented with cybersecurity controls at least as strong as those for other sensitive firm systems.⁵⁷ Access controls, logging, intrusion monitoring, and restrictions on uploading client data to public tools warrant review.⁵⁸ If the firm uses AI in workflows that touch confidential or regulated information, it should test for data leakage, prompt injection, and output manipulation risks.⁵⁹

The rollout should also include training, periodic reminders, and usage monitoring.⁶⁰ Personnel need to understand not only how to use the tool, but why certain use cases are off-limits and what the consequences are if they ignore the policy.⁶¹ Monitoring should include periodic audits of AI use, incident tracking, and a process for updating the policy as the technology and legal landscape evolve.⁶² In litigation terms, these controls help show that AI was used as a tool within a managed process, not as a substitute for professional judgment.⁶³

M&A and Successor Exposure

CPA firm acquisitions are a growing source of liability risk because an acquiring firm may inherit weak controls, historical claims, and underdeveloped documentation practices along with the acquired practice and clients.⁶⁴ SQMS No. 1 applies, especially the components dealing with risk assessment, acceptance and continuance, engagement performance, resources, monitoring, and remediation.⁶⁵ A buyer that fails to investigate thoroughly the target's claim history, engagement quality, and client profile may later discover that it bought much more than a book of business.⁶⁶

A risk-conscious acquisition process should determine whether the target's work fits the buyer's risk tolerance, whether prior engagement documentation is defensible, and whether any inherited engagements must be re-papered or re-evaluated.⁶⁷ If the survivor continues the work without reviewing the prior firm's conclusions or claims history, the litigation story becomes significantly worse.⁶⁸ This is one of the clearest examples of quality management operating as a legal-risk tool rather than merely a compliance exercise.⁶⁹

Third-Party Reliance Claims

CPA firms may also face liability to nonclient third parties who claim to have relied on an audit report in making a loan, investment, or transaction decision.⁷⁰ The scope of that exposure

depends heavily on state law and may turn on strict privity, near-privity, a limited-class approach, or broader foreseeability principles.⁷¹ In practical terms, the same report may create very different exposure depending on the forum, the audience, and the firm's communications.⁷² The most restrictive jurisdictions require privity or something close to it, while other states allow claims when the auditor knew or should have known the report would be used by a limited class of users.⁷³ In other jurisdictions with broader liability, an auditor may owe a duty to any persons whom it could reasonably foresee relying on the report.⁷⁴ Accordingly, audit planning should consider not only the client, but also the intended audience and distribution of the report.⁷⁵

Risk controls begin at the engagement stage. Firms should identify likely users, understand whether the report will be provided to lenders, investors, or other third parties, and limit direct third-party communications wherever possible.⁷⁶ Engagement letters should restrict use and distribution of the report and require written consent before the client circulates the report beyond the specified users.⁷⁷ Firms should be especially cautious about verification letters or informal confirmations outside the scope of the engagement, since those communications can increase reliance arguments.⁷⁸

From a liability perspective, third-party claims are tied to the same core professional-standards and duties that govern the audit itself: due care, competence, objectivity, professional skepticism, and compliance with the applicable audit standards.⁷⁹ For public-company audits, PCAOB standards on skepticism and fraud also matter.⁸⁰ It is clear that liability exposure is not limited to client disputes; it can extend to known or foreseeable users depending on the engagement setting and governing law.⁸¹

Summary of Standards Most Implicated

| Risk Theme | Standards Most Often Implicated | Practical Significance |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| Audit fraud claims | AU-C 240, AU-C 315, professional skepticism, due care ⁸² | These standards frame whether the auditor identified, assessed, and responded to fraud risk appropriately. ⁸³ |
| Tax and advisory errors | Due care, competence, technical and ethical standards, documentation. ⁸⁴ | These claims often turn on whether the firm gave careful, well-documented advice. ⁸⁵ |
| Cyber incidents | Confidentiality, due care, competence, quality management. ⁸⁶ | Security failures can become negligence and confidentiality claims. ⁸⁷ |
| Generative AI use | Due care, competence, confidentiality, quality management. ⁸⁸ | Firms may be faulted for overreliance on AI output or improper data handling. ⁸⁹ |

| Risk Theme | Standards Most Often Implicated | Practical Significance |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| M&A / successor risk | Acceptance and continuance, engagement performance, monitoring, quality management. ⁹⁰ | Buyers can inherit liability if diligence and integration are weak. ⁹¹ |
| Independence / conflicts | Objectivity, independence in fact and appearance. ⁹² | Independence issues can create both disciplinary and civil leverage. ⁹³ |
| Third-party reliance | AU-C 240, skepticism, due care, engagement-letter limits. ⁹⁴ | Exposure depends heavily on jurisdiction and intended user analysis. ⁹⁵ |

Documentation Of SQMS Compliance

SQMS documentation should show not only that the firm has policies, but that it designed, implemented, and monitored a functioning system.⁹⁶ The documentation should be calibrated to the firm's actual services, personnel, and technology environment.⁹⁷ The most effective record is one that traces the path from quality objective to identified risk to chosen response to evidence that the response operated as intended.⁹⁸

The firm should document who has ultimate responsibility and operational responsibility for the system, what quality objectives the firm has adopted, what risks were identified, and what responses to risk were selected.⁹⁹ It should also document monitoring activity, the results of that monitoring, any deficiencies found, root-cause analysis, remediation steps, and the annual evaluation conclusion.¹⁰⁰ The documentations should state whether the system provides reasonable assurance that quality objectives are being achieved and explain the basis for that conclusion.¹⁰¹

The best evidence is operational: policies and procedures, checklists, training records, independence confirmations, acceptance-and-continuance evaluations, monitoring logs, remediation trackers, screenshots, and configuration records are all useful.¹⁰² A reviewer should be able to understand the firm's quality-management story from the file alone, without reconstructing it from memory or verbal explanations.¹⁰³

Risk Management Recommendations

Firms should treat liability prevention as an operating system, not as an annual compliance event.¹⁰⁴ Engagement letters should be tightened, scope limits should be clear, and any assumptions or client responsibilities should be written down.¹⁰⁵ That is particularly important in tax and advisory work, where ambiguity about scope often becomes the litigation battleground.¹⁰⁶

Firms should align their quality-management systems with current service realities. That means using SQMS No. 1 to address fraud risk, supervision, cybersecurity, vendor oversight, AI governance, and remediation.¹⁰⁷ For audit practices, the highest priority remains disciplined professional skepticism and documentation showing how the audit team dealt with risk

indicators.¹⁰⁸ Critical thinking on potential areas for misstatements or fraud or weaknesses in client internal controls at the outset of each new or annual audit engagement is necessary for audit design. For acquisition activity, diligence should cover claim history, insurance continuity, independence issues, and operational fit.¹⁰⁹

Conclusion

The modern CPA liability environment is impacted by the intersection of professional standards and litigation risk.¹¹⁰ Few industries define their own duties with such precision and in some cases high standards. Audit fraud claims remain the highest-severity exposures, but cyber, AI, acquisition-related, and third-party reliance risks are increasingly important because they create new fact patterns addressed with traditional negligence theories.¹¹¹ The most effective prevention strategy is standards-based: identify and align the firm's practices with the appropriate standards, and document the result.¹¹² You can expect that counsel for adversaries will hold you to those very standards, or exaggerated application of their terms.

For firm leadership, clients, and insurers, the core lesson is straightforward. The firms best positioned to avoid claims are the ones that treat integrity, objectivity, due care, competence, confidentiality, independence, skepticism, and quality management as daily operating requirements rather than aspirational language.¹¹³ In the current market, that is not only good compliance; it is good defense planning and serves delivery of quality professional services.¹¹⁴

Endnotes

1. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*, <https://www.aicpa-cima.com/resources/article/professional-responsibilities>; Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation for SQMS No. 1*, <https://www.journalofaccountancy.com/issues/2025/oct/right-size-your-quality-management-documentation-for-sqms-no-1/>.
2. NJCPA, *The Current State of Professional Liability Protection*, <https://www.njcpa.org/article/2024/11/01/the-current-state-of-professional-liability-protection>; AICPA & CIMA, *Facing Complexity, Uncertainty and Rapid Change*, <https://www.cpai.com/Education-Resources/My-Firm/Multiple-Services/Facing-Complexity-Uncertainty-and-Rapid-Change-Accounting-Fir>; AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*, <https://www.cpai.com/Education-Resources/My-Firm/Data-Security-Risk-Management/Generative-AI-and-risks-to-CPA-firms>; Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions – part 1*, <https://www.journalofaccountancy.com/issues/2025/jul/professional-liability-risk-stemming-from-cpa-firm-acquisitions-part-1/>; Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*, <https://www.journalofaccountancy.com/issues/2013/may/20137570/>.
3. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; Aon, *Accountants' Liability Risk: Global Trends and Issues*, <https://www.aon.com/risk-services/professional-services/accountants-liability-risk-global-trends-and-issues-summary-highlights>; PCAOB, *AS 2401: Consideration of Fraud in a Financial Statement Audit*, <https://pcaobus.org/oversight/standards/auditing-standards/details/AS2401>.

4. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; AICPA Quality Management Standards, <https://www.aicpa-cima.com/topic/audit-assurance/quality-management>; Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*.
5. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; AICPA & CIMA, *A journey to quality management*, <https://www.aicpa-cima.com/resources/landing/a-journey-to-quality-management>.
6. NJCPA, *The Current State of Professional Liability Protection*; AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*.
7. NJCPA, *The Current State of Professional Liability Protection*; AICPA & CIMA, *Facing Complexity, Uncertainty and Rapid Change*; AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions*; Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*.
8. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; AICPA & CIMA, *5 tips for QM success*, <https://www.aicpa-cima.com/resources/article/5-tips-for-qm-success>.
9. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; AICPA Code of Professional Conduct 2, <https://www.spokaneipc.org/assets/Councils/Spokane-WA/library/AICPA%20Code%20of%20Professional%20Conduct%202.docx>.
10. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; AICPA Code of Professional Conduct 2.
11. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; AICPA Code of Professional Conduct 2.
12. AICPA Quality Management Standards; Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*, <https://tax.thomsonreuters.com/blog/sqms-1-explained-a-practical-guide-to-firm-level-quality-management/>.
13. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; AICPA & CIMA, *5 tips for QM success*.
14. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; ICPAS, *6 Tips for Implementing the New Quality Management Standards*, <https://www.icpas.org/resources/publications/insight-magazine/article-search/detail/winter-2024/6-tips-for-implementing-the-new->.
15. PCAOB, *AS 2401*; Journal of Accountancy, *The auditor's approach to fraud*, <https://www.journalofaccountancy.com/news/2024/mar/the-auditors-approach-to-fraud-enhanced-with-forensics/>; eGrove, *Statement on Auditing Standards*, https://egrove.olemiss.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1180&context=aicpa_sas.
16. PCAOB, *AS 2401*; PCAOB, *Fraud Risk Resources*, <https://pcaobus.org/resources/information-for-audit-firms/fraud-risk-resources>; PCAOB, *AU 316.13*, https://pcaobus.org/oversight/standards/archived-standards/pre-reorganized-auditing-standards-interpretations/details/AU316_13.
17. AICPA, *Statement on Standards for Accounting and Review Services No. 25*, <https://www.aicpa-cima.com/resources/download/aicpa-statement-on-standards-for-accounting-and-review-services-no-25>; AICPA, *Preparation, Compilation, and Review Standards*, <https://www.aicpa-cima.com/resources/landing/preparation-compilation-and-review-standards>.
18. NJCPA, *The Current State of Professional Liability Protection*; Journal of Accountancy, *Fraud risk applies to all CPA firm services*,

- <https://www.journalofaccountancy.com/issues/2022/oct/fraud-risk-applies-all-cpa-firm-services/>.
19. NJCPA, *The Current State of Professional Liability Protection*; PCAOB, AS 2401; Journal of Accountancy, *Evaluating fraud risks related to revenue recognition*, <https://editions.journalofaccountancy.com/article/Evaluating+fraud+risks+related+to+revenue+recognition/4954175/843684/article.h>.
 20. PCAOB, AS 2401; PCAOB, *Fraud Risk Resources*.
 21. PCAOB, AS 2401; eGrove, *Statement on Auditing Standards*.
 22. PCAOB, AS 2401; PCAOB, *Fraud Risk Resources*; PCAOB, AU 316.13.
 23. PCAOB, AS 2401; Journal of Accountancy, *Evaluating fraud risks related to revenue recognition*.
 24. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; AICPA & CIMA, *5 tips for QM success*.
 25. eGrove, *Statement on Auditing Standards*; PCAOB, *Fraud Risk Resources*.
 26. NJCPA, *The Current State of Professional Liability Protection*.
 27. Journal of Accountancy, *Fraud risk applies to all CPA firm services*; Hunter Sure, *Professional Liability for Accountants*, <https://www.huntersure.com/professional-liability-for-accountants-common-claims-scenarios/>.
 28. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; Spokane EPC, *AICPA Code of Professional Conduct 2*.
 29. Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions*; CAMICO, *Top 5 Ways a CPA Can Invite a Malpractice Lawsuit*, <https://www.camico.com/blog/top-5-ways-cpas-can-invite-a-malpractice-lawsuit/>.
 30. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; AICPA & CIMA, *5 tips for QM success*.
 31. AICPA & CIMA, *Facing Complexity, Uncertainty and Rapid Change*; Nerdssupport, *Why Accounting Firms Are Prime Targets for Ransomware Attacks in 2025*, <https://nerdssupport.com/why-accounting-firms-are-prime-targets-for-ransomware-attacks-in-2025-how-to-protect-your-practice/>.
 32. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*.
 33. AICPA & CIMA, *Facing Complexity, Uncertainty and Rapid Change*; Nerdssupport, *Why Accounting Firms Are Prime Targets for Ransomware Attacks*.
 34. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; AICPA Quality Management Standards; Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*.
 35. Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*; Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*.
 36. Nerdssupport, *Why Accounting Firms Are Prime Targets for Ransomware Attacks*; AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*.
 37. AICPA Quality Management Standards; Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*.
 38. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; Nerdssupport, *Why Accounting Firms Are Prime Targets for Ransomware Attacks*.
 39. AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; AICPA & CIMA, *Should I disclose my use of gen AI to clients*, <https://www.cpai.com/Education-Resources/My-Firm/Data-Security-Risk-Management/Should-I-disclose-my-use-of-gen-AI-to-clients>.

40. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; AICPA Quality Management Standards; Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*.
41. AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; AICPA & CIMA, *Should I disclose my use of gen AI to clients*.
42. AICPA & CIMA, *Should I disclose my use of gen AI to clients*.
43. AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; AICPA & CIMA, *Should I disclose my use of gen AI to clients*; Hinckley Allen, *Top 5 Ways to Mitigate Liability Risks When AI Goes Wrong*, <https://www.hinckleyallen.com/publications/top-5-ways-to-mitigate-liability-risks-when-ai-goes-wrong/>.
44. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*.
45. AICPA & CIMA, *Should I disclose my use of gen AI to clients*; Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*.
46. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*.
47. AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; Risk and Insurance, *Cyber and Professional Liability Considerations*, <https://riskandinsurance.com/cyber-and-professional-liability-considerations-to-take-before-incorporating-generative-ai-into-you>; Hinckley Allen, *Top 5 Ways to Mitigate Liability Risks*.
48. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*; AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*.
49. AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; Hinckley Allen, *Top 5 Ways to Mitigate Liability Risks*; IANS Research, *8 Ways to Mitigate ChatGPT and Generative AI Risks*, <https://www.iansresearch.com/resources/all-blogs/post/security-blog/2023/06/27/8-ways-to-mitigate-chatgpt-and-generative-ai-risk>.
50. AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; Osborne Clarke, *How to mitigate legal risks when using generative AI in Europe*, <https://www.osborneclarke.com/insights/how-mitigate-legal-risks-when-using-generative-ai-europe>; IANS Research, *8 Ways to Mitigate ChatGPT and Generative AI Risks*.
51. AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; Risk and Insurance, *Cyber and Professional Liability Considerations*.
52. AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; Risk and Insurance, *Cyber and Professional Liability Considerations*; Hinckley Allen, *Top 5 Ways to Mitigate Liability Risks*.
53. AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; Risk and Insurance, *Cyber and Professional Liability Considerations*.
54. AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; Osborne Clarke, *How to mitigate legal risks when using generative AI in Europe*; IANS Research, *8 Ways to Mitigate ChatGPT and Generative AI Risks*.
55. Hinckley Allen, *Top 5 Ways to Mitigate Liability Risks*; Osborne Clarke, *How to mitigate legal risks when using generative AI in Europe*; IANS Research, *8 Ways to Mitigate ChatGPT and Generative AI Risks*.
56. Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*; Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*.
57. Hinckley Allen, *Top 5 Ways to Mitigate Liability Risks*; Risk and Insurance, *Cyber and Professional Liability Considerations*.

58. Hinckley Allen, *Top 5 Ways to Mitigate Liability Risks*; Osborne Clarke, *How to mitigate legal risks when using generative AI in Europe*.
59. Hinckley Allen, *Top 5 Ways to Mitigate Liability Risks*; Qualys, *AI Data Privacy & Risk Mitigation*, <https://blog.qualys.com/product-tech/2025/02/07/ai-and-data-privacy-mitigating-risks-in-the-age-of-generative-ai-tools>.
60. AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; Hinckley Allen, *Top 5 Ways to Mitigate Liability Risks*; IANS Research, *8 Ways to Mitigate ChatGPT and Generative AI Risks*.
61. AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; IANS Research, *8 Ways to Mitigate ChatGPT and Generative AI Risks*.
62. Hinckley Allen, *Top 5 Ways to Mitigate Liability Risks*; IANS Research, *8 Ways to Mitigate ChatGPT and Generative AI Risks*; Wolters Kluwer, *Generative AI risks and mitigation*, <https://www.wolterskluwer.com/en/expert-insights/breaking-down-generative-ai-risks-mitigation-options>.
63. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; Risk and Insurance, *Cyber and Professional Liability Considerations*.
64. Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions*; Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions – part 2*, <https://www.journalofaccountancy.com/issues/2025/aug/professional-liability-risk-stemming-from-cpa-firm-acquisitions-part-2/>; PICPA, *Market Changes Should Spur Professional Liability Review*, <https://www.picpa.org/professional-resources/research-publications/pennsylvania-cpa-journal/journal-articles/2026/03/05/market-c>.
65. AICPA Quality Management Standards; Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions*; Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions – part 2*.
66. Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions*; PICPA, *Market Changes Should Spur Professional Liability Review*.
67. Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions*; Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions – part 2*.
68. Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions – part 2*; Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions*.
69. AICPA Quality Management Standards; Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions*.
70. Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*.
71. Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*; CPA Journal Archive, *Courts in two states reaffirm the requirement of privity*, <http://archives.cpajournal.com/old/14467991.htm>; Butler Digital Commons, *Accountants' Liability to Third Parties for Negligent Misrepresentation*, https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1074&context=cob_paper.
72. Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*; CPA Journal Archive, *Courts in two states reaffirm the requirement of privity*.
73. Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*; CPA Journal Archive, *Courts in two states reaffirm the requirement of privity*.

74. Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*; Butler Digital Commons, *Accountants' Liability to Third Parties*.
75. Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*.
76. Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*.
77. Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*.
78. AICPA Insurance, *Third Party Verification Letters*, <https://www.cpai.com/Plans/My-Firm/Cyber-Liability>.
79. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; PCAOB, *AS 2401*; PCAOB, *Fraud Risk Resources*.
80. PCAOB, *AS 2401*; PCAOB, *Fraud Risk Resources*; PCAOB, *AU 316.13*.
81. Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*; CPA Journal Archive, *Courts in two states reaffirm the requirement of privity*.
82. PCAOB, *AS 2401*; eGrove, *Statement on Auditing Standards*; PCAOB, *Fraud Risk Resources*.
83. Journal of Accountancy, *Evaluating fraud risks related to revenue recognition*.
84. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; Spokane EPC, *AICPA Code of Professional Conduct 2*.
85. Hunter Sure, *Professional Liability for Accountants*.
86. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; AICPA Quality Management Standards; Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*.
87. AICPA & CIMA, *Facing Complexity, Uncertainty and Rapid Change*; Nerdssupport, *Why Accounting Firms Are Prime Targets for Ransomware Attacks*.
88. AICPA & CIMA, *Should I disclose my use of gen AI to clients*; AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*.
89. AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; AICPA & CIMA, *Should I disclose my use of gen AI to clients*.
90. Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*; Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*.
91. Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions*; PICPA, *Market Changes Should Spur Professional Liability Review*.
92. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; Spokane EPC, *AICPA Code of Professional Conduct 2*; PCAOB, *ET Section 102*, <https://pcaobus.org/oversight/standards/ethics-independence-rules/details/ET102>.
93. CPA Journal, *Professional Independence Resources*, <https://www.cpajournal.com/2024/04/30/professional-independence-resources/>.
94. PCAOB, *AS 2401*; PCAOB, *Fraud Risk Resources*; Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*.
95. Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*; CPA Journal Archive, *Courts in two states reaffirm the requirement of privity*.
96. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; AICPA & CIMA, *5 tips for QM success*.
97. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; ICPAS, *6 Tips for Implementing the New Quality Management Standards*.
98. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; AICPA & CIMA, *5 tips for QM success*.

99. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; MNCPA, *A new tool for implementing QM standards*, <https://www.mncpa.org/resources/publications/perspectives/august-2025/a-new-tool-for-implementing-qm-standards/>.
100. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; AICPA & CIMA, *5 tips for QM success*; AICPA, *The Monitoring and Remediation Process for a Firm's System of Quality*, <https://www.aicpa-cima.com/resources/download/practice-aid-qm-monitoring-remediation>.
101. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; AICPA & CIMA, *5 tips for QM success*.
102. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; CPA.com, *Making the most of the quality management standards*, <https://www.cpa.com/blog/2025/08/06/making-most-sqms-1-auditing-standard-changes>.
103. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*.
104. Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*; Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*.
105. Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions*; CAMICO, *Top 5 Ways a CPA Can Invite a Malpractice Lawsuit*.
106. Journal of Accountancy, *Fraud risk applies to all CPA firm services*; CAMICO, *Top 5 Ways a CPA Can Invite a Malpractice Lawsuit*.
107. Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*; Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; AICPA & CIMA, *5 tips for QM success*.
108. PCAOB, *AS 2401*; PCAOB, *Fraud Risk Resources*.
109. Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions*; Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions – part 2*.
110. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; AICPA Quality Management Standards.
111. NJCPA, *The Current State of Professional Liability Protection*; AICPA & CIMA, *Facing Complexity, Uncertainty and Rapid Change*; AICPA & CIMA, *Generative AI and risks to CPA firms*; Journal of Accountancy, *Professional liability risk stemming from CPA firm acquisitions*; Journal of Accountancy, *Defending third-party audit claims*.
112. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; Aon, *SQMS 1 explained*; Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*.
113. AICPA & CIMA, *Professional Responsibilities*; PCAOB, *Fraud Risk Resources*; Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*.
114. Journal of Accountancy, *Right-size your quality management documentation*; AICPA & CIMA, *5 tips for QM success*.