



On the 2026 audit committee agenda

KPMG Board Leadership Center

December 5, 2025



As the pace of change and complexity in the business environment continues to pressure management and put companies on less-solid footing, the focus and effectiveness of the audit committee will be paramount to investor confidence.



Drawing on insights from our survey work and interactions with audit committees and business leaders, we highlight eight issues to keep in mind as audit committees consider and carry out their 2026 agendas:

Continue to focus on the effects of volatility—tariff-related, economic, and geopolitical—on financial reporting and related internal control risks.

Help ensure that management monitors the SEC's planned deregulatory and regulatory actions and how they may impact the company.

Clarify the role of the audit committee in the oversight of AI, cybersecurity, and data governance.

Understand how technology is affecting the finance organization's talent, efficiency, and value-add.

Monitor management's preparations for new climate and other sustainability reporting frameworks and standards.

Reinforce audit quality and set clear expectations for frequent, candid, and open communication with the external auditor.

Help maintain internal audit's focus on the company's critical risks, beyond financial reporting and compliance.

Take a fresh look at the audit committee's composition and skill sets.



Continue to focus on the effects of volatility—tariff-related, economic, and geopolitical—on financial reporting and related internal control risks.

Key areas of focus for companies' 2025 10-K and 2026 filings

Continuing tariff uncertainty

Oversight of the financial reporting, accounting, and disclosure obligations posed by tariff uncertainty will remain a top priority for audit committees in 2026. Key areas of financial reporting under US GAAP that can be most susceptible to the effects or potential effects of tariffs include revenue recognition, inventory costs and associated impairment risk, credit losses, going concern, and others. For more details, see our [Tariffs Uncertainty: Ask the right financial reporting questions](#). On November 5, the Supreme Court heard oral arguments related to tariffs imposed by President Trump under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) emergency powers. The outcome of this case may have significant implications for US trade policy, and the Supreme Court could make its decision by the end of the year or in the new year. The Supreme Court decision would address only tariffs imposed under IEEPA, and other tariffs would remain unaffected. Thus, regardless of the outcome of the case, there may continue to be a level of uncertainty regarding the administration's tariff policies.

Forecasting and disclosures

Other matters requiring the audit committee's attention include disclosures regarding the impact of the wars in Ukraine and the Middle East, government sanctions, US and foreign export controls, supply chain disruptions, heightened cybersecurity risk, inflation, interest rates, and market volatility; preparation of forward-looking cash-flow estimates; impairment of nonfinancial assets, including goodwill and other intangible assets; impact of events and trends on liquidity; accounting for financial assets (fair value); going concern; and use of non-GAAP metrics. With companies making tough calls, regulators will continue to emphasize the importance of well-reasoned judgments and transparency, including contemporaneous documentation to demonstrate that the company applied a rigorous process. Given the fluid nature of the long-term environment, disclosure of changes in judgments, estimates, and controls may be required more frequently.



Internal control over financial reporting (ICOFR) and probing control deficiencies

Given the ongoing volatility, as well as changes in the business, such as acquisitions, new lines of business, digital transformations, deployment of GenAI and AI agents, etc., a focus on the effectiveness of internal controls remains critical, including whether controls have kept pace with changes in the company's operations and risk profile. Discuss with management how the current environment and regulatory mandates affect management's disclosure controls and procedures and ICOFR, as well as management's assessment of the effectiveness of ICOFR. When control deficiencies are identified, probe beyond management's explanation for "why it's only a control deficiency" or "why it's not a material weakness," and help provide a balanced evaluation of the deficiency's severity and cause.

Climate, AI, and cybersecurity disclosures

Audit committees should consider tasking management with reassessing the adequacy of the company's internal controls and disclosure controls and procedures to support the company's current climate disclosures, even without the SEC's climate rule, and disclosures about the company's use of AI, the associated risks, and the company's governance of the technology. Management should also reassess the company's processes and procedures for identifying and escalating potentially significant cybersecurity incidents and risks to ensure timely analysis and disclosure of those determined to be material.



Help ensure that management monitors the SEC's planned deregulatory and regulatory actions and how they may impact the company.

In the Spring 2025 Unified Agenda,¹ the Commission outlined its regulatory priorities under Chairman Paul Atkins. In addition to the emphasis on crypto assets and facilitating capital formation, priorities included:

- A proposed rulemaking on rationalization of disclosure practices (to facilitate material disclosure by companies and shareholders' access to that information)
- A proposed rulemaking on shareholder proposal modernization (to reduce compliance burdens for registrants)
- The withdrawal of items from the prior administration's agenda that, as Chair Atkins stated, "do not align with the goal that regulation should be smart, effective and appropriately tailored within the confines of our statutory authority."² These items include rulemakings on human capital management disclosure and board diversity.

On September 19, 2025, Chairman Atkins confirmed that the SEC will propose a rule change which, if approved, would allow companies to continue reporting quarterly or switch to semiannual reports, in line with other jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom and European Union.³ In his October speech, Atkins suggested that there was likely no basis in state corporate law for precatory shareholder proposals.⁴

Given the scope of the SEC's proposed deregulatory initiatives—and the implications for the company's earnings reports frequency, disclosure practices, internal controls, risk profile, compliance obligations, and shareholder engagement strategies—audit committees should stay well-informed about the planned rulemakings and receive regular updates from management, legal counsel, and auditors about the status of the rulemakings and the implications for the company.

Among the key areas of focus:

- Help ensure that management monitors and understands SEC policy shifts and how deregulatory initiatives may affect the company's strategic positioning, investor relations, capital formation, and compliance and disclosure obligations.
- Understand investor expectations regarding quarterly reporting, including how a shift to semiannual reporting would impact those expectations. In the event of such a shift, investors may expect companies to voluntarily provide quarterly earnings releases and updates. Management should ensure that the frequency and quality of earnings reports are aligned with investor expectations.
- What are the compliance and risk implications if formal SEC rules are rescinded but the underlying risks (e.g., cybersecurity, climate, sustainability, AI) remain? How will a shift to a principles-based regime affect the company's internal controls, policies, and monitoring system?
- Encourage a culture of transparency and proactive compliance amid deregulation, and confirm that management maintains a robust system of ICOFR, including disclosure controls and procedures.

It is important to note that the SEC's deregulatory agenda may add more complexity to an already fragmented regulatory landscape, with regulatory divergence on the state and federal level as well as the international level posing an additional challenge for many companies.



¹ "Statement on the Spring 2025 Regulatory Agenda," SEC Chairman Paul S. Atkins, September 4, 2025.


² "Statement on the Spring 2025 Regulatory Agenda," Paul S. Atkins, September 4, 2025.

³ Lydia Beyoud, "SEC Will Move to Overhaul Investor Disclosures, Atkins Says," Bloomberg, September 19 2025.

⁴ Paul S. Atkins, Chairman, "Keynote Address at the John L. Weinberg Center for Corporate Governance's 25th Anniversary Gala," US Securities and Exchange Commission, October 9, 2025.

In July, Chairman Atkins announced plans for the SEC's "Project Crypto" to modernize existing securities laws to accommodate the unique characteristics of crypto assets, establishing a clear regulatory framework such as guidelines on whether a crypto asset is classified as a security, commodity, stablecoin, or collectible, while also encouraging innovation and promoting market competition. The project also supports tokenization, which involves creating digital representations of physical or financial assets on a blockchain, seen as a key driver of efficiency and transparency in financial markets. Project Crypto and its push for a formal token taxonomy will impact disclosures, exemptions, and legal responsibilities for issuers and corporate holders.⁵ Yet, there remain many open and unresolved questions related to crypto assets, including accounting, auditing, disclosures, and controls.

For companies that hold or plan to hold crypto assets, including cryptocurrencies, stablecoins, tokenized deposits, and other digital assets, audit committees can play an important role in helping management navigate the evolving global regulatory environment. This will impact compliance, risk management, and governance strategies for these assets. Regulators worldwide are rapidly developing new frameworks in response to the growth of crypto asset markets, and audit committees should encourage management to establish formal processes for monitoring and assessing regulation and implementing appropriate governance and risk frameworks.



⁵Paul S. Atkins, Chairman, "American Leadership in the Digital Finance Revolution," US SEC, July 31, 2025.



Clarify the role of the audit committee in the oversight of AI, cybersecurity, and data governance.


As companies continue to move forward with investment in and deployment of AI in all its forms, a key question for boards is how to structure oversight of AI at the full board and committee levels, including the audit committee. As discussed in [On the 2026 board agenda](#), for many companies, oversight is often at the full board level—where boards are seeking to understand the company’s strategy for developing business value from AI and its potential impacts on the business model and workforce, while monitoring management’s governance structure for the deployment and use of the technology.

However, many audit committees already may be involved in overseeing specific AI-related issues, and it is important to clarify the scope of the audit committee’s responsibilities. AI-related issues for which the audit committees may have oversight responsibilities include:

- AI governance, including compliance with evolving and diverging AI, privacy, consumer protection, and intellectual property laws and regulations
- Use of GenAI and AI agents in the preparation and audit of financial statements and drafts of SEC and other regulatory filings
- Use of GenAI and AI agents by internal audit and the finance organization, and whether those functions have the necessary talent and skill sets
- Development and maintenance of internal controls and disclosure controls and procedures related to AI, as well as controls around data.

Assessing audit committee oversight responsibilities for cybersecurity and data governance

For many companies, much of the board’s oversight responsibility for cybersecurity and data governance has resided with the audit committee. With the explosive growth in GenAI and AI agents, many boards are reassessing their data governance and cybersecurity frameworks and processes to help ensure that they address any increased risks related to the technology. In the process, many boards are reassessing which board committee has the time, expertise, and skill sets to assume a role in the oversight of data governance and perhaps cybersecurity.





Understand how technology is affecting the finance organization's talent, efficiency, and value-add.

Finance organizations operate in a complex environment, managing talent shortages alongside implementing digital strategies and transformations. They are also tasked with developing systems and procedures that go beyond conventional financial stewardship and reporting, aiming to enhance value by serving as strategic partners within their organizations. At the same time, many are contending with difficulties in forecasting and planning for a volatile environment. As audit committees monitor and help guide the finance organization's progress, we suggest three areas of focus:

- GenAI and AI agents go a long way toward solving one of the biggest pain points in finance—manual processes. Labor-intensive systems increase the risk of human errors, consume valuable resources, and limit real-time insights. AI can boost efficiency, but involving humans at vital points in AI workflows is necessary to ensure accuracy, validate results, fix mistakes, add context and provide for judgment.
- Given the broad role of finance in strategy and risk management, finance professionals can play a role in spearheading the company's use and deployment of GenAI and AI agents. These technologies and the acceleration of digital strategies and transformations present important opportunities for finance to add greater value to the business by providing forward-looking insights and analysis in key strategic and risk areas.
- To add value, the finance organization requires talent and expertise beyond traditional finance skills, including talent and expertise in information technology, AI, data analytics, risk management, and strategy, as well as climate and sustainability.

It is essential that the audit committee work closely with the CFO and devote adequate time to understanding the finance organization's AI and digital transformation strategy, where finance can add strategic value to the business, and help ensure that finance is attracting, developing, and retaining the leadership, talent, and skill sets to execute those strategies alongside its existing responsibilities. Staffing deficiencies in the finance department may pose the risk of an internal control deficiency, including a material weakness.





Monitor management's preparations for new climate and other sustainability reporting frameworks and standards.

The regulatory uncertainty that defined 2025 is giving way to a clearer path forward in 2026, as greater clarity continues to emerge with multiple climate and sustainability reporting proposals taking shape.

US developments

Even without the SEC's climate rule, the significance of current disclosure requirements and their applicability to climate-related matters is not diminished. Audit committees should consider tasking management with refreshing their understanding of the SEC's 2010 disclosure guidance and how it currently applies to their organization.

In California, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) is developing regulations that will underpin the California climate laws, SB-253 (GHG emissions) and SB-261 (climate risks). In October, CARB announced that it is delaying initial rulemaking to the first quarter of 2026. Though CARB announced a delay, it did not change the reporting deadlines in the laws. However, in November, the US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued an injunction halting enforcement of SB-261 while an appeal is pending, but SB-253 remains unaffected. CARB will not enforce SB-261 following the injunction. Once the appeal is resolved, CARB will provide further information and set an alternate date for reporting, as appropriate. Companies can still voluntarily submit their Climate-Related Financial Risk Report.

EU developments

In February 2025, the European Commission released an Omnibus package of proposals to reduce sustainability reporting and due diligence requirements. This includes proposed amendments to the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive aimed at simplifying and streamlining the regulatory framework introduced by both directives while still achieving the overall ambition of the European Green Deal. The proposals include significant changes to CSRD scoping, which could result in only some 5 percent of the companies originally in scope remaining in scope. The proposals are currently being finalized, with a final text expected to become EU law in early 2026. Although uncertainty still abounds, significant changes to the CSRD scoping thresholds are highly likely. As part of the Omnibus package of proposals, another effort is being undertaken to streamline the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) and to substantially reduce the volume of disclosures. The simplified version of ESRS is likely to enter into force in late 2026.

ISSB developments

The International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) has proposed significant amendments to the SASB Standards as part of supporting the high-quality implementation of IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards.

IFRS® Sustainability Disclosure Standards are mandatory only in jurisdictions that choose to adopt them. Although the effective date in the IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards is January 1, 2024, individual jurisdictions are deciding whether and when companies would be required to apply the standards, akin to the process for adopting IFRS Accounting Standards. Unlike IFRS Accounting Standards, which have become the de facto global language of financial reporting, adoption of IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards is varying widely across jurisdictions. This leads to differences in how the standards are adopted, who is required to comply, which requirements apply, and when they become mandatory.

Even in the absence of regulatory-driven required disclosures, many companies will continue to issue voluntary sustainability and climate-related reports, and many may be asked to provide climate information to companies to which they provide products and services.

In 2026, audit committees should help ensure management is not simply tracking regulatory developments but is navigating the intersection of three key challenges: the uncertain timeline in California, the scoping uncertainty in the EU, and the global fragmentation of ISSB adoption. Engagement with management should focus on ensuring companies at least consider a flexible, risk-based reporting strategy that satisfies immediate compliance needs without losing sight of broader market expectations and future regulatory horizons.



Reinforce audit quality and set clear expectations for frequent, candid, and open communication with the external auditor.

Audit quality is enhanced by a fully engaged audit committee that sets the tone and clear expectations for the external auditor and monitors auditor performance rigorously through frequent, quality communication and a robust performance assessment.

In setting expectations for 2026, audit committees should be sure that their discussions with the auditor include two critical areas: how the company's financial reporting and related internal control risks have changed (and are changing) in light of the unprecedented disruption, volatility, and risks the company will continue to face, as well as changes in the business; and how the company is using AI technologies, including GenAI and AI agents in its financial reporting and related internal control processes.

Set clear expectations for frequent, open, candid communication between the auditor and the audit committee, beyond what's required. The list of required communications is extensive and includes matters about the auditor's independence as well as matters related to the planning and results of the audit. Taking the conversation beyond what's required can enhance the audit committee's oversight, particularly regarding the company's culture, tone at the top, and the quality of talent in the finance organization.

Given the rapid advancements in the use and deployment of AI, audit committees should discuss with the external auditor how the audit plan provides for assessing risks posed by the company's use of GenAI and AI agents in the financial reporting and related internal control processes. Audit committees should also discuss with the external auditor how the auditor is using GenAI and AI agents in the audit process, how the firm is ensuring audit quality when AI is used, and the impact of the use of AI on audit strategy and resource and talent requirements.

Audit committees should continue to probe the audit firm regarding its quality control systems that are intended to drive sustainable, improved audit quality—including the firm's implementation and use of new technologies such as AI to drive audit quality. In discussions with the external auditor regarding the firm's internal quality control systems, consider the results of PCAOB inspections, Part I and Part II, and internal inspections and efforts to address deficiencies.

Discussions should also include the status of the firm's preparations for the PCAOB's new quality control standard, QC 1000, A Firm's System of Quality Control. QC 1000 will require audit firms to identify specific risks to audit quality and design a quality control system that includes policies and procedures to mitigate these risks. Audit firms will also be required to conduct annual evaluations of their quality control systems and report the results of their evaluation to the PCAOB on a new Form QC. QC 1000 is effective on December 15, 2026, with the first annual evaluation covering the period beginning on December 15, 2026, and ending on September 30, 2027.





Help maintain internal audit's focus on the company's critical risks, beyond financial reporting and compliance.

Internal audit should be a valuable resource for the audit committee and a crucial voice on risk and control matters. This means not only focusing on financial reporting and compliance risks, but also on critical strategic, operational, AI and other technology risks and related controls, as well as sustainability risks.

Given the evolving geopolitical, macroeconomic, and risk landscape, reassess whether the internal audit plan is risk-based and flexible enough to adjust to changing business and risk conditions. The audit committee should work with the chief audit executive and chief risk officer to help identify the risks, including industry-specific and mission-critical risks, that pose the greatest threat to the company's reputation, strategy, and operations, and help ensure that internal audit is focused on these key risks and related controls.

The risks posed by the company's use of GenAI and AI agents—and whether the company's governance structure and risk management processes around AI are effective—will likely be an important area of internal audit focus in the coming year. Audit committees will also want to understand how internal audit is using GenAI and AI agents to improve its effectiveness and efficiency. What internal audit workflows can AI agents handle, and what internal audit workflows are AI agents actually handling today? Is internal audit maintaining a human-on-the-loop at critical stages of AI agent workflows?

Internal audit's broadening mandate will likely require upskilling the function to develop and maintain proficiency in areas such as advanced data analytics, AI, cybersecurity risk assessment, climate and sustainability, and operational resilience. Set clear expectations and help ensure that internal audit has the talent, resources, skills, and expertise to succeed—and help the chief audit executive think through the impact of GenAI, AI agents, and digital technologies on internal audit.





Take a fresh look at the audit committee's composition and skill sets.

The continued expansion of the audit committee's oversight responsibilities beyond its core oversight responsibilities (financial reporting and related internal controls, and internal and external auditors) has heightened concerns about the committee's bandwidth, composition, and skill sets. Assess whether the committee has the time and the right composition and skill sets to oversee the major risks on its plate. Such an assessment is sometimes done in connection with an overall reassessment of issues assigned to each standing board committee.

In making that assessment, we recommend three areas to probe as part of the audit committee's annual self-evaluation:

- Does the committee have the bandwidth and members with the experience and skill sets necessary to oversee areas of risk beyond its core responsibilities? For example, do some risks—e.g., mission-critical risks such as product safety, as well as AI, data governance, cybersecurity, legal/regulatory compliance, culture, supply chain, and geopolitical risk—require more attention at the full board level, or perhaps the focus of another standing committee?
- How many committee members have deep expertise in financial accounting, reporting, and control issues? Is the committee relying only on one or two members to do the “heavy lifting” in the oversight of financial reporting and controls?
- As the committee's workload expands to include oversight of a range of risk disclosures—including AI, cybersecurity, and sustainability issues, as well as related disclosure controls and procedures and internal controls—does it have the necessary financial reporting and internal control expertise to effectively carry out these responsibilities as well as its core oversight responsibilities?

With investors and regulators focusing on audit committee composition and skill sets, this is an important issue for audit committees.



About the KPMG Board Leadership Center

The KPMG BLC champions outstanding corporate governance to drive long-term value and enhance stakeholder confidence. Through an array of insights, perspectives, and programs, the BLC promotes continuous education and improvement of public and private company governance. BLC engages with directors and business leaders on the critical issues driving board agendas—from strategy, risk, talent, and sustainability to data governance, artificial intelligence, audit quality, proxy trends, and more. Learn more at kpmg.com/blc.

Contact us

kpmg.com/us/blc

T: 800-808-5764

E: us-kpmgmktblc@kpmg.com

Learn about us:



kpmg.com

Some or all of the services described herein may not be permissible for KPMG audit clients and their affiliates or related entities.

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavor to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act upon such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.

© 2025 KPMG LLP, a Delaware limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organization of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organization. USCS035395-5A

This publication contains copyright © material and trademarks of the IFRS® Foundation. All rights reserved. Reproduced by KPMG LLP with the permission of the IFRS Foundation. Reproduction and use rights are strictly limited. For more information about the IFRS Foundation and rights to use its material please visit www.ifrs.org.

Disclaimer: To the extent permitted by applicable law the IASB, the ISSB, and the IFRS Foundation expressly disclaims all liability howsoever arising from this publication or any translation thereof whether in contract, tort or otherwise (including, but not limited to, liability for any negligent act or omission) to any person in respect of any claims or losses of any nature including direct, indirect, incidental or consequential loss, punitive damages, penalties or costs.

Information contained in this publication does not constitute advice and should not be substituted for the services of an appropriately qualified professional.

'ISSB™' is a Trade Mark and 'IFRS®' is a registered Trade Mark of the IFRS Foundation and are used by KPMG LLP under licence subject to the terms and conditions contained therein. Please contact the IFRS Foundation for details of countries where its Trade Marks are in use and/or have been registered.