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PREFACE TEXT TO BE CONFIRMED BASED ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO COME

International Standards on Auditing (ISAs) are to be applied in the audit of financial statements. ISAs are also to be applied, adapted as necessary, to the audit of other information and to related services.

ISAs contain the basic principles and essential procedures (identified in bold type black lettering) together with related guidance in the form of explanatory and other material. The basic principles and essential procedures are to be interpreted in the context of the explanatory and other material that provide guidance for their application.

To understand and apply the basic principles and essential procedures together with the related guidance, it is necessary to consider the whole text of the ISA including explanatory and other material contained in the ISA, not just that text which is black lettered.

In exceptional circumstances, an auditor may judge it necessary to depart from an ISA in order to more effectively achieve the object of an audit. When such a situation arises, the auditor should be prepared to justify the departure.

ISAs need only be applied to material matters.

The Public Sector Perspective (PSP) issued by the Public Sector Committee of the International Federation of Accountants is set out at the end of an ISA. Where no PSP is added, the ISA is applicable in all material respects to the public sector.
Introduction

1. The purpose of this International Standard on Auditing (ISA) is to establish standards and provide guidance on the objective and general principles governing an audit of financial statements. This ISA is to be read in conjunction with ISA 120 “Framework of International Standards on Auditing.”

Objective of an Audit

2. The objective of an audit of financial statements is to enable the auditor to express an opinion whether the financial statements are prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with an identified applicable financial reporting framework. The phrases used to express the auditor’s opinion are “give a true and fair view” or “present fairly, in all material respects,” which are equivalent terms.

3. Although the auditor’s opinion enhances the credibility of the financial statements, the user cannot assume that the audit opinion is an assurance as to the future viability of the entity nor the efficiency or effectiveness with which management has conducted the affairs of the entity.

General Principles of an Audit

4. The auditor should comply with the “Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants” issued by the International Federation of Accountants. Ethical principles governing the auditor’s professional responsibilities are:

   (a) Independence;
   (b) Integrity;
   (c) Objectivity;
   (d) Professional competence and due care;
   (e) Confidentiality;
   (f) Professional behavior; and
   (g) Technical standards.

5. The auditor should conduct an audit in accordance with ISAs. These contain basic principles and essential procedures together with related guidance in the form of explanatory and other material.

6. The auditor should plan and perform an audit with an attitude of professional skepticism recognizing that circumstances may exist that cause the financial statements to be materially misstated. An attitude of professional skepticism means the auditor makes a critical assessment, with a questioning mind, of the validity of audit evidence obtained and is alert to audit evidence that contradicts or brings into question the reliability of documents or management representations. For example, an attitude of professional skepticism is necessary throughout the audit process for the auditor to reduce
the risk of overlooking suspicious circumstances, of overgeneralizing when drawing conclusions from audit observations, and of using faulty assumptions in determining the nature, timing and extent of the audit procedures and evaluating the results thereof. In planning and performing an audit, the auditor neither assumes that management is dishonest nor assumes unquestioned honesty. Accordingly, representations from management are not a substitute for obtaining sufficient appropriate audit evidence to be able to draw reasonable conclusions on which to base the audit opinion.

Scope of an Audit
7. The term “scope of an audit” refers to the audit procedures deemed necessary in the circumstances to achieve the objective of the audit. The audit procedures required to conduct an audit in accordance with ISAs should be determined by the auditor having regard to the requirements of ISAs, relevant professional bodies, legislation, regulations and, where appropriate, the terms of the audit engagement and reporting requirements.

Reasonable Assurance
8. An audit in accordance with ISAs is designed to provide reasonable assurance that the financial statements taken as a whole are free from material misstatement. Reasonable assurance is a concept relating to the accumulation of the audit evidence necessary for the auditor to conclude that there are no material misstatements in the financial statements taken as a whole. Reasonable assurance relates to the whole audit process.

9. However, there are inherent limitations in an audit that affect the auditor’s ability to detect material misstatements. These limitations result from factors such as:

- The use of testing.
- The inherent limitations of any accounting and internal control system (for example, the possibility of management override or collusion).
- The fact that most audit evidence is persuasive rather than conclusive.

10. Also, the work undertaken by the auditor to form an audit opinion is permeated by judgment, in particular regarding:

(a) The gathering of audit evidence, for example, in deciding the nature, timing and extent of audit procedures; and

(b) The drawing of conclusions based on the audit evidence gathered, for example, assessing the reasonableness of the estimates made by management in preparing the financial statements.

---

4 Paragraph 6 reflects the changes indicated in ISA 240. This new text is effective for audits of financial statements for periods ending on or after June 30, 2002. The original Paragraph 6 is indicated below:

The auditor should plan and perform the audit with an attitude of professional skepticism recognizing that circumstances may exist which cause the financial statements to be materially misstated. For example, the auditor would ordinarily expect to find evidence to support management representations and not assume they are necessarily correct.
11. Further, other limitations may affect the persuasiveness of audit evidence available to draw conclusions on particular financial statement assertions\(^1\) (for example, transactions between related parties). In these cases certain ISAs identify specified audit procedures which will, because of the nature of the particular assertions, provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence in the absence of:

\((a)\) Unusual circumstances which increase the risk of material misstatement beyond that which would ordinarily be expected; or

\((b)\) Any indication that a material misstatement has occurred.

12. Accordingly, an audit is not a guarantee that the financial statements are free of material misstatement, because absolute assurance is not attainable.

**Audit Risk and Materiality**

13. Entities pursue strategies to achieve their objectives, and depending on the nature of their operations and industry, the regulatory environment in which they operate, and their size and complexity, they face a variety of business risks\(^2\). Management is responsible for identifying such risks and responding to them. However, not all risks relate to the preparation of the financial statements. The auditor is ultimately concerned only with risks that may affect the financial statements.

14. The auditor obtains and evaluates audit evidence to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements give a true and fair view (or are presented fairly, in all material respects) in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework. The concept of reasonable assurance acknowledges that there is a risk the audit opinion is inappropriate. The risk that the auditor expresses an inappropriate audit opinion when the financial statements are materially misstated is known as “audit risk.”\(^3\)

15. The auditor should plan and perform the audit to reduce audit risk to an acceptably low level that is consistent with the objective of an audit. The auditor reduces audit risk to an acceptably low level by designing and performing audit procedures to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to be able to draw reasonable conclusions on which to base an audit opinion. Reasonable assurance is obtained when the auditor has reduced audit risk to an acceptably low level.

\(^1\) Paragraphs 15 to 18 of ISA XX, “Audit Evidence,” discuss the use of assertions in obtaining audit evidence.

\(^2\) Paragraph 30 to 33 of ISA XX, “Understanding the Entity and Its Environment and Assessing the Risks of Material Misstatement,” discuss the concept of business risks.

\(^3\) This definition of audit risk does not include the risk that the auditor might erroneously conclude that the financial statements are materially misstated. In such a situation, the auditor ordinarily reconsiders or extends audit procedures and requests that management perform specific tasks to reevaluate the appropriateness of the financial statements. These steps ordinarily lead the auditor to the correct conclusion. This definition also excludes the risk of an inappropriate reporting decision notwithstanding the audit evidence obtained, unrelated to the detection and evaluation of a misstatement in the financial statements, such as an inappropriate decision regarding the form of the auditor’s report because of a limitation of scope of the audit.
165. Audit risk is a function of the risk of material misstatement of the financial statements (or simply, the “risk of material misstatement”) (i.e., the risk that the financial statements are materially misstated prior to audit) and the risk that the auditor will not detect such misstatement (“detection risk”). The auditor performs audit procedures to assess the risk of material misstatement and seeks to limit or restrict detection risk by performing further audit procedures based on that assessment (see ISA XX, “Understanding the Entity and Its Environment and Assessing the Risks of Material Misstatement,” and ISA XX, “The Auditor’s Procedures in Response to Assessed Risks.”) The audit process involves the exercise of professional judgment in designing the audit approach, through focusing on what can go wrong (i.e., what are the potential misstatements that may arise) at the assertion level (see ISA XX, “Audit Evidence”) and performing audit procedures in response to the assessed risks in order to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence.

176. The auditor is concerned only with material misstatements, and is not responsible for the detection of misstatements that are not material to the financial statements taken as a whole. The auditor considers whether the effect of identified uncorrected misstatements, both individually and in the aggregate, is material to the financial statements taken as a whole. Materiality and audit risk are related (see ISA 320, “Audit Materiality”). In order to design audit procedures to determine whether there are misstatements that are material to the financial statements taken as a whole, the auditor considers risk and materiality at two levels: the overall financial statement level and in relation to the individual classes of transactions, account balances, and disclosures and the related assertions.

187. The auditor considers the risk of material misstatement at the overall financial statement level, which refers to risks of material misstatement that relate pervasively to the financial statements as a whole and potentially affect many assertions. Risks of this nature often relate to the entity’s control environment (although these risks may also relate to other factors, such as declining economic conditions), and are not necessarily risks identifiable with specific assertions at the class of transactions, account balance, or disclosure level. Rather, this overall risk represents circumstances that increase the risk that there could be material misstatements in any number of different assertions, for example, through management override of internal control. Such risks may be especially relevant to the auditor’s consideration of the risk of material misstatement arising from fraud. The auditor’s response to the assessed consideration of the risk of material misstatement at the overall financial statement level includes consideration of the knowledge, skill, and ability of personnel assigned significant engagement responsibilities, including whether to involve experts; the appropriate levels of supervision; and whether there are events or conditions that may cast significant doubt on the entity’s ability to continue as a going concern.

198. The auditor also considers the risk of material misstatement at the individual class of transactions, account balance, and disclosure level because such consideration directly assists in determining the nature, timing, and extent of further audit procedures at the

---

4 ISA XX, “Understanding the Entity and Its Environment and Assessing the Risks of Material Misstatement,” provides additional guidance on the auditor’s requirement to assess risks of material misstatement at the financial statement level and at the assertion level.
The auditor seeks to restrict risks at the individual class of transactions, account balance, and disclosure level in such a way that enables the auditor, at the completion of the audit, to express an opinion on the financial statements taken as a whole at an acceptably low level of audit risk. Auditors use various approaches to accomplish that objective.

The discussion in the following paragraphs provides an explanation of the components of audit risk. The risk of material misstatement at the assertion level consists of two components as follows:

- **“Inherent risk”** is the susceptibility of an assertion to a material misstatement, that could be material, either individually or when aggregated with other misstatements, assuming that there are no related controls. The risk of such misstatement is greater for some assertions and related classes of transactions, account balances, and disclosures than for others. For example, complex calculations are more likely to be misstated than simple calculations. Accounts consisting of amounts derived from accounting estimates that are subject to significant measurement uncertainty pose greater risks than do accounts consisting of relatively routine, factual data. External circumstances giving rise to business risks may also influence inherent risk. For example, technological developments might make a particular product obsolete, thereby causing inventory to be more susceptible to overstatement. In addition to those circumstances that are peculiar to a specific assertion for a class of transactions, account balance or disclosure, factors in the entity and its environment that relate to several or all of the classes of transactions, account balances, or disclosures may influence the inherent risk related to a specific assertion for a specific class, balance or disclosure. These latter factors include, for example, a lack of sufficient working capital to continue operations or a declining industry characterized by a large number of business failures.

- **“Control risk”** is the risk that a material misstatement that could occur in an assertion and that could be material, either individually or when aggregated with other misstatements, will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis by the entity’s internal control. That risk is a function of the effectiveness of the design and operation of internal control in achieving the entity’s objectives relevant to preparation of the entity’s financial statements. Some control risk will always exist because of the inherent limitations of internal control.

Inherent risk and control risk are the entity’s risks, and they exist independently of the audit of the financial statements. The auditor is required to assess the risk of material misstatement at the assertion level as a basis for further audit procedures, though that assessment is a judgment, rather than a precise measurement of risk. The ISAs do not ordinarily refer to inherent risk and control risk separately, but rather to a combined

---

5 ISA XX, “The Auditor’s Procedures in Response to Assessed Risks,” provides additional guidance on the requirement for the auditor to design and perform further audit procedures in response to the assessed risks at the assertion level.

6 The auditor may make use of a model that expresses the general relationship of the components of audit risk in mathematical terms to arrive at an appropriate level of detection risk. Some auditors find such a model to be useful when planning audit procedures to achieve a desired audit risk though the use of such a model does not eliminate the judgment inherent in the audit process.
assessment of the “risk of material misstatement.” Although the ISAs ordinarily describe a combined assessment of the risk of material misstatement, the auditor may make separate or combined assessments of inherent and control risk depending on preferred audit techniques or methodologies and practical considerations. The assessment of the risk of material misstatement may be expressed in quantitative terms, such as in percentages, or in non-quantitative terms across a range. In any case, the need for the auditor to make appropriate risk assessments is more important than the different approaches by which they may be made.

221. “Detection risk” is the risk that the auditor will not detect a material misstatement that exists in an assertion that could be material, either individually or when aggregated with other misstatements. Detection risk is a function of the effectiveness of an audit procedure and of its application by the auditor. Detection risk cannot be reduced to zero because it arises partly from the fact that the auditor usually does not examine all of a class of transactions, account balance, or disclosure and partly because of other uncertainties. Such other uncertainties arise because an auditor might select an inappropriate audit procedure, misapply an appropriate audit procedure, or misinterpret the audit results. These other uncertainties ordinarily can be reduced to a negligible acceptably low level through adequate planning, proper assignment of personnel to the engagement team, audit staff, the application of professional skepticism, and supervision and review of the audit work performed.

232. Detection risk relates to the nature, timing and extent of the auditor's procedures that are determined by the auditor to reduce audit risk to an acceptably low level. For a given level of audit risk, the acceptable level of detection risk bears an inverse relationship to the assessment of the risk of material misstatement at the assertion level. The greater the risk of material misstatement the auditor believes exists, the less the detection risk that can be accepted. Conversely, the less risk of material misstatement the auditor believes exist, the greater the detection risk that can be accepted.

Responsibility for the Financial Statements

1224. While the auditor is responsible for forming and expressing an opinion on the financial statements, the responsibility for preparing and fairly presenting the financial statements in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework is that of the management of the entity, with oversight from those charged with governance. The audit of the financial statements does not relieve management or those charged with governance of its responsibilities.

Effective Date

25. This ISA is effective for audits of financial statements for periods beginning on or after December 15, 2004.

7 The structures of governance vary from country to country reflecting cultural and legal backgrounds. Therefore, the respective responsibilities of management and those charged with governance vary depending on the legal responsibilities in the particular jurisdiction.