

Meeting: IAASB Consultative Advisory Group (CAG)
Meeting Location: New York, United States of America
Meeting Date: March 7–8, 2017

Agenda Item D

ISA 540 (Revised), *Auditing Accounting Estimates and Related Disclosures*

Objectives of Agenda Item

1. The objectives of this agenda item are to:
 - (a) Inform Representatives on the ISA 540 Task Force’s activities since the September 2016 CAG meeting;
 - (b) Obtain Representatives’ views on the issues paper regarding the draft proposed International Standard on Auditing (ISA) 540 (Revised), *Auditing Accounting Estimates*; and
 - (c) Provide a report back on comments of the CAG Representatives on this project as discussed at the September 2016 CAG meeting.

Project Status and Timeline

2. This is the final scheduled IAASB CAG discussion on draft proposed ISA 540 (Revised) prior to the anticipated approval of an exposure draft in March 2017 and, accordingly the current proposed Exposure Draft is included as **Agenda Item D-2**. The proposed conforming and consequential amendments have also been included in light of the importance of the proposed amendments to ISA 500¹ (see **Agenda Item D-4**).
3. The Appendix to this paper provides a history of previous discussions with the CAG and IAASB on this topic, including links to the relevant CAG documentation.

September 2016 CAG Discussion

4. Extracts from the draft minutes of the September 2016 CAG meeting, as well as an indication of how the Task Force or IAASB has responded to the Representatives’ comments are included in the table below.

¹ ISA 500, *Audit Evidence*

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
BROADER PROJECT GOALS AND TIMELINE	
Mr. Waldron asked when ISA 540 (Revised) would come into effect if the standard is approved by the IAASB in December 2017.	Mr. Sharko explained that after approval by the IAASB, the Public Interest Oversight Board (PIOB) has to consider whether due process was followed in the development of the standard and that, while the IAASB has not yet discussed the possible dates, the usual implementation period for standards is 18-24 months from approval of the final standard. He noted that the standard would therefore be effective for 2019 year-end audits.
Ms. Vanich was of the view that the proposed timeline is challenging and that audit firms may need more time to fully understand the implications of the revised standard, both with regard to considering the exposure draft as well as implementing the final standard. She also questioned whether firms would be required to change their risk assessment twice in a short period of time given the activities of the ISA 315 (Revised) ² Working Group.	Point taken into account. The anticipated approval of the exposure draft of proposed ISA 540 (Revised) was moved to March 2017. The IAASB approved the timing of the projects to revise ISA 315 (Revised) and ISA 540, taking into account the public interest issues. Firms will have to amend their methodologies for both projects, as with any other projects
Mr. van der Ende supported the timetable and the ambition of the Task Force to meet it. He noted that it would be helpful to have an exposure draft out in 2017 as that would give banks and auditors an indication of the Task Force's direction. He also welcomed the Global Public Policy Committee's publication on the implementation of IFRS 9 ³ impairment requirements by banks. Mr. van der Ende noted Ms. Vanich's concerns but added that delaying the implementation would be counter to the view of banking regulators and others who believe a revised ISA 540 is necessary in the near term.	
Ms. Molyneaux noted it was important for the IAASB to be clearly communicating about the	Point noted.

² ISA 315 (Revised), *Identifying and Assessing the Risks of Material Misstatements through Understanding the Entity and its Environment*

³ International Financial Reporting Standard (IFRS) 9, *Financial Instruments*

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
nature of the project and how it will achieve its intended objectives. While the prime users of ISA 540 will be the auditors, she noted the issuance of the proposals may result in CFOs, those charged with governance and others needing further guidance on implementation.	
SCALABILITY	
Ms. McGeachy, speaking in her own capacity, supported the Task Force's proposals in paragraph 12A as she believed that the Task Force's approach would help differentiate the risks arising from accounting estimates more clearly. She noted that non-authoritative material such as the flowchart handed out in the meeting was particularly helpful to small and medium practices.	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>As shown in Agenda Item D-1, proposed draft ISA 540 (Revised) now deals with low assessed risks of material misstatement in ISA 540, rather than through reference to ISA 330. See paragraphs 13, A57AA-A57AD, and A57I of Agenda Item D-2.</p>
Mr. Thompson noted that it would be useful to include application material that explains that paragraph 12A, which requires that accounting estimates with "lower" risk of material misstatement should be addressed by ISA 330 ⁴ and that no specific work effort response is required by ISA 540. He also suggested clarifying that the concept of risks of material misstatement that are assessed as "lower risk" excludes accounting estimates that give rise to a significant risk. Mr. Iinuma added that it would be useful to include a reference in paragraph 12A to the paragraphs in ISA 330 that are specifically relevant, as a general reference to the standard could be confusing.	
DEFINITIONS	
Mr. Hines noted that actuaries also had difficulties in defining the difference between data and assumptions and therefore used the term "input". He suggested that the Task Force could do the same given that the procedures an auditor would perform over data and assumptions would be similar.	<p>Point noted.</p> <p>Mr. Sharko noted that, given the difficulty to articulate the difference between data and assumptions, the Task Force decided to explain these terms in the application material. He added that the term "input" has been used in the past, but the Task Force did not support its continued</p>

⁴ ISA 330, *The Auditor's Responses to Assessed Risks*

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
	confusion due to the level of specificity needed for the work effort.
Mr. Rockwell noted his view that some definitions are fundamental to the scope and application of the ISA, such as the definitions of an accounting estimate and estimation uncertainty, and that they should be fully defined without needing application material that could be interpreted as a further definition. He therefore questioned whether the application material to these definitions should be included in the definition section instead of the application material to that section.	Point noted. Mr. B. James explained that the application material provides guidance to how the definition should be interpreted and applied in practice. Prof. Schilder added that the way application material is written makes it clear that it is not a definition. Mr. Sharko noted that the use of the header "Definitions" in the application material was a clarity convention but the Task Force will consider alternative approaches to ensure that the balance and placement of the material is appropriate.
Mr. Stewart questioned the authority of application material in the ISAs, as for IFRS standards the application guidance is also part of the requirements.	Point noted. Ms. Healy explained that the application material provides guidance on how the requirements should be applied in practice but that the application material is not intended to extend the requirements. Mr. Landes added that the structure currently applied in the ISAs (Scope, Objectives, Definitions, Requirements, Application Material) has been used since the clarity project, so auditors are familiar with the current structure, and are aware of their obligation to have an understanding of the entire text of the ISAs, including the application material.
RISK ASSESSMENT	
Ms. Vanich noted that paragraph 8A seems to repeat ISA 315 (Revised) instead of building on it. Mr. van der Ende noted that the Basel Committee supported the addition of paragraph 8A and that the risk assessment is moving in the right direction.	Point taken into account. The references to the components of internal control (previously paragraph 8A) have now been incorporated into paragraph 8, and supplemented by application material. See paragraphs 8 and A38B–A38D of Agenda Item D-2.
Mr. Hines questioned what the difference is between the first sentence of paragraph 8(aA) and 8(a). With respect to the application material related to paragraph 8A, Mr. Hines questioned whether all factors listed in paragraph A38H should	Point noted. Mr. Sharko explained that paragraph 8(a) requires the auditor to obtain an understanding of the financial reporting framework while paragraph

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
<p>be taken into account or that they are mutually exclusive as suggested by the 'or' at the end of third bullet. He also questioned whether the third bullet of A38Q should make it clear that all changes to the model should be taken into account and not just changes in market conditions. Ms. McGeachy added that application material that discusses the consideration to smaller entities could be enhanced and suggested further consideration be given to paragraph A49G.</p>	<p>8(aA) brings in concepts other than the financial reporting framework, such as the complexity in making the accounting estimate, estimation uncertainty and judgment. Mr. Sharko also noted that the Task Force will consider how the application material related to paragraph 8A can be enhanced.</p> <p>The Task Force reviewed the material on considerations for smaller entities and made limited changes throughout the ISA.</p>
<p>Mr. Thompson agreed with the addition of the first sentence in paragraph 9, which requires the auditor to determine whether reviewing previous accounting estimates will assist in identifying and assessing the risks of material misstatement in the current period, but noted that the second sentence in that paragraph should be adjusted, as it still suggested that a retrospective review should be performed in all cases. Because of the changes made to paragraph 9, Ms. Vanich questioned if amendments will be made to the paragraphs in ISA 240⁵ that also discuss the retrospective review of prior accounting estimates.</p>	<p>Point noted.</p> <p>The Task Force concluded that the revised paragraph 9 of Agenda Item D-2 should flag that the review of previous accounting estimates may not be useful in identifying and assessing the risks of material misstatement in the current period.</p> <p>The Task Force does not believe that changes are needed to ISA 240 in light of the changes to paragraph 9, as the two requirements serve different purposes.</p>
<p>Ms. Vanich supported the addition of paragraph 9A, which requires the auditor to assess whether an expert is needed in the risk assessment and noted that in the United States the use of experts in the risk assessment was very successful when obtaining an understanding of complex accounting estimates.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Mr. van der Ende noted that the Basel Committee supported the linkage between the factors that need to be considered in the identification and assessment of the risk of material misstatement, as included in paragraph 10, and the work effort, as included in paragraph 13. With respect to the application material to paragraph 10, he noted that it currently mainly addresses inherent risk but not</p>	<p>Points taken into account.</p> <p>Mr. Sharko agreed that the linkage between paragraph 10 and 13 should be clear and noted the linkage with the work of the ISA 315 (Revised) Working Group as well.</p> <p>The Task Force enhanced the references to controls and control risk in paragraph 13, and</p>

⁵ ISA 240, *The Auditor's Responsibilities Relating to Fraud in an Audit of Financial Statements*

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
control risk, while paragraph 13 does include references to control risk.	included new application material on when testing the operating effectiveness of controls would likely be needed as substantive procedures alone would be insufficient (see paragraph A57A).
Mr. linuma supported paragraphs 10 and 10A and asked the Task to include in the application material to paragraph 10 an example that includes long- and short-term interest curves.	Point noted.
WORK EFFORT	
<p>Ms. Borgerth supported the Task Force's proposed approach in paragraph 13, noting that further prescription would make the list of procedures look like a checklist that must be followed. Mr. van der Ende noted that financial regulators usually preferred more prescriptive requirements as such requirements aided regulators in overseeing the work of auditors. However, in his view, more prescriptive requirements may not be needed if the principle is clear enough, such as the principle that the auditor needs to obtain more evidence until sufficient appropriate evidence has been obtained. Messrs. Dalkin and Hansen and Ms. Singh did not support further prescription of procedures.</p> <p>Mr. Dalkin noted that paragraph 13 could be seen as an audit program, which may reduce the auditor's flexibility and judgment, and that the Task Force should investigate why the IAASB has traditionally not included such detailed procedures in the ISAs. Mr. Fortin suggested that the detailed procedures in paragraph 13 should be retained in the requirement but that the columns indicating which procedure applies to which factor could be moved to the application material to avoid the perception of a checklist.</p>	<p>Support for approach noted.</p> <p>The Task Force determined that the work effort should focus on identifying the reasons for the risk of material misstatement and then specifying the matters about which the auditor is required to obtain audit evidence. Importantly, the ISA does not specify many procedures, as the Task Force wanted to require the auditor to develop responses that best fit the circumstances. See paragraphs 13A-13C of Agenda Item D-2.</p>
Mr. van der Ende noted that, while he supports the direction of paragraph 13, he believed that the linkage with the identification of the risks of material misstatement needs to be enhanced. He also	<p>Point noted.</p> <p>The Task Force enhanced the linkage of the risk assessment to the work effort through a focus on three key factors that drive the risk of material misstatement in accounting estimates, being</p>

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
questioned how different the revised work effort would be compared to the extant work effort.	complexity, judgment, and estimation uncertainty. This is reinforced through the introductory material and Appendix 2 of Agenda Item D-2.
Mr. van der Ende emphasized that it is management's responsibility to make the accounting estimates and that when discussing the audit implications in the Basel Committee two relevant elements were discussed. He noted that the auditor needs to consider whether (a) the translation from management's broader views into the operational data and assumptions is adequate; and (b) the organization is adhering to the management's broader views. He highlighted that the auditor needs to consider whether these two elements lead to reliable numbers in the financial statements. Mr. van der Ende then noted that these audit implications highlight the relationship between the project on ISA 540 and ISA 315 (Revised) and that some elements should be taken into account by the ISA 315 (Revised) Working Group. Given the different timeline of the projects he would be in favor of including some material in ISA 540 that could, at a later stage, be moved to ISA 315 (Revised).	Points noted. The ISA 540 and ISA 315 (Revised) Task Forces have liaised on several occasions and share common Task Force members to enhance co-operation.
Mr. van der Ende noted that auditing management overlays is often difficult for auditors and he asked the Task Force to address this in ISA 540 (Revised).	Mr. Sharko noted that the Task Force had noted this point in the outreach previously but that it is largely specific to financial institutions and is difficult for those without experience in dealing with management overlays to understand. Material on model adjustments (also known as management overlays) have been included in paragraphs 13B(c), A25A, A35D, and A59T of Agenda Item D-2.
Ms. Vanich noted that the procedures with respect to models seem mainly focused on the inputs and not the model itself. The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's (PCAOB) outreach indicated that testing models could increase audit costs especially for models obtained from external sources. Mr. van Hulle noted that ISA 540	Mr. Sharko explained that outreach indicated that it will be hard to audit around a model and not the model itself. He noted that experts informed the Task Force how they get comfortable with certain models and that this is often through testing the model itself or by developing their own model.

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
<p>(Revised) should address the audit of complex models given the importance of the topic and that the PIOB will not approve a standard that shies away from difficult issues. He noted that complex models are not only used for IFRS 9 but also extensively in the accounting for insurance contracts.</p>	<p>The audit implications of complex modelling is addressed in paragraph 13A and A59PA–A59PC of Agenda Item D-2.</p>
<p>Mr. Hansen questioned whether the issue of testing a model from an external source has been addressed by the Task Force and noted his view that this will be a very important component of the revised standards.</p> <p>Mr. linuma questioned whether there should be stricter auditing requirements for management's own model instead of an external model. Mr. Hines added that actuaries use a lot of models and that actuaries are expected to understand how the model works irrespective whether they are internally or externally developed.</p>	<p>Points noted.</p> <p>The Task Force discussed the treatment of third party models and concluded that the ISA should deal with both management's use of its own model and models obtained externally. See paragraph A25A of Agenda Item D-2.</p>
<p>Mr. Hines questioned what the difference is between the stand back requirement in ISA 540 (Revised) and the stand back requirement in ISA 330.⁶</p>	<p>Mr. Sharko explained that the proposed requirement in ISA 540 (Revised) is more granular and that this requirement would require the auditor to take a step back and assess whether sufficient and appropriate audit evidence has been obtained regarding the riskier accounting estimates. He noted that the stand back requirement is a necessary component of the work effort that draws the various risks of material misstatement together to ensure that the overall assessment of the accounting estimate is appropriate.</p> <p>The stand back requirement has been revised to better align with the stand back in ISA 330 (see paragraph 13E of Agenda Item D-2).</p>
<p>Ms. Vanich noted that the work effort required in accordance with extant ISA 540 is not broken, but that there are opportunities for the work effort to be enhanced. In that respect she questioned if auditor would get to the right risk assessment in the</p>	<p>Point noted.</p> <p>The ISA 540 Task Force has worked in conjunction with the ISA 315 (Revised) Task Force as needed, recognizing that they are at different stages.</p>

⁶ See paragraphs 25–27 of ISA 330.

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
absence of a revised ISA 315, as it is unclear where the ISA 315 (Revised) project will lead.	
With respect to the procedures in paragraph 13, Ms. Vanich noted that it would be useful if the Task Force takes into account how the more granular work effort would work for firms that perform audits under both the ISAs and the PCAOB standards. She also noted that some of the procedures in paragraph 13 look similar and that it would be difficult in practice to differentiate them.	Point noted. The work effort has been extensively revised (see paragraphs 13–13C of Agenda Item D-2). This has resulted in a different approach that is less focused on specifying procedures.
SIGNIFICANT RISKS	
Mr. Thompson noted that changing the nature of the procedures performed on significant risks, not just the extent of procedures, was important to some regulators.	Mr. Sharko noted that relocating some procedures from being applicable only to accounting estimates that are assessed as significant risks to being applicable to all risks meant that there may be less of a need to have requirements specific to significant risks.
EXTERNAL DATA SOURCES	
Mr. Hansen asked if it was possible for an auditor to use multiple external data sources to test the validity of one in particular. He noted that obtaining audit evidence about the internal workings of some external sources could be difficult, but looking at the differentiation with other external sources may provide a solution.	Mr. Sharko noted that this approach had been raised at the IAASB but it was noted that it may not necessarily be helpful as there may not be a variety of alternative sources, including when sources that purport to be different are actually based on the same data, assumptions or methods. Mr. Sharko also highlighted that the Task Force believed that an auditor who could not obtain access to the internal workings of the model may have a scope limitation if the auditor is not able to perform a valuation. He added that the Task Force will consider this further. See Agenda Item D-3 for the conforming amendments to ISA 500 to accommodate external information sources.
PROFESSIONAL SKEPTICISM	
Mr. Inuma highlighted that the IAASB should be emphasizing the need for application of professional skepticism through the requirements,	Point taken into account.

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
not the application material. He also noted that a regulator had noted that there should be additional required audit procedures when indicators of management bias are present, and that extant paragraph 21 did not require procedures to be performed if such indicators are present (unlike paragraph 32(b) of ISA 240).	The Task Force concluded that it was necessary to reflect and reinforce professional skepticism, but merely including the words in certain requirements would not improve audit quality. Paragraph 21 of Agenda Item D-2 now notes that the auditor needs to consider the implications of indicators of possible management for the audit.
COMMUNICATION WITH THOSE CHARGED WITH GOVERNANCE	
Mr. van der Ende supported the new paragraph addressing communication with those charged with governance but noted that it could further address considerations related to professional skepticism. He also supported the new application material addressing communications that may take place with regulators and noted that such communications can inform the regulator's assessment of the quality of the audit.	Support noted.
MANAGEMENT BIAS	
Ms. Vanich noted that the Task Force should consider how indicators of management bias interact with the auditor's assessment of fraud risk.	Point accepted. See paragraph A121F of Agenda Item D-2.
IMPLICATIONS FOR DISCLOSURES REGARDING ACCOUNTING ESTIMATES	
Mr. Hines noted that addressing disclosures will be a significant component of the auditor's effort. He added that companies have to track some information that is not recorded in the general and subsidiary ledgers, such as keeping track of a portfolio of financial instruments that may not need to be recorded in the current period, but that may need to be recorded in a future period if circumstances change.	The Task Force has emphasized the role of disclosures (see paragraph 13D of Agenda Item D-2). Consistent with other ISAs, ISA 540 (Revised) does not discuss management's responsibilities at length.
INSURANCE CONTRACTS	
Mr. Dalkin did not support addressing insurance contracts specifically in ISA 540, as doing so would make the ISA too long if that approach was taken for other accounting issues.	Mr. Sharko agreed and noted that the Task Force has put in examples to show how ISA 540 can be applied to different industries.

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
Mr. Fortin also asked what whether International Auditing Practice Statements (IAPS) 1004 was still being used.	Mr. Sharko noted that it made sense for ISA 540 to include banking and insurance examples because of the subject matter of ISA 540, but it is not clear if the same approach would be warranted for other standards. He also noted that IAPS 1004 had been withdrawn in 2011, and that decision was part of the rationale for the banking focus in early work of the ISA 540 Task Force.
DOCUMENTATION	
Mr. Thompson suggested that the documentation requirement related to the decision to use an expert could be improved by focusing on how the auditor obtained the specialized skills and knowledge in accordance with paragraphs 9A and 11A.	Point not accepted. After further deliberation, the Task Force concluded that the documentation requirement should be concise, and should only deal with key matters that are specific to accounting estimates. Accordingly, the reference to the use of specialized skills and knowledge was removed. See paragraph 23 of Agenda Item D-2.
OTHER MATTERS RAISED BY REPRESENTATIVES	
Mr. Dalkin provided several suggestions to enhance the considerations specific for public sector entities. For paragraph A44A, he noted that this paragraph states that a retrospective review may not be relevant for certain public sector specific accounting estimates and questioned whether application material can override a requirement. He noted that paragraph A125B makes reference to Courts of Accounts, which is a function specific to European Union's regulations and that the inference of this material may not be more widely applicable in relation to the possibility of civil and criminal charges. He further questioned if paragraph A11 should say that, in some rare cases, measurement at fair value might not be possible in public sector entities.	Point accepted.
Mr. Iinuma noted that the JFSA had performed a root cause analysis on the issues identified with auditing accounting estimates in their jurisdiction. This analysis indicated that many of the issues	Point noted. Prof. Schilder agreed that the accessibility of ISAs generally is important and that the Board will consider whether to establish an implementation

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
<p>relate to the incorrect application of ISA 540. He therefore asked the Task Force to make sure the standard is written clearly and in such a way that it is understandable.</p>	<p>working group, similar to the Auditor Reporting Implementation Working Group, when ISA 540 (Revised) is finalized.</p> <p>The Task Force has focused on the clarity, understandability, and practicality of the ISA and this will be a key focus of the IAASB in considering whether to approve the ISA.</p>
<p>Mr. E. Bradbury noted that clearer requirements and application material would lead to a more efficient audit, as an auditor who is unsure of what is required may continue seeking information from management beyond what is needed to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence.</p>	<p>Mr. Sharko noted that this issue was not unique to ISA 540, and that the IAASB is considering a project on ISA 500. Ms. Healy also noted that part of the IAASB's work going forward would be how to take the concept of a critical assessment of audit evidence from the definition of professional skepticism and bring it to life in the ISAs.</p>
<p>Mr. Iinuma suggested to add application material in ISA 540 (Revised) that explains that the recoverable amount has a significant impact on the estimation of intangibles and the going concern assessment.</p> <p>Mr. Bini added that application material could explain the effect of the valuation basis on the audit of the accounting estimates, highlighting that the use of a certain valuation basis impacts the complexity in making the accounting estimates or the estimation uncertainty.</p>	<p>Points partially taken into account.</p> <p>The Task Force has included an appendix describing the measurement basis of many accounting estimates, though it does not deal with the specific items mentioned.</p>
<p>Mr. Stewart noted that the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) has a project underway to clarify the difference between changes in accounting estimates and changes in accounting policies, but that this project will not necessarily have an impact on the project to revise ISA 540. However, the ISA 540 Task Force might be interested in following the IASB's project. He also noted that this draft of ISA 540 (Revised) is, recognizing the ISAs are framework neutral, in some areas inconsistent with IFRS 9 and IFRS 13.⁷ For example, the current draft of ISA 540 (Revised)</p>	<p>Points noted.</p>

⁷ IFRS 13, *Fair Value Measurements*

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
uses the term 'provision for doubtful debts' which under IFRS 9 is referred to as "impairment of receivables". Mr. Stewart will provide IAASB Staff with other inconsistencies he noted offline. He also questioned why ISA 540 (Revised) uses fair value in some instances as this could be seen as providing advice on interpretations.	
Mr. Hansen questioned whether there is a need for a conference call to update the CAG on the progress of the project.	Mr. Sharko noted that the Task Force will schedule another informal call after the IAASB's September 2016 board meeting to update the CAG on the discussions in the Board

Matters for CAG Consideration

5. The Representatives are asked for their views on the matters for CAG consideration included in **Agenda Item D.1.**

IAASB Interaction with the IAASB CAG with Respect to Proposed ISA 540 (Revised)

6. The substantive issues being raised for the purposes of the March 2017 IAASB meeting are included in this paper and Agenda Items D.1, D.2, D.3 and D.4. As noted above, the Appendix to this paper provides a project history, including links to the relevant CAG documentation

Material Presented – IAASB CAG Papers

Agenda Item D.1	ISA 540 – Issues and Task Force Recommendations
Agenda Item D.2	Draft Proposed ISA 540 (Revised) - Clean
Agenda Item D.3	Draft Proposed ISA 540 (Revised) – Comparison with Extant ISA 540 Requirements
Agenda Item D.4	Draft Proposed Conforming and Consequential Amendments

Material Presented – IAASB CAG REFERENCE PAPER

[Links Pending]

Appendix

Project History

Project: ISA 540

Summary

	CAG Meeting	IAASB Meeting
Preliminary discussions on audit issues relevant to financial institutions and ISA 540	September 2015	March 2015 June 2015 September 2015
Discussion on project proposal to revise ISA 540	December 2015 Teleconference	December 2015
Discussion on project publication		January 2016
Discussion on audit issues relevant to ISA 540	March 2016 September 2016	March 2016 June 2016 July 2016 September 2016
Exposure Draft		March 2017

CAG Discussions: Detailed References

Preliminary Discussions	<p><u>September 2015</u></p> <p>See IAASB CAG meeting material and CAG meeting minutes (Agenda Item D). http://www.iaasb.org/cag/meetings/new-york-usa-0</p>
Project Proposal	<p><u>December 2015</u></p> <p>See IAASB CAG meeting material and CAG meeting minutes (Agenda Item A). http://www.iaasb.org/cag/meetings/iaasb-cag-conference-call-december-2-2015</p>
Issues	<p><u>March 2016</u></p> <p>See IAASB CAG meeting material and CAG meeting minutes (Agenda Item I) http://www.iaasb.org/cag/meetings/paris-france</p>

	<p><u>September 2016</u></p> <p>See IAASB CAG meeting material (Agenda Item E).</p> <p>http://www.iaasb.org/cag/meetings/new-york-usa</p>
--	--