

Supplement O to Agenda Item 5

RESPONSES RECEIVED ON THE DISCUSSION PAPER

EXPLORING THE DEMAND FOR AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES ENGAGEMENTS AND OTHER SERVICES, AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE IAASB'S INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS

COMMENTS TO QUESTION 14

Note: This supplement has been prepared for information only. A comprehensive summary of the significant comments received on the November 2016 Discussion Paper, *Exploring the Demand for Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagements and Other Services, and the Implications for the IAASB's International Standards* and related analyses of significant issues are presented at the [September 2017 IAASB meeting](#). All comment letters on the Discussion Paper can be accessed [here](#).

Q14. What are your views as to whether the IAASB needs to address multi-scope engagements, and how should this be done? For example, would non-authoritative guidance be useful in light of the emerging use of these types of engagements?

| # | Respondent | Comments |
|---|---------------------|---|
| Those Charged with Governance | | |
| 1. | IIA SA | Yes the IAASB may address multi-scope engagements. Guidance would be useful. |
| Regulators and Oversight Authorities | | |
| 2. | EUROPEAN COMMISSION | Multi-scope engagements should be considered with extreme prudence, and if not necessary, not introduced at all. If absolutely needed, non-authoritative guidance is not enough to avoid all the uncertainties inherent to this kind of new engagement. |
| 3. | IRBA | <p>14.1 We support the idea that non-authoritative guidance be developed. This would be useful as regulators are requiring practitioners to perform these types of engagements. Further, this will alert users who are not aware of the fact that these types of engagements can be performed.</p> <p>14.2 We recommend that the guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers a classification for the reports within multi-scope engagements and clarifies that the scope of each of the engagements is different in order to avoid confusion or misunderstanding among users of the reports; and • Clarifies who can perform each of these engagements. |

| National Auditing Standard Setters | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|--|
| 4. | AASB-CNAC | <p>Our view is that IAASB should address multi-scope engagements given the increasing demand for such engagements. We believe that guidance on multi-scope engagements to be developed by the IAASB should set out general principles (and provide examples) that are applicable globally; for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification on whether, and if so how, the reporting on various elements within a multi-scope engagement should be segregated. • Example reports on multi-scope engagements – for example, a multi-scope engagement consisting of an engagement under ISA 8051 and an AUP engagement under ISRS 4400 on both financial and non-financial information. <p>Specific guidance such as a roadmap or decision tree on standards relevant in a multi-scope engagement may best be developed by national standard setters and not by the IAASB. This is because multi-scope engagements are often jurisdiction-specific and many jurisdictions have a suite of standards that may differ from the IAASB pronouncements.</p> <p>1 ISA 805, Special Considerations — Audits of Single Financial Statements and Specific Elements, Accounts or Items of a Financial Statement</p> |
| 5. | AUASB | <p><i>Combined answer to question 14 and 15</i></p> <p>With the increase in demand for multi-scope engagements, the AUASB believes guidance is necessary in this area, particularly around reporting. To this end, the AUASB in June 2015 issued a guidance statement, GS 022 Grant Acquittals and Multi-Scope Engagements, to assist auditors in exercising professional judgement in applying the auditing standards to a selection of practical application issues that may arise in this area. The IAASB may find this guidance beneficial in the development of international guidance in this area.</p> <p>Owing to the age of the extant ISRS 4400, and the increase in demand for such engagements, the AUASB agrees that a revision to ISRS 4400 be prioritised over guidance on multi-scope engagements.</p> |
| 6. | CNCC-CSOEC | <p>We fully support the Working Group's view that considers that an update of ISRS 4400 is necessary as a priority and needs to be addressed before potentially developing guidance on multi-scope engagements.</p> <p>Once the update of ISRS 4400 is finalized, we consider that the IAASB will be able to examine the issue of multi-scope engagements. We fully support a non-authoritative guidance to deal with the multi-scope engagements.</p> |
| 7. | FAP | NO RESPONSE |
| 8. | HKICPA | <p>With regulators increasingly relying on professional accountants to carry out assurance and/or AUP engagements to improve accountability it would be helpful to develop a standard addressing multi-scope engagements. We appreciate the time and effort required to develop a standard, a non-authoritative guidance out-lining how "multi-scope" engagements could be addressed using the current suite of standards would be useful. Such non-authoritative guidance would also help regulators to understand why professional accountants may not be able to perform certain engagements.</p> |
| 9. | IDW | <p>Multi-scope engagements (audits, reviews, other assurance engagements compilations or agreed-upon-procedures engagements performed together) are not uncommon in practice. Such engagements do not present performance problems, but there are reporting issues as to how to present the report or reports (that is, separate reports or one report with multiple separate sections). Most important in this context is that, in any case, the description of the different kinds of engagement needs to be separated so that users are not</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---------|--|
| | | <p>confused as to the nature of the work done and the conclusions or factual findings reached, if any. We have now issued a number of standards (e.g., the additional requirements for the long-form audit report for audits of financial statements of banks, engagements in relation to energy laws, wider scope engagements to audit financial statements of government entities) at the IDW that combine different engagements into a single engagement (audits, reviews, other assurance engagements – both reasonable and limited assurance – compilation engagements, agreed-upon procedures engagements, specified audit-type procedures engagements, expert opinions). Rationalizing the reporting with multiple types of engagements within one engagement and one report has proven to be the greatest challenge.</p> <p>For these reasons we would very much support the IAASB undertaking a project on multi-scope engagements and would be prepared to contribute our experience in this area to the deliberations. We are not convinced that non-authoritative guidance will suffice in the long run, but such guidance may be the first step. We also agree that this is a matter that needs to be dealt with separately from agreed-upon procedures engagements – preferably after a new standard on such engagements has been completed.</p> |
| 10. | JICPA | Issues concerning the multi-scope engagements cover a wide dimension ranging from the AUP engagement to assurance engagement and consulting business. Therefore, we are of the view that non-authoritative guidance would be a proper tool to deal with, and that the issues concerning the multi-scope engagements should be discussed, separately from the ISRS4400 revision project. |
| 11. | MAASB | The AASB is of the view IAASB needs to address multi-scope engagements given that there is an increasing demand for these types of engagements. The IAASB should provide guidance on addressing practical application issues that may arise in multi-scope engagements. |
| 12. | NBA | We do feel the need for more guidance on multi-scope engagements as we mentioned earlier in our response to the IAASB discussion paper regarding EER. An example is a combination of ISAE 3000 and ISRS 4400 for EER. A practice note would be useful considering the developments in these types of engagements. |
| 13. | NZAuASB | <p>Unless required by law or regulation, the NZAuASB considers that multi-scope engagements should be discouraged. Users of a multi-scope engagement report may not understand the difference between the engagement types, creating or adding to confusion about the level of assurance to be taken or lack thereof.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the previous comment, given the increasing demand for multi-scope engagements, guidance would be helpful.</p> |
| Accounting Firms | | |
| 14. | BDO | <p>As an international network of member firms, we champion the development of different types of engagements in which clients see value. Multi-scope engagements as described in paragraphs 50 and 52 of the discussion paper appear suitable in terms of the types of services that can be provided by a practitioner. As these types of engagements contain elements which are addressed by existing IAASB standards, we believe providing guidance would be useful to address the increased demand for these engagements. We propose that any guidance on multi-scope engagements should not be included as part of ISRS 4400 but in a separate standard or in non-authoritative guidance.</p> <p>For example, the Canadian Standard on Related Services 4460 – Reporting on Supplementary Matters Arising from an Audit or a Review Engagement is an example of a multi-scope engagement. The scope of this standard encompasses circumstances when a practitioner has been requested to accept another reporting responsibility having all of the following attributes :</p> <p>(a) The practitioner has been engaged or requested to perform an audit or a review engagement;</p> |

| | | |
|-----|------|---|
| | | <p>(b) The practitioner has received a request from a third party, or is required by law, regulation or agreement, to provide a written report on a supplementary matter arising from the audit or review engagement;</p> <p>(c) The practitioner has not been engaged to perform an audit or a review engagement on the supplementary matter referred to in (b); and</p> <p>(d) The practitioner's responsibility to provide the written report is not covered by other standards in the CPA Canada Handbook – Assurance.</p> <p>Other reporting responsibilities include :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completing or reporting on supplementary information; • Completing or reporting on questionnaires; • Reporting instances of non-compliance with law, regulation or agreement; • Reporting facts or figures other than the information on which the practitioner is performing an audit or a review engagement; • Reporting observations made or items of interest to the third party; or • Providing recommendations. <p>The first step in accepting this kind of an engagement is determining whether all criteria above are met and if the other reporting responsibility is within the practitioner's area of expertise and that the wording used does not indicate or suggest that the practitioner is providing assurance on the subject matter. As noted above in the response to question 4, there is also some guidance regarding what to do when the terminology or criteria used in unclear, and how to ensure this information is appropriately provided to the users of the report.</p> |
| 15. | CHI | <p>Multi-scope engagements will have to be addressed. Because these may come in many different forms and will often be jurisdiction specific then general guidance may be the solution.</p> <p>The general guidance could cover the areas included in ISRS 4400 as matters such as independence, terminology, report formats and report restrictions will arise.</p> |
| 16. | DTTL | <p>DTTL agrees multi-scope engagements need to be addressed, particularly as there are different understandings of what constitutes a multi-scope engagement. DTTL believes that this can be done through the provision of non-authoritative guidance as opposed to setting additional standards.</p> |
| 17. | EYG | <p>We agree with the Working Group's position in paragraph 52 of the Discussion Paper that the key characteristic of a multi-scope engagement is that the various elements of the engagement comply with the corresponding IAASB pronouncements. We do not believe that, other than clearly communicating this principle in some manner, any more work is needed by the IAASB to produce guidance or otherwise address multi-scope engagements at this time.</p> |
| 18. | GTIL | <p><i>Combined answer to question 14 and 15</i></p> <p>We agree with the proposals in the Discussion Paper that focus should continue to be on the current projects on the IAASB Work Plan for 2017-2018, which incorporates revisions to ISRS 4400 as a project commencing in 2017.</p> <p>Further, in respect of multi-scope engagements, we are of the view that further outreach is needed to understand what the specific issues are with respect to performing such engagements. If interim guidance is considered appropriate, national auditing standard setters may</p> |

| | | |
|-----|--------------------|---|
| | | be better placed to issue any non-authoritative guidance required. This could include developing a "road map" that would help practitioners determine which standards or other local reporting requirements an engagement will be governed by. |
| 19. | KINGSTON SMITH LLP | This is an emerging area where we can see that some form of guidance might ultimately be useful. However, we do not think that the revision of ISRS 4400 should be delayed in order to address multi-scope engagements. |
| 20. | KPMG | <p><i>Combined answer to question 8, 14 and 15</i></p> <p>We understand that multi-scope engagements are becoming more common with increased regulatory oversight, and the resulting development of regulatory reporting frameworks.</p> <p>We are aware of three types of engagement that could be considered to be “multi-scope” or hybrid:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engagements where the practitioner is requested to provide limited or reasonable assurance on certain subject matter information, as well as reporting factual findings on an entirely distinct, but related, subject matter information. For example, when a practitioner reports on an audit of financial statements, as well as, factual findings on procedures required by a regulator; 2. Engagements where the practitioner is requested to provide limited or reasonable assurance on certain subject matter information, with the scope of their work including certain procedures specified by the preparer, and/or user, and their assurance report is required to include the findings from these procedures. For example, when a practitioner provides an assurance conclusion on financial information prepared pursuant to the terms and conditions of a grant, as well as factual findings on specific internal controls as specified in the grant conditions; and 3. Engagements where the preparer and/or third-party user’s intention is to request an AUP, but the actual scope of work specified includes procedures that require application of judgement and/or forming of subjective views. The practitioner agrees to provide a long-form narrative report including results of testing, professional views, and recommendations, but no opinion. <p>We believe that the above scenarios describe areas of emerging practice. While we do not believe that these scenarios should be within the scope of a revision to extant ISRS 4400, practitioners may benefit from more guidance in this area at some point in the future as practice in this area evolves. Accordingly, we recommend that IAASB monitor the development of such engagements and consider the need to develop additional guidance in this area at some point in the future.</p> |
| 21. | PKFI | We agree that the IAASB will need to address the use of multi-scope engagements, and that non-authoritative guidance will be useful. |
| 22. | PwC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Engagements that combine AUP with other forms of assurance are performed in practice today and, where this is done, each form of reporting needs to be clearly distinguishable. The Standard does not need to provide a lot of guidance in this regard, but it would be useful to acknowledge that multi-scope engagements are possible and that clarity is important when reporting. – Given that there is market demand for AUP engagements on non-financial information, broadening the scope of the Standard to apply to both financial and non-financial information would be useful, as well as developing any specific considerations when the subject matter is non-financial. • In practice, we do encounter engagements that include different elements. Each element of a multi-scope engagement is subject to its own individual Standards and, as such, it is a matter of drawing on those and bringing the reporting together. |

| | | |
|---|-------------------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Standard therefore does not need to provide a lot of guidance, but it would be useful to acknowledge that multi-scope engagements are possible and that each form of reporting and related scope should be clearly distinguishable. |
| 23. | RSM | See response to Q15 please. |
| Public Sector Organizations | | |
| 24. | AUDIT NEW ZEALAND | It would be helpful for the IAASB to address multi-scope engagements. In our view this could take the form of guidance on how the requirements that relate to the different elements apply in a multi-scope engagement. |
| 25. | CIPFA | CIPFA agrees that guidance on multi-scope engagements could be useful, but we suggest addressing this in a separate exercise. We currently have no strong view on whether this should be progressed using non-authoritative guidance. |
| 26. | PAS | Because different aspects of a multi-scope engagement should already be conducted in compliance with their respective IAASB standard, non-authoritative guidance would be useful to communicate to practitioners the distinction between the different scopes of the engagement. |
| Member Bodies and Other Professional Organizations | | |
| 27. | ACCA | ACCA supports the preparation of non-authoritative guidance, as suggested in the paper. |
| 28. | AE | <p>(47) Non-authoritative guidance would be useful to address multi-scope engagements. However, this should be done upon completion of the revised ISRS 4400. Otherwise any non-authoritative guidance developed at this stage should be a 'living document' to reflect this project's conclusions.</p> <p>(48) Engagement performance is generally not an issue, whereas form of reporting is often an issue. Transparency for the readers of the report as to the nature of the work done is essential.</p> |
| 29. | AICPA | <p><i>Combined answer to question 14 and 15</i></p> <p>AT-C section 215 contains the following guidance in the scope section that is relevant to multi-scope engagements:</p> <p>When a practitioner performs services pursuant to an engagement to apply agreed-upon procedures to subject matter as part of or in addition to another form of service, this section applies only to those services described herein; other professional standards would apply to the other services. Other services may include an audit, review, or compilation of a financial statement, another attestation service performed pursuant to the attestation standards, or a nonattestation service. A practitioner's report on applying agreed-upon procedures to subject matter may be combined with a report on such other services, provided the types of services can be clearly distinguished, and the applicable standards for each service are followed.</p> <p>We believe that adding the above guidance to revised ISRS 4400 would suffice. To the extent the IAASB does not agree, we agree with the Working Group that issues within AUP engagements should be addressed before multi-scope engagements are addressed.</p> |
| 30. | ASSIREVI | We would welcome guidance and best practice on the form of the report in circumstances where the practitioner provides assurance on a subject matter information and specific procedures are performed and described in the report at the same time, without affecting – either extending or qualifying - the overall reasonable or limited assurance conclusion on the subject matter information as a whole. |

| | | |
|-----|---------|--|
| | | Therefore, we agree to the fundamental principle stated in the standard (“...the key characteristics of a multi-scope engagement is that the various elements of the engagement comply with the corresponding IAASB pronouncements.”) |
| 31. | CAANZ | As multi-scope engagements are usually jurisdictional, the IAASB could consider formulating a framework (or updating the Assurance Framework) for national standard-setters to follow when developing local guidance on multi-scope engagements. |
| 32. | CAI | Given the added complexities with these engagements, we believe it would be best to address as a separate project. We would prefer that non-authoritative guidance is developed as a starting point |
| 33. | CPAA | Whilst non-authoritative guidance would be helpful for practitioners, there are some requirements which would be useful in this regard and may be able to be incorporated into existing standards. We consider that the International Framework for Assurance Engagements (Framework) may be able to usefully address multi-scope engagements. The Framework would need to address how practitioners’ reports can include different engagements with different levels of assurance (limited, reasonable or no assurance) and/or different subject matters, whilst clearly separating and communicating the outcomes from the different parts of the engagement or engagements. Multi-scope engagements should not be addressed in conjunction with AUP engagements and should be a distinct project. |
| 34. | EFAA | <i>Combined answer to question 14 and 15</i> We agree. Issues within AUP engagements should be addressed with high priority. Nevertheless multi-scope engagements are an important issue to cover. Due to the complexity of arising questions (e.g. combination of different kinds of confirmation / assurance, interrelation of findings, form of the report) it seems better to address these engagements in non-binding guidance. |
| 35. | FACPCE | We agree the Working Group’s view in order that any work to address multi- scope engagements needs to be separated from the project to revise ISRS 4400 because the scope of multi- scope engagements extends beyond ISRS 4400 into other IAASB pronouncements. We believe that a non- authoritative guide on the subject can help the application. In addition, we believe it would be useful to make a mention in the Preface to the pronouncements of the IAASB. |
| 36. | FAR | It would be useful with guidance and practical examples of how the practitioners can handle these types of engagements. Differences between the various types of engagements and differences in reports from the auditor should be highlighted. A non-authoritative guidance can be sufficiently to start with and there after the need of a standard can be considered. |
| 37. | FSR | Non-authoritative guidance would be useful to address multi-scope engagements. The guidance should focus on reporting issues to help ensure consistency and transparency to readers of reports on multi-scope engagements. Today we experience that there is a significant number of different multi-scope engagements that are driven by legal and regulatory requirements. We have noted that they are usually handled in a satisfactory manner, as the recipient of the report is usually the same party as the one that set the requirements for such engagements and how they should be reported. |
| 38. | IBR-IRE | We believe multi-scope engagements should be addressed separately from the ISRS 4400 project. |

| | | |
|-----|-------|---|
| 39. | ICAEW | <p>8. While multi-scope engagements are increasing in frequency we do not believe that these pose too many challenges for practitioners if approached correctly. It would be helpful for the IAASB to provide non-authoritative guidance that clarifies the approach here but we do not see a need for more detailed guidance.</p> <p><i>Combined answer to question 14 and 15</i></p> <p>34. While multi-scope engagements are increasing in frequency, we do not consider the performance of these to be especially challenging as each element of a multi-scope engagement should be subject to its own individual standards (which could be, for example, ISAE 3000 or ISRS 4400). It is more a matter of recognising that the engagement has a number of distinct parts and then drawing on the relevant standard to address each part of the engagement and reporting on each part in line with these standards.</p> <p>35. The IAASB could, therefore, usefully issue non-authoritative guidance which just clarifies this.</p> |
| 40. | ICAG | <p>We agree that all engagements need to be considered. Multi-scope engagements have additional components that are not addressed by the current draft and given the vast variety and complexity of assignments/engagements, additional guidance can only help in the quality and consistency of such engagements. A non-authoritative guidance will be useful.</p> |
| 41. | ICAS | <p>We believe that some form of non-authoritative guidance would be useful to address multi-scope engagements but this should be developed following the completion of the revision to ISRS 4400 to ensure that any non-authoritative guidance is based on the final requirements of the standard.</p> |
| 42. | ICASL | <p>Multi-scope engagements are not encouraged as it could leads to an absolute confusion to the users at this stage.</p> |
| 43. | ICAZ | <p>Our view is that IAASB needs to address multi-scope engagements given that the need for this type of engagement is increasing in the market. The profession's relevance is partly assessed by its response to the evolving market needs. We are of the view that the different components of a multi-scope engagements can be identified by the practitioner, therefore non-authoritative guidance would be most appropriate. If there is need the practitioner can refer to the already existing authoritative guidance for each component of the multi-scope engagement.</p> |
| 44. | ICPAU | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAASB should first address the requirements under ISRS 4400. • No-authoritative guidance would be issued as per emerging issues. |
| 45. | ISCA | <p>In addition, there appears to be demand for multi-scope engagements in Singapore, though they are currently not prevalent. This is perhaps due to a lack of guidance and practitioners would generally perform separate engagements to meet stakeholders' needs. We believe this may be an emerging area, for example, for grants of significant amounts and in the area of due diligence work.</p> <p>5.1 As highlighted above, multi-scope engagements are currently not prevalent in Singapore. Hence, we agree with the IAASB AUP Working Group's proposed plans to address issues within AUP engagements first before addressing and providing guidance on multi-scope engagements.</p> |
| 46. | KICPA | <p>We believe IAASB needs to engage more in addressing multi-scope engagements.</p> |

| | | |
|-----|-------|---|
| | | <p>For one, some of the Korean government agencies request multi-scope engagements, and the nature of relevant engagements demand audit opinions or review conclusions along with the performance of AUP procedures. In this case, professional accountants in Korea have difficulties in practice, due to the lack of clarity as to which standard they should apply to their engagements between ISAs and ISRS 4400.</p> <p>The provision of non-authoritative guidance could be more useful as compared to the status quo where relevant guidance does not exist at all. However, non-authoritative guidance is only confined to providing a direction on how multi-scope arrangements are performed. Not enough to provide a fundamental solution to authorize relevant procedures or methods even when professional accountants perform engagements according to non-authoritative guidance.</p> <p>Thus, it would be necessary for IAASB to establish standards or provide authoritative guidance professional accountants can apply in their performance of multi-scope engagements.</p> |
| 47. | MICPA | <p>The Institute agrees that the IAASB needs to address multi-scope engagements as they become more prevalent. Whilst non-authoritative guidance is useful, MICPA is of the view that the Working Group should work on a standard for multi-scope engagements to avoid an overlap or inconsistency with revised ISRS 4400 due to the lapse of time between the issue of revised ISRS 4400 and a standard for multi-scope engagements.</p> |
| 48. | NASBA | <p>We believe that one cannot make an AUP engagement a hybrid without jeopardizing some of its foundational conditions. Reports based on different types of professional standards would likely mislead the user as to the level of service provided on the subject matter of the report and such confusion would not be in the public interest. Therefore, if a request is made to perform a multi-scope engagement such work should be covered as separate engagements.</p> |
| 49. | SAICA | <p>97. The results of the SAICA survey indicated that there is a need for the IAASB to address multi- scope engagements with 86% of survey respondents being of the view that non-authoritative guidance would be useful in light of the emerging use of these types of engagements. It is SAICA's view that although non-authoritative guidance will provide useful guidance in the interim; the ultimate goal of the Working Group should be for this non-authoritative guidance to become authoritative in future to ensure consistent application in practice.</p> <p>98. Guidance as to what is considered to be a multi-scope engagement and how this is applied in practice is required as these types of engagements are becoming more popular among regulators.</p> <p>99. The Discussion Paper already refers to examples of multi-purpose engagements in the South African environment⁴². SAICA does not currently have any further information to add in this regard.</p> |
| 50. | SAIPA | <p>It's important to specify what is in the engagement. It will be good to have non-authoritative guidance on the AUP engagements. SAIPA however is not convinced that this should be the responsibility of the IAASB the other IFAC committees can develop such guidance.</p> |
| 51. | SMPC | <p>This is a complex issue that goes beyond the scope of any revision of ISRS 4400. We agree with the Working Group that any work to address multi-scope engagements extends into other IAASB pronouncements and should be addressed as a separate project.</p> <p>In the short-term, the development of non-authoritative guidance, particularly on reporting, may be helpful to assist practitioners when they are engaged to perform multi-scope engagements.</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 52. | WPK | <p><i>Combined answer to question 14 and 15</i></p> <p>Yes we do agree. Issues within AUP engagements should be addressed with priority.</p> <p>Nevertheless multi-scope engagements are an important issue to cover. Due to the complexity of arising questions (e.g. combination of different kinds of confirmation / assurance, interrelation of findings, form of the report) it seems better to address these engagements in non-binding guidance.</p> |
| Individuals and Others | | |
| 53. | 14000REGISTRY | <p>We can only offer a comment as a warning. One of the challenges with multi-scope approaches based on experience with other standards is that the needs driven by a specific subject matter can be undermined, in the pursuit of integration. From a systems perspective, the standard should excel at being 'fit for purpose', and this fundamental value can be lost if not carefully designed for and well tested before release to a market.</p> |
| 54. | ANA | <p>The dp rightly reflects that certain engagements (in our opinion, most engagements) are a mixture of assurance and non-assurance components, calling them 'hybrid' (or multi-scope) engagements. The hybrid engagements use a combination of procedures derived from review, compilation and AUP engagements. A majority of engagements we came across in our practice belong to this category. We agree that multi-scope engagements call for a wider consideration and separate guidance. Q14</p> <p>A14. The dp rightly reflects that certain engagements (in our opinion, most engagements) are a mixture of assurance and non-assurance components, calling them 'hybrid' (or multi-scope) engagements . The hybrid engagements use a combination of procedures derived from review, compilation and AUP engagements. A majority of engagements we came across in our practice belong to this category. We agree that multi-scope engagements call for a wider consideration and separate guidance. This will be the case where a single collective opinion is required, independence of the practitioner calls for further consideration.</p> |